

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,
Petitioner

v.

BRADIUM TECHNOLOGIES LLC,
Patent Owner

CASE IPR2015-01432
Patent 7,139,794

**PATENT OWNER BRADIUM TECHNOLOGIES LLC'S
PRELIMINARY RESPONSE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. §42.107**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THE REQUIREMENTS TO INSTITUTE AN INTER PARTES REVIEW	2
III. GROUND 1 IS FATALLY FLAWED BECAUSE THE PETITION DOES NOT ESTABLISH THAT EITHER LINDSTROM OR POTMESIL IS PRIOR ART	3
A. Petitioner Has Not Shown that Lindstrom Qualifies as Prior Art.....	4
B. Petitioner Has Not Shown that Potmesil Qualifies as Prior Art.	9
IV. THE PETITION FAILS TO ESTABLISH A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF PREVAILING ON GROUND 1.....	12
A. Claim 1.....	13
1. <i>Element 1.A</i> "a parcel request subsystem, including a parcel request queue, operative to request discrete image data parcels in a priority order"	13
2. <i>Element 1.C</i> "said parcel request subsystem being responsive to an image parcel request of assigned priority to place said image parcel request in said parcel request queue ordered in correspondence with said assigned priority"	19
3. <i>Element 1.D</i> " an parcel rendering subsystem coupled to said parcel data store to selectively retrieve and render received image data parcels to a display memory"	22
4. <i>Element 1.E</i> "said parcel rendering system providing said parcel request subsystem with said image parcel request of said assigned priority".....	24
5. <i>Elements 1.F, 1.G, And 1.H</i> "wherein said parcel rendering subsystem determines said assigned priority based on a determined optimal image resolution level [1.F], wherein said display memory is coupled to an image display of predetermined resolution [1.G] and wherein said determined optimal image resolution level is based on said predetermined resolution [1.H]".....	25
6. <i>Element 1.I</i> " wherein said assigned priority further reflects the proximity of the image parcel referenced by said image parcel request to a predetermined focal point"	31
7. Conclusion as to Ground 1, Claim 1	33
B. Claim 2.....	33
1. <i>Element 2.A</i> " determining, in response to user navigational commands, a viewpoint orientation with respect to an image displayed within a three-dimensional space"	33

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
2. <i>Element 2.B</i> "requesting, in a priority order, image parcels renderable as corresponding regions of said image"	35
3. <i>Element 2.D</i> "wherein said priority order is determined to provide a progressive regional resolution enhancement of said image as each said image parcel is rendered"	37
4. <i>Element 2.H</i> "wherein said step of rendering provides for the selective rendering of said plurality of image parcels having the highest associated resolutions to the corresponding regions of said image"	39
5. <i>Element 2.I</i> " wherein said step of rendering limits the selective rendering of said image parcels to image parcels having associated resolutions less than a predetermined level"	41
6. <i>Element 2.K</i> "wherein said priority order is re-evaluated in response to a change in said viewpoint orientation"	43
7. Conclusion as to Ground 1, Claim 2	44
V. THE PETITION FAILS TO ESTABLISH A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF PREVAILING ON GROUND 2	44
A. Claim 1	47
1. <i>Element 1.A</i> "a parcel request subsystem, including a parcel request queue, operative to request discrete image data parcels in a priority order"	47
2. <i>Element 1.B</i> "to store received image data parcels in a parcel data store"	48
3. <i>Element 1.C</i> "said parcel request subsystem being responsive to an image parcel request of assigned priority to place said image parcel request in said parcel request queue ordered in correspondence with said assigned priority"	49
4. <i>Element 1.E</i> "said parcel rendering system providing said parcel request subsystem with said image parcel request of said assigned priority"	50
5. <i>Elements 1.F, 1.G, And 1.H</i> "wherein said parcel rendering subsystem determines said assigned priority based on a determined optimal image resolution level [1.F], wherein said display memory is coupled to an image display of predetermined resolution [1.G] and wherein said determined optimal image resolution level is based on said predetermined resolution [1.H]"	51

..

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
6. Element 1.J " wherein said discrete image data parcels are of a first fixed size as received by said parcel request subsystem".....	52
7. Element 1.K "of a second fixed size as rendered by said parcel rendering subsystem".....	53
8. Conclusion as to Ground 2, Claim 1.....	53
VI. THE PETITION FAILS TO ESTABLISH A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF PREVAILING ON GROUND 3.....	53
A. Claim 2.....	53
1. Element 2.B "requesting, in a priority order, image parcels renderable as corresponding regions of said image"	54
2. Element 2.D "wherein said priority order is determined to provide a progressive regional resolution enhancement of said image as each said image parcel is rendered"	55
3. Elements 2.E and 2.F	56
4. Element 2.H "wherein said step of rendering provides for the selective rendering of said plurality of image parcels having the highest associated resolutions to the corresponding regions of said image"	56
5. Element 2.I " wherein said step of rendering limits the selective rendering of said image parcels to image parcels having associated resolutions less than a predetermined level".....	57
6. Element 2J "wherein said step of rendering selectively renders said plurality of image parcels as the unique textures for the corresponding regions of said image".....	58
7. Element 2K "wherein said priority order is re-evaluated in response to a change in said viewpoint orientation".....	59
8. Conclusion as to Ground 3, Claim 2.....	60
VII. CONCLUSION.....	60

...

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>2Wire, Inc. v. TQ Delta LLC</i> , IPR2015-00239, (P.T.A.B. May 29, 2015).....	5, 9, 19
<i>ActiveVideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Commc'n, Inc.</i> 694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	18
<i>Apple Inc. v. DSS Tech. Mgmt., Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00369 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 12, 2015).....	6, 7, 9, 10
<i>Apple, Inc. v. Contentguard Holdings, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00445 (P.T.A.B. July 9, 2015)	34, 38
<i>Cisco Systems, Inc., v. C-Cation Technologies, LLC</i> , IPR2014-00454 (P.T.A.B. August 29, 2014).....	passim
<i>Dish Network L.L.C. v. Dragon Intellectual Property, LLC</i> , IPR2015-00499 (P.T.A.B. July 17, 2015)	6, 8, 11
<i>Google Inc. v. ART+COM InnovationPool GmbH</i> , IPR2015-00788 (P.T.A.B. September 2, 2015).....	4, 5, 9
<i>Google, Inc. v. Everymd.com LLC</i> , IPR2014-00347 (P.T.A.B. May 22, 2014).....	14, 21
<i>Gracenote, Inc. v. Iceberg Industries LLC</i> , IPR2013-00552 (P.T.A.B. March 7, 2014).....	passim
<i>Hopkins Manufacturing Corporation v. Cequent Performance Products, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00613 (P.T.A.B. August 7, 2015)	18, 58
<i>In re Khan</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	13, 18
<i>In re Lister</i> , 583 F.3d 1307 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	4, 7, 11
<i>Kinetic Technologies, Inc. v. Skyworks Solutions, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00529 (P.T.A.B. September 23, 2014),.....	passim
<i>KSR Intern. Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	2, 13, 28

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.