

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

GOOGLE INC.,
Petitioner,
v.

VEDANTI SYSTEMS LIMITED,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2016-00212¹
Patent 7,974,339 B2

RESPONSE OF PATENT OWNER VEDANTI SYSTEMS LIMITED

Mail Stop PATENT BOARD
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
United States Patent and Trademark Office
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

¹ Case IPR2016-00215 has been consolidated with this proceeding.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	v
PATENT OWNER’S EXHIBIT LIST	vi
I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT	1
II. THE ALLEGED GROUNDS FOR UNPATENTABILITY	4
III. THE ’339 PATENT DISCLOSES AND CLAIMS AN UNPRECEDENTED UNIQUE COMBINATION OF APPROACHES.....	4
IV. PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART OF IMAGE, VIDEO AND DATA COMPRESSION AND TRANSMISSION	11
A. Petitioner’s Characterization of the Field is Overbroad	11
B. Dr. Grindon is not Qualified to Opine as to the Abilities and Understandings of One of Ordinary Skill in the Relevant Art	13
V. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	15
A. “Frame Data”	16
B. “Region and Matrix”	17
C. “Region Data/Matrix Data/Matrix Definition Data” and “Data”	17
D. “Matrix Size Data”	18
E. “A Analysis System Receiving Frame Data and Generating Region Data”	18
F. “Pixel Selection Data”/“Selection Pixel Data”	22
G. “selecting one of two or more sets of pixel data”	23
H. “selecting a set of pixel data from each region”	24
VI. IPR2016-00212	26
A. Cited References	26

a.	Spriggs Discloses Quad-tree Decomposition of an Image into Variable Regions Defined by a Data Stream of Pixel Values Interspersed with the 1/0 Subdivision Codes	26
b.	Golin Discloses Edge Detection	32
B.	Petitioner Has Failed to Show All of the Claim Elements in the Asserted Combination	33
a.	The Invention of a System and Method of Selecting Pixels from Regions determined by analysis or optimization is not found in the asserted combination	33
b.	The asserted ground as to claim 1, 6 and 13 fails to identify a “pixel selection system” separately identifiable from an “analysis system” relying instead solely on the coding process of Spriggs for both	37
c.	The asserted grounds incorrectly interpret the corner pixel values as both “the region data” and “the pixel data” that is based upon the “region data”	41
d.	Neither Spriggs nor Golin disclose a “pixel selection system receiving the region data and generating one set of pixel data for each region” as required by Claims 1, 6 and 13.....	45
e.	Neither Spriggs nor Golin disclose “selecting one of two or more sets of pixel data based on the optimized matrix data” as required by Claims 7 and 9	50
f.	Neither Spriggs nor Golin disclose “selecting a set of pixel data for each region” as required by Claims 10 and 12.....	53
VII.	IPR2016-00215	54
A.	Cited References	54

a.	In Belfor, Uniformly Sized Regions are Subsampled According to a Selected One from a Set of Subsampling Lattice Modes	54
b.	In Thyagarajan, Uniformly Sized Regions are Quad-tree Decomposed into Variable Sub- Regions for Application of DCT Compression.....	62
c.	Golin Discloses Edge Detection	64
B.	Petitioner Has Failed to Prove Obviousness of Claims 1, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12 And 13	64
a.	The Quad-tree Block Subdivision of the Uniformly Sized Blocks in Thyagarajan Cannot be Simply Substituted for the Block Size Determination of the Uniformly Sized Blocks in Belfor	64
b.	The System of Belfor Operates on Uniformly Sized Blocks and Offers No Disclosure of How to Produce Encodable and Decodable Data with Different Sets of Lattices for Blocks of Different Sizes	68
c.	Even if Combined, Belfor, Thyagarajan and Golin fail to disclose the “region data” and “data receiving system receiving the region data...generating a display” and the “display generation system receiving pixel location data” of Claim 1	72
d.	Even if Combined, Belfor, Thyagarajan and Golin fail to disclose the “assembling” step of Claims 7 and 10	74
e.	Dr. Grindon’s Visualization of Regions in a Subsampling Lattice of Belfor Does Not Correspond to Anything that Might be Called Region Data or Matrix Data in Belfor Nor is There any Suggestion to Apply a Subsampling Lattice to the Regions Drawn By Dr. Grindon.....	76
f.	The Petition Fostered Misconceptions About the Cited References	80

i.	Thyagarajan Teaches DCT Compression Not Pixel Sampling	80
ii.	Belfor Does Not Set a Block Size and Sampling Frequency for Each Block	83
VIII.	CONCLUSION.....	83

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.