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 IPR2017-01190
Patent No. 6,717,518

IMAGE PROCESSING TECHNOLOGIES LLC'S
PATENT OWNER RESPONSE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.120

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction....1

II. Summary....3

III. Constitutionality of *Inter Partes* Review....5

IV. Technical Background....5

A. Anatomy of the Eye....5

B. Facial Detection....7

V. Overview of the ’518 Patent....8

A. Histogram Calculation Based on Image Data....10

B. Detection of Eye Area—Two Preferred Embodiments....16

1. Detection of Eye Area Based on Head Frame....17

2. Detection of Eye Area Based on Location of a Facial Characteristic....21

C. Claim 39....27

D. Claim Construction....28

1. “histogram”....28

2. “anthropomorphic model”....31

3. “characteristic of the face” / “facial characteristic”....32

4. “Selecting pixels of the portion of the image having characteristics corresponding to the feature to be detected; forming at least one histogram of the selected pixels”....34

VI. Legal Standards....41

VII. Claim 39 Is Not Obvious Over the Asserted Prior Art Combinations....44

A. Eriksson (Ex. 1005) in View of Stringa (Ex. 1006) Does Not Teach or Suggest All Elements of Claim 39....45

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

1. Neither Reference Teaches or Suggests a “Histogram” 45

2. Eriksson in Combination with Stringa Does Not Teach or Suggest a Histogram “of the Selected Pixels”. 48

B. A POSA Would Not Have Selected and Combined Eriksson and Stringa in the Manner Proposed by Petitioner to Achieve the Claimed Invention. 52

C. Ando (Exhibit 1009) in View of Suenaga (Exhibit 1007) Does Not Teach or Suggest All Elements of Claim 39. 57

1. Neither References Teaches or Suggests Forming a Histogram “of the Selected Pixels”. 57

2. Suenaga Does Not Teach or Suggest Identifying a Facial Characteristic Other than the Feature to Be Detected. 66

D. A POSA Would Not Have Selected and Combined Ando and Suenaga in the Manner Proposed by Petitioner to Achieve the Claimed Invention. 66

VIII. Conclusion 74

DOCKET ALARM

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Apple Inc. v. Contentguard Holdings, Inc.,
IPR2015-00442, Paper 9 (P.T.A.B. July 13, 2015) 41, 43, 44

Google, Inc. v. Everymd.com LLC,
IPR2014-00347, Paper 9 (P.T.A.B. May 22, 2014).....42

Grain Processing v. American-Maize Prods,
840 F.2d 902 (Fed. Cir. 1988).....45

In re Magnum Oil Tools Int’l.,
829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016)..... 41, 43

In re NTP, Inc.,
654 F.3d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....45

In re Omeprazole Patent Litigation,
536 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....45

InTouch Tech., Inc. v. VGo Communs., Inc.,
751 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....45

Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.,
688 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....42

KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.,
550 U.S. 398 (2007)..... 44, 45, 46

Liberty Mut. Ins. Co. v. Progressive Cas. Ins. Co.,
CBM-2012-00003, Paper 7 (P.T.A.B. Nov. 26, 2012)..... 42, 43

Ortho-McNeil Pharm. v. Mylan Labs,
520 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....45

Proctor & Gamble Co. v. Teva Pharm. USA, Inc.,
566 F.3d 989 (Fed. Cir. 2009)..... 43, 44

Rolls–Royce PLC v. United Techs. Corp.,
603 F.3d 1325, 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....54

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

Unigene Labs., Inc. v. Apotex, Inc.,
655 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2011)..... 44, 45

Whole Space Indus Ltd. v. Zipshade Indus.,
IPR2015-00488, Paper 14 (P.T.A.B. July 24, 2015) 42

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 103.....41

35 U.S.C. § 314.....41

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKET ALARM

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.