

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,
Petitioner

v.

BRADIUM TECHNOLOGIES LLC,
Patent Owner

CASE IPR2016-00448
Patent 7,908,343

**PATENT OWNER BRADIUM TECHNOLOGIES LLC'S
CORRECTED RESPONSE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. §42.120**

PROTECTIVE ORDER MATERIAL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Overview of the '343 Patent.....	6
	A. Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art	8
	B. Claim Construction	8
III.	Legal Standards	15
IV.	The Patentability of Claims 1–20 Should Be Affirmed	17
	A. Summary of Patent Owner’s Argument.....	17
	B. Discussion of Reddy and Hornbacker	19
	1. Reddy	19
	2. Hornbacker.....	20
	C. The Asserted References Do Not Teach or Suggest All Elements of the '343 Patent	21
	1. Reddy does not disclose a limited bandwidth communications channel	21
	2. Reddy does not disclose a limited communication bandwidth computer device	23
	3. Neither Reddy nor Hornbacker discloses selection of data parcels for progressive resolution enhancement	26
	4. Neither Reddy nor Hornbacker discloses prioritization of requests for image parcels, including based on difference in resolution.....	28
	5. Neither Reddy nor Hornbacker discloses the use of a “prioritization value”	32
	6. Neither Reddy nor Hornbacker discloses the '343 patent’s efficient data structure.....	35

- D. A POSA Would Not Have Selected and Combined Reddy and Hornbacker, and the Asserted Combination Is Driven by Improper Hindsight44
 - 1. The prior art taught away from an image pyramid approach such as TerraVision II for real-time image display over the World Wide Web45
 - 2. Reddy teaches away from operation on a limited communications bandwidth computer device47
 - 3. Hornbacker and Reddy are incompatible49
 - 4. The reference combination is guided by impermissible hindsight51
- E. Objective Indicia of Non-Obviousness Support a Finding of Non-Obviousness.....52
 - 1. There was a long-felt need but unresolved need for the invention of the '343 Patent.52
 - 2. Praise for the Invention.....55
 - 3. Commercial Success of the Invention57
- V. Conclusion60

Patent Owner Bradium Technologies LLC (“Patent Owner”) hereby submits this Patent Owner’s Response to the Petition filed by Microsoft Corporation (“Petitioner”) in case IPR2016-00448 for review of claims 1–20 of U.S. Patent No. 7,908,343 (the “’343 patent”).

I. INTRODUCTION

The Board instituted *inter partes* review on one ground: whether claims 1–20 are patentable over Reddy in view of Hornbacker. But the Board did not have the benefit of a full record, including the declarations of Dr. Peggy Agouris and of inventor, Mr. Isaac Levanon. Based on the complete record, the Board should affirm the patentability of all claims.

Reddy in view of Hornbacker does not teach or suggest all of the elements of the challenged claims of the ’343 patent, including a limited bandwidth device or communications channel, the ’343 patent’s efficient K_D , X, Y data structure, prioritization of data parcels, or a prioritization value associated with an update data parcel request. Hornbacker does not disclose all the elements which Reddy is lacking, including the efficient K_D , X, Y data structures of the ’343 patent, prioritization of data parcels and a prioritization value parameter. Ex. 2003, ¶¶46–48.

In any case, a POSA would not have combined Reddy and Hornbacker to arrive at the claimed invention. A POSA would not consider a document-processing reference such as Hornbacker for GIS applications. Ex. 2003, ¶¶50, 127-132. Also, in addressing a bandwidth-limited situation, a POSA would not have looked to Reddy, either alone or in view of Hornbacker, because Reddy is specifically designed for a high-speed internet connection and is computationally complex and bandwidth intensive. *See* Ex. 2066 at 2 (proposal to build application over advanced NGI networks); Ex. 2003, ¶¶51-52. Reddy is part of the Multidimensional Applications GigaBit (extremely high-speed) Internet Consortium (MAGIC) project. Ex. 1004, ¶38 and p.37 (Acknowledgements, showing funding by MAGIC II). A POSA would not have considered Reddy for a limited bandwidth environment and would not have applied Reddy to achieve the method and system described and claimed in the '343 patent. Ex. 2003, ¶53.

A POSA would also not have considered Hornbacker in a bandwidth-limited environment. Hornbacker discloses that the server custom-calculates tile views of an image based, for example, on a particular angle of rotation that the user happens to request—these tiles would be unusable in the system of Hornbacker by a user who requests the same image at a slightly different angle, for example, which a POSA would understand to be an inefficient approach that would needlessly result in duplicative network traffic. Ex. 2003, ¶54.

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.