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

PETITIONER'S REPLY



TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Intro	duction	1	1	
II.	Argu	ıment		2	
	A.	IPT's	IPT's Constructions Are Incorrect		
		1.	IPT's Construction of "forming at least one histogramsaid at least one histogram referring to classes defining said target" Is Incorrect (1[a])	2	
		2.	IPT's Construction of "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" Is Incorrect (1[a])	7	
		3.	IPT's Construction of "wherein forming the at least one histogram further comprises determining X minima and maxima and Y minima and maxima of boundaries of the target" Is Incorrect (1[c])	8	
	В.		Claim 3 Is Obvious Over Gerhardt in View of Bassman (Ground A)		
		1.	Gerhardt and Bassman Each Discloses Element 1[a]	17	
		2.	Gerhardt Discloses Element 1[c]	19	
		3.	It Would Have Been Obvious To Combine Gerhardt and Bassman	20	
	C.	Claim 3 Is Obvious Over Gilbert, Gerhardt, and Hashima (Ground B)			
		1.	Gilbert, Gerhardt, and Hashima Each Discloses Element 1[a]	21	
		2.	Gilbert, Gerhardt, and Hashima Each Discloses Element 1[c]	24	
		3.	It Would Have Been Obvious To Combine Gilbert, Gerhardt, and Hashima	29	
III.	Conc	clusion		30	
Cert	ificatio	n of W	ord Count	31	



LIST OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit	Description	Filing/Service
No.		Status
1001	U.S. Patent No. 8,983,134 ("the '134 patent")	Filed and
		served on
		03/31/2017
1002	Declaration of Dr. John C. Hart	Filed and
		served on
		03/31/2017
1003	Curriculum Vitae for Dr. John C. Hart	Filed and
		served on
		03/31/2017
1004	Prosecution File History of U.S. Patent No.	Filed and
	8,983,134	served on
		03/31/2017
1005	Alton L. Gilbert et al., A Real-Time Video Tracking	Filed and
	System,	served on
	PAMI-2 No. 1 IEEE Transactions on Pattern	03/31/2017
	Analysis and	
	Machine Intelligence 47 (Jan. 1980) ("Gilbert")	
1006	U.S. Patent 5,521,843 ("Hashima")	Filed and
		served on
		03/31/2017
1007	Reserved	
1008	D. Trier, A. K. Jain and T. Taxt, "Feature	Filed and
	Extraction Methods	served on
	for Character Recognition-A Survey", Pattern	03/31/2017
	Recognition, vol.	
	29, no. 4, 1996, pp. 641–662	
1009	M. H. Glauberman, "Character recognition for	Filed and
	business	served on
	machines," Electronics, vol. 29, pp. 132-136, Feb.	03/31/2017
	1956	
1010	Declaration of Gerard P. Grenier (authenticating	Filed and
	Ex. 1005)	served on
		03/31/2017
1011	Reserved	
1012	Reserved	



IPR2017-01218 (U.S. 8,983,134) Petitioner's Reply

1013	U.S. Patent No. 5,481,622 to Gerhardt ("Gerhardt")	Filed and
		served on
		03/31/2017
1014	U.S. Patent No. 6,044,166 to Bassman ("Bassman")	Filed and
		served on
		03/31/2017
1015	Reserved	
1016	Reserved	
1017	Reserved	
1018	Reserved	
1019	Reserved	
1020	Reserved	
1021	Reserved	
1022	Prosecution File History of U.S. Patent No.	Filed and
	8,805,001	served on
		03/31/2017



I. INTRODUCTION

The Board instituted review of claim 3 of the '134 Patent on two grounds:

A) claim 3 is obvious over Gerhardt and Bassman; and B) claim 3 is obvious over Gilbert, Gerhardt, and Hashima. Institution Decision, 29.

Regarding Ground A, Patent Owner Image Processing Technologies ("IPT") does not in its Response dispute that Gerhardt and Bassman disclose elements 1[pre], 1[b], or claim 3.¹ IPT only challenges 1[a] and 1[c]. PO Resp., 53-56. That the combination of Gerhardt and Bassman discloses 1[pre], 1[b], and claim 3 should therefore be deemed admitted. 37 CFR §42.23(a).

Regarding Ground B, IPT similarly disputes only that Gilbert, Gerhardt, and Hashima disclose elements 1[a] and 1[c]. PO Resp., 2-3, 57-61; Ex. 2007, ¶45. That the combination of Gilbert, Gerhardt, and Hashima discloses 1[pre], 1[b], and claim 3 should therefore be deemed admitted. 37 CFR §42.23(a).

As discussed below, IPT provides no argument that claim 3 is not rendered obvious under either Ground A or B under the proper constructions preliminarily adopted by the Board in its Institution Decision. Accordingly, to the extent IPT's incorrect claim constructions are rejected, claim 3 is invalid. Furthermore, even under IPT's constructions, claim 3 is invalid.

¹ Elements 1[pre], 1[a], 1[b], and 1[c] are defined in the Petition at 39, 41, 43, 45.



DOCKET

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.

