

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

---

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

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. Introduction..... 1

II. Constitutionality of *Inter Partes* Review .....2

III. Overview of the '134 Patent.....2

    A. Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art .....10

    B. Claim Language .....11

    C. Claim Construction .....12

IV. Legal Standards .....13

V. No Review Should be Instituted for Claims 3–6.....17

    A. Petitioner Has Not Shown that the Asserted References Teach or Suggest All Elements of Claims 4, 5, or 6 of the '134 Patent .....17

        1. Petitioner Has Not Shown that Gerhardt (Ex. 1013) or Bassman (Ex. 1014) Teach or Suggest All Elements of Claims 4, 5, or 6 ..19

        2. Petitioner Has Not Shown that Gilbert (Ex. 1005), Gerhardt or Hashima (Ex. 1006) Teach or Suggest All Elements of Claims 4, 5, or 6 .....28

    B. Neither Gerhardt nor Bassman Teaches or Suggests All Elements of Claim 3 .....35

    C. Petitioner Has Not Shown That a POSA Would Have Selected and Combined the Asserted References to Reach Claim 3 .....39

        1. Petitioner Has Not Shown That a POSA Would Have Combined Gerhardt and Bassman .....41

        2. Petitioner Has Not Shown That a POSA Would Have Combined Gilbert, Gerhardt and Hashima .....45

    D. Petitioner’s Reasons for Combining the References Are Driven by Improper Hindsight Analysis .....53

VI. Conclusion .....56

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>Apple Inc. v. Contentguard Holdings, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00442, Paper 9 (P.T.A.B. July 13, 2015) .....	14, 15, 16
<i>Google, Inc. v. Everymd.com LLC</i> , IPR2014-00347, Paper 9 (P.T.A.B. May 22, 2014).....	14
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966),.....	13, 14
<i>Grain Processing v. American-Maize Prods.</i> , 840 F.2d 902 (Fed. Cir. 1988).....	17
<i>In re Magnum Oil Tools Int'l.</i> , 829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	13, 15
<i>In re NTP, Inc.</i> , 654 F.3d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	17, 54
<i>In re Omeprazole Patent Litigation</i> , 536 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	16
<i>Innogenetics, N.V. v. Abbott Labs.</i> , 512 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	54
<i>InTouch Tech., Inc. v. VGo Communs., Inc.</i> , 751 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	17
<i>Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Smith &amp; Nephew, Inc.</i> , 688 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	14, 54
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	16, 17
<i>Liberty Mut. Ins. Co. v. Progressive Cas. Ins. Co.</i> , CBM-2012-00003, Paper 7 (P.T.A.B. Nov. 26, 2012) .....	14, 15
<i>Ortho-McNeil Pharm. v. Mylan Labs</i> , 520 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	17, 54

*Phillips v. AWH Corp.*,  
415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....12

*Proctor & Gamble Co. v. Teva Pharm. USA, Inc.*,  
566 F.3d 989 (Fed. Cir. 2009)..... 15, 16

*SAS Inst., Inc. v. ComplementSoft, LLC*,  
825 F.3d 1341 (2016),  
*cert. granted sub nom. SAS Inst. Inc. v. Lee*,  
137 S. Ct. 2160 (May 22, 2017) (No. 16-969).....13

*Synopsys, Inc. v. Mentor Graphics Corp.*,  
814 F.3d 1309 (2016).....13

*Trivascular Inc. v. Samuels*,  
812 F.3d 1056 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....54

*Unigene Labs., Inc. v. Apotex, Inc.*,  
655 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....16

*W.L. Gore & Assoc., Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*,  
721 F.2d 1540 (Fed. Cir. 1983)..... 40, 54

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

**Statutes**

35 U.S.C. § 103 ..... 13, 14

**LIST OF EXHIBITS**

2001	Claim construction opinion in <i>Image Processing Technologies, LLC v. Samsung Elecs. Co., et al.</i> , No. 16-cv-00505-JRG (E.D. Tex.), dated June 21, 2017.
------	---

Patent Owner Image Processing Technologies LLC (“Patent Owner”) hereby submits this Preliminary Patent Owner’s Response to the Petition filed by Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. and Samsung Electronics America, Inc. (collectively, “Petitioner”) on March 31, 2017, in case IPR2017-01218 for review of claims 3–6 of U.S. Patent No. 8,983,134 (the “’134 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.

For challenged claims 4–6, as to each of Grounds 1 and 2, Petitioner has not shown that the asserted references teach or suggest at least the following elements:

(i) “successively increasing the size of a selected area until the boundary of the target is found,” (claim 4) and (ii) “adjusting a center the selected area based upon a shape of the target until substantially the entire target is within the selected area,” (claim 5) as a part of “forming the at least one histogram” on a “frame-by-frame basis” as required by claims 4 and 5 respectively and thus dependent claim 6.

For challenged claim 3, as to Ground 1, Petitioner has not shown that either Gerhardt or Bassman teaches or suggests all elements of claim 1, from which claim 3 depends.

# 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.