

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Axis Communications AB, Canon Inc., and Canon U.S.A., Inc.,

Petitioners,

v.

Avigilon Fortress Corporation,

Patent Owner.

Case: IPR2019-00235

U.S. Patent No. 7,868,912

Issue Date: January 11, 2011

Title: Video Surveillance System Employing Video Primitives

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO PETITION FOR
INTER PARTES REVIEW**

CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	BACKGROUND	3
	A. The ’912 Patent	3
	B. Overview of the Claims of the ’912 Patent	5
	C. The Petition Proposes Two Obviousness Challenges	5
III.	LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL.....	6
IV.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.....	7
	A. Single Processor Claims (Claims 6, 9, 12, 18, 24, 25, 27–30, 32, 33).....	7
	B. “Filtering” (Claims 23–25, 31–36)	7
	C. “Stream” (Claims 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 15–17, 24, 25, 27–29, 32, 33).....	9
	D. “analyzing a combination of the received determined attributes” or “wherein analyzing the combination of the received determined attributes comprises filtering” (Petitioners’ “Independence Argument (1)” Discussion) (Claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 11, 12, 16, 18, 23–27, 29–36).....	9
	E. “Event” (Petitioners’ “Independence Argument (3)” Discussion) (Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 16–18, 22–36).....	11
	F. “Independent” (Petitioners’ “Independence Argument (2)” Discussion) (Claims 1, 6, 9, 15, 18, 23–28, 30–33).....	12
	G. “Analyzing only the attributes” (Claims 3, 8, 11).....	14
V.	THE BOARD SHOULD REJECT THE PETITION IN ITS ENTIRETY.	15
	A. Petitioners Fail to Prove <i>Flinchbaugh</i> Is a “Printed Publication.”	15
	B. Petitioners Fail To Prove <i>Kellogg</i> Is A “Printed Publication.”	18

C.	The Art Presented Is Cumulative To That Considered In Prior Reexamination.....	23
D.	Petitioners' Alleged Motivation To Combine <i>Kellogg</i> , <i>Flinchbaugh</i> , and <i>Brill</i> Is Unsupported.....	32
E.	Ground 1: Petitioners Fail To Prove <i>Kellogg</i> In Combination With <i>Flinchbaugh</i> Renders Claims 1–4 And 6–11 Obvious.	33
1.	Overview of <i>Kellogg</i>	33
2.	Overview of <i>Flinchbaugh</i>	34
3.	Petitioners fail to prove <i>Kellogg</i> in combination with <i>Flinchbaugh</i> teaches a system or method that “determines a first event . . . by analyzing a combination of the received determined attributes.” (Claims 1–11).....	36
4.	Petitioners fail to prove <i>Kellogg</i> in combination with <i>Flinchbaugh</i> teaches a system or method that “determines attributes independent of a selection of the first event.” (Claims 1–11).....	40
5.	Petitioners fail to prove <i>Kellogg</i> in combination with <i>Flinchbaugh</i> teaches “a first processor which analyzes a video to determine attributes” and “a second processor, separate from the first . . . which determines a first event.” (Claims 1–4).....	44
6.	Petitioners fail to prove <i>Kellogg</i> in combination with <i>Flinchbaugh</i> teaches “attributes of objects detected in the video.” (claims 1–4).....	48
F.	Ground 2: Petitioners Fail To Prove <i>Kellogg</i> In Combination With <i>Flinchbaugh</i> And <i>Brill</i> Renders Claims 1–4 And 6–36 Obvious.	50
1.	Overview of <i>Brill</i>	50
2.	Petitioners fail to prove <i>Kellogg</i> and <i>Flinchbaugh</i> teach the corresponding limitations in Claims 12–36 that relate to those in Claims 1–4, 6–11.....	52

Patent Owner’s Preliminary Response

- 3. Petitioners fail to prove *Brill* teaches a system or method that “determines a first event . . . by analyzing a combination of the received determined attributes.” (1–4, 6–36)53
- 4. Petitioners fail to prove *Brill* teaches a system or method that “determines attributes independent of a selection of the first event.” (Claims 1–4, 6–36).....54
- 5. Petitioners fail to prove *Brill* teaches “a first processor which analyzes a video to determine attributes” and “a second processor, separate from the first . . . which determines a first event.” (Claims 1–4, 23, 26, 31)55
- 6. Petitioners fail to prove *Kellogg*, *Flinchbaugh*, or *Brill* teach “filtering.” (Claims 23–25, 31–36).....59

VI. CONCLUSION62

PATENT OWNER'S EXHIBIT LIST

Exhibit No.	Description
2001	Declaration of Michael W. De Vries in Support of Unopposed Motion to Appear Pro Hac Vice on Behalf of Patent Owner Avigilon Fortress Corporation.
2002	Declaration of Adam R. Alper in Support of Unopposed Motion to Appear Pro Hac Vice on Behalf of Patent Owner Avigilon Fortress Corporation.
2003	Declaration of Akshay S. Deoras in Support of Unopposed Motion to Appear Pro Hac Vice on Behalf of Patent Owner Avigilon Fortress Corporation.
2004	37 C.F.R. § 1.132 Declaration of Kenneth A. Zeger (excerpt of U.S. Patent No. 7,868,912 Reexamination).
2005	Thomas Olson & Frank Brill, <i>Moving Object Detection & Event Recognition Algorithms for Smart Cameras</i> , 1 PROC. 1997 IMAGE UNDERSTANDING WORKSHOP 159-175 (1997).
2006	Jonathan D. Courtney, <i>Automatic Video Indexing Via Object Motion Analysis</i> , 30(4) PATTERN RECOGNITION 607-625 (1997).
2007	Patent Application No. 09/987707.
2008	U.S. Patent No. 6,628,835 to Brill et al.
2009	Declaration of Jennifer A. Babbitt.
2010	SearchWorks Catalog Entry for Thomas Olson & Frank Brill, <i>Moving Object Detection & Event Recognition Algorithms for Smart Cameras</i> , 1 PROC. 1997 IMAGE UNDERSTANDING WORKSHOP 159-175 (1997).
2011	Scanned Cover and Front Matter of Jonathan D. Courtney, <i>Automatic Video Indexing Via Object Motion Analysis</i> , 30(4) PATTERN RECOGNITION 607-625 (1997)

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.