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 IPR2017-01218
Patent No. 8,983,134

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. Constitutionality of *Inter Partes* Review....3

III. Overview of the '134 Patent....4

IV. Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art....14

V. Prosecution History....14

A. The '001 Patent....14

B. The '134 patent....18

VI. Claim Construction....19

A. [1c] "wherein forming the at least one histogram further comprises determining X minima and maxima and Y minima and maxima of boundaries of the target." 20

1. The Board's Preliminary Construction Would Conflict with the '134 Patent Prosecution History. 21

2. Patent Owner's Proposed Construction is Consistent with the Plain Meaning of the Claim and the Patent Specification. 23

3. There is No Requirement that the Scope of the Claim Encompass All Embodiments Taught in the Patent. 26

4. The Board's Preliminary Construction Would Conflict with Principles of Claim Differentiation....27

B. [1a] "forming at least one histogram . . . said at least one histogram referring to classes defining said target"....28

1. "Comprising" Used Elsewhere in the Claim Does Not Expand the Scope of this Claim Element....31

2. Other Claim Language Already Requires that the Target be Included in the Histogram....33

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

3. The Specification teaches limiting the data used to form histograms to data for pixels that meet classes that define the target, such as DP=1. 35

C. [1a] "forming at least one histogram of the pixels in the one or more of a plurality of classes in the one or more of a plurality of domains" 38

VII. The Asserted Prior Art 39

A. Gerhardt 39

B. Bassman 41

C. Gilbert 42

D. Hashima 46

VIII. Legal Standards 52

IX. Claim 3 Is Not Obvious Over The Asserted Prior Art Combinations 53

A. Gerhardt in View of Bassman Does Not Teach or Suggest All Elements of Claim 3. 53

1. The references do not teach or suggest element [1a] "forming at least one histogram . . . said at least one histogram referring to classes defining said target" 53

2. The references also do not teach or suggest element [1a] "forming at least one histogram of the pixels in the one or more of a plurality of classes in the one or more of a plurality of domains". 55

3. The references do not teach or suggest the claim element [1c] "forming the at least one histogram further comprises determining X minima and maxima and Y minima and maxima of boundaries of the target". 55

B. Gilbert in View of Gerhardt and Further in View of Hashima Does Not Teach or Suggest All the Elements of Claim 3. 57

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

1. The references do not teach or suggest the claim element [1c] "forming the at least one histogram further comprises determining X minima and maxima and Y minima and maxima of boundaries of the target". 57

2. The references do not teach or suggest [1a] "forming at least one histogram of the pixels in the one or more of a plurality of classes in the one or more of a plurality of domains". 61

C. A POSA Would Not Have Selected and Combined the Asserted References to Reach Claim 3. 61

1. A POSA Would Not Have Combined Gerhardt and Bassman.....64

2. A POSA Would Not Have Combined Gilbert, Gerhardt and Hashima 69

X. Conclusion 72

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) 53

Aylus Networks, Inc. v. Apple Inc.,
No. 13-CV-04700-EMC, 2016 WL 270387 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 21, 2016),.....34

Blackboard, Inc. v. Desire2Learn, Inc.,
574 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....28

Digital-Vending Servs. v. *Univ. of Phoenix*,
672 F.3d 1270 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....27

Dippin' Dots, Inc. v. Mosey,
476 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....32

Genentech, Inc. v. Chiron Corp.,
112 F.3d 495 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....33

In re Magnum Oil Tools Int’l.,
829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....53

In re NTP, Inc.,
654 F.3d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....63

In re Smith,
871 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2017)..... 31, 36

INVISTA v. M&G USA,
951 F. Supp. 2d 604 (D. Del. 2013).....26

Liberty Ammunition, Inc. v. United States,
835 F.3d 1388 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....33

Ortho-McNeil Pharm. v. Mylan Labs,
520 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....63

Phillips v AWH Corp.,
415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....54

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.