

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD. AND
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.
Petitioner

v.

IMAGE PROCESSING TECHNOLOGIES LLC,
Patent Owner

CASE IPR2017-00357
Patent No. 8,989,445

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Overview of the '445 Patent.....	1
	A. Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art	6
	B. Claim Construction	7
III.	Legal Standards	7
IV.	No Review Should be Instituted for Claims 1, 4, 6, 9, 18, 24, 25 and 27	11
	A. Petitioner Has Not Shown that a POSA Would Have Selected and Combined the Asserted References to Arrive at the Claimed Invention.....	12
	1. Ground 1: Petitioner Has Not Shown that a POSA Would Have Combined Gilbert and Brady	12
	2. Ground 2: Petitioner Has Not Shown that a POSA Would Have Combined Gilbert and Hashima	15
	3. Ground 3: Petitioner Has Not Shown that a POSA Would Have Combined Hashima and Brady	18
	4. Grounds 1 and 2: Petitioner Has Not Shown that a POSA Would Have Combined Altan with Any of Gilbert, Brady and Hashima	22
V.	Conclusion	26

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Apple Inc. v. Contentguard Holdings, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00442, Paper 9 (P.T.A.B. July 13, 2015)	8, 9, 10
<i>Google, Inc. v. Everymd.com LLC</i> , IPR2014-00347, Paper 9 (P.T.A.B. May 22, 2014).....	9
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966),.....	7, 8
<i>Grain Processing v. American-Maize Prods.</i> , 840 F.2d 902 (Fed. Cir. 1988).....	11
<i>In re Magnum Oil Tools Int’l.</i> , 829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	8, 9
<i>In re NTP, Inc.</i> , 654 F.3d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	11
<i>In re Omeprazole Patent Litigation</i> , 536 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	10
<i>InTouch Tech., Inc. v. VGo Communs., Inc.</i> , 751 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	11
<i>Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.</i> , 688 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	8
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007)	10, 11
<i>Liberty Mut. Ins. Co. v. Progressive Cas. Ins. Co.</i> , CBM-2012-00003, Paper 7 (P.T.A.B. Nov. 26, 2012)	8, 9
<i>Ortho-McNeil Pharm. v. Mylan Labs</i> , 520 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	11
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	7

<i>Proctor & Gamble Co. v. Teva Pharm. USA, Inc.</i> , 566 F.3d 989 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	9, 10
<i>SAS Institute, Inc. v. ComplementSoft, LLC</i> , 825 F.3d 1341 (2016).....	7
<i>Synopsys, Inc. v. Mentor Graphics Corp.</i> , 814 F.3d 1309 (2016).....	7
<i>Unigene Labs., Inc. v. Apotex, Inc.</i> , 655 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	10
<i>W.L. Gore & Assoc., Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.</i> , 721 F.2d 1540 (Fed. Cir. 1983).....	12
<i>Whole Space Indus Ltd.</i> , IPR2015-00488, Paper 14 (P.T.A.B. July 24, 2015)	8

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 103.....	7, 8
----------------------	------

Patent Owner Image Processing Technologies LLC (“Patent Owner”) hereby respectfully submits this Preliminary Patent Owner’s Response to the Petition filed by Samsung Electronics Co. Ltd. and Samsung Electronics America, Inc. (collectively, “Petitioner”) on November 30, 2016 in case IPR2017-00357 for review of claims 1, 4, 6, 9, 18, 24, 25 and 27 of U.S. Patent No. 8,989,445 (the “’445 patent”).

I. INTRODUCTION

The Board should not institute review because the Petition fails to establish a reasonable likelihood that the Petitioner would prevail with respect to any of the challenged claims.

As to each of Grounds 1, 2 and 3, Petitioner fails to show that a POSA would have combined the asserted references Gilbert, Brady and Hashima (claims 1, 4, 6, 9, 24, 25 and 27) and additionally Altan (claim 18) to arrive at the claimed subject matter.

The Board should decline to institute an *inter partes* review of claims 1, 4, 6, 9, 18, 24, 25 and 27 of the ’445 patent.

II. OVERVIEW OF THE ’445 PATENT

The ’445 patent is directed to efficient, real time identification and localization of a wide range of moving objects using histograms. *E.g.*, ’445 patent, Ex. 1001 at 1:37–42; 9:17–24; 16:48–56. The inventor developed a system that

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.