

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CORPORATION, LTD., AND
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.,
Petitioners

v.

IMAGE PROCESSING TECHNOLOGIES, LLC,
Patent Owner

CASE IPR2017-01218
Patent No. 8,983,134 B2

**PATENT OWNER IMAGE PROCESSING TECHNOLOGIES LLC'S
RESPONSE TO PETITIONER'S SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF**

Paper No. 34

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	The Natural and Correct Reading of Element [1c] Requires that Determining Target Boundaries Must Occur as a Part of the Formation of the Histogram.	1
II.	The Specification Supports Image Processing’s Construction	2
III.	The Prosecution History Supports Image Processing’s Construction.....	5
A.	Samsung’s Reading of Element [1c] and Claim 4 Encompasses Hunke and Grove, Over Which the Claims Were Allowed.....	5
B.	The Examiner Distinguished between Processing in a Frame and Processing Over Multiple Frames	7

The Board authorized Image Processing Technologies, LLC (“Image Processing”) to file this response. Paper 31 (Order), 2 (stating that Petitioner’s brief raised new claim interpretation issues). The correct claim construction of element [1c] under *Phillips* is dispositive of this IPR because the Petition and its exhibits do not show that the prior art teaches or suggests this claim element, (*see* Paper 11 (Institution Decision), 18 (Gerhardt), 28 (Gilbert, Hashima)), and no additional evidence or argument has been authorized (Paper 26 (Order), 4).

The IPR2017-00353 panel did not have the benefit of a full record, *e.g.*, Ex. 2011 (Hart deposition), so that Panel’s claim interpretation should not control.

I. The Natural and Correct Reading of Element [1c] Requires that Determining Target Boundaries Must Occur as a Part of the Formation of the Histogram.

Under *Phillips*, the Board attempts to identify the correct construction in light of the claim language, specification, and prosecution history, not the broadest construction. *PPC Broadband v. Corning Optical Commc’ns*, 815 F.3d 734, 740 (Fed. Cir. 2016) (under *Phillips*, the PTO should seek “the construction that most accurately delineates the scope of the claim invention”). Under *Phillips*, the meaning most closely aligned with the plain language of claim element [1c] “forming the...histogram...**comprises** determining...boundaries of the target,” requires that determining the boundaries be part of forming the histogram.

Samsung’s position (Paper 29, 2–3, 6) reads element [1c] unreasonably

broadly as encompassing an *unlimited* amount of post-histogram-formation activity prior to determination of the target boundaries.¹ See Ex. 2011, 114:14–115:23. As Dr. Hart stated in deposition:

Q Is there any limitation on how much additional processing can be done after the histogram is formed in order to find boundaries?

A I don't see any limitation on the amount of computation or analysis. I think '134, Claim 1 and specifically Element 1C says that you form a histogram and determine the X and Y minima and maxima as boundaries of the target. And I think that [if] determination is based on the formation of that histogram . . . then you satisfied the restrictions of Element 1C.

Ex. 2011, 115:11–23. Allowing an unlimited amount of post histogram-formation processing reads out the “comprising” language, and instead merely requires both a “forming” step and a “determining” step with no relationship between the steps.

II. The Specification Supports Image Processing’s Construction

Contrary to Samsung’s assertion, the lock-on tracking embodiment (Ex. 1001, 23:59–25:2, Figs. 20–23) is an embodiment of claims 1–6 that teaches iteratively adjusting a selected area while forming a histogram such that the X and Y minima and maxima of boundaries of a target are determined as part of forming

¹ *Phillips* requires consideration of claim language, specification, and prosecution history. The *Phillips* doctrine of construing claims to preserve their validity applies to AIA trials. See Changes to the Claim Construction Standard for Interpreting Claims Before the PTAB, 83 FED. REG. 21221, 21223 (May 9, 2018).

the histogram. *See* Paper 15, 8–13. The lock-on tracking embodiment is consistent with dependent claims 4–6. The embodiment teaches setting boundaries in the x and y histogram formation units 28 and 29 such that only the pixels falling in the bounded area will be processed. Ex. 1001, 24:1–12, 35–54. The embodiment teaches processing “successively larger areas” and “adjusting the center of the area” for which pixels are processed based upon the shape of the object. Ex. 1001, 24:1–12. Pixel data from an expanded area area can be added to a histogram of the smaller original area. *See* Ex. 2011 (Hart depo.), 79:14–83:24.

Samsung’s interpretation of claim 6 is incorrect. Paper 29, 2. Claim 6 is consistent with the lock-on tracking embodiment and merely requires setting X and Y value boundaries in the histogram formation units to adjust the selected area. This is how the lock-on tracking embodiment changes the area in the box shown in Figures 21–22 while the histogram is being calculated. Ex. 1001, 24:1–12, 35–54.

Thus, Samsung’s argument that the lock-on tracking embodiment must operate across multiple frames is meritless. Samsung claims that an iterative process must form a new histogram for each iteration (Paper 29, 4) but Dr. Hart admitted that a single histogram can *continue* to be formed if the area under consideration is enlarged to include more pixel data. Ex. 2011, 79:14–83:24; Ex. 2014. Samsung’s argument that the histogram memory is “cleared” only between frames thus misses the point. The histogram memory *need not* be cleared for

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.