

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

AXIS COMMUNICATIONS AB, CANON INC.,  
and CANON U.S.A., INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

AVIGILON FORTRESS CORPORATION,  
Patent Owner.

---

IPR2019-00235  
Patent 7,868,912 B2 & C1

---

Before GEORGIANNA W. BRADEN, KIMBERLY McGRAW, and  
JESSICA C. KAISER, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

McGRAW, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION

Denying Petitioner's Request for Rehearing of Decision  
Denying Institution of *Inter Partes* Review  
*37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d)*

## I. INTRODUCTION

Axis Communications AB, Canon Inc., and Canon U.S.A., Inc. (collectively “Petitioner”) filed a Petition (Paper 1, “Pet.”) requesting an *inter partes* review of claims 1–4 and 6–36 of U.S. Patent No. 7,868,912 B2 & C1 (Ex. 1001, “the ’912 patent”) over certain references, including Flinchbaugh I<sup>1</sup> (Ex. 1005) and Kellogg (Ex. 1003). Petitioner also filed a Declaration of Emily R. Florio (Ex. 1007, “Original Florio Declaration”) supporting its Petition. Avigilon Fortress Corporation (“Patent Owner”) filed a Preliminary Response (Paper 9, “Prelim. Resp.”). Petitioner then filed an authorized Reply to Patent Owner’s Preliminary Response (Paper 14, “Reply”) and an authorized Motion to Correct the Florio Declaration under 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(c) (Paper 15). We issued a Decision (Paper 19, “Decision” or “Dec.”), in which we denied Petitioner’s Motion to Correct the Florio Declaration and declined to institute *inter partes* review of the ’912 patent. *See* Dec. 5–12.

In the Decision, we determined Petitioner had failed to establish sufficiently that Flinchbaugh I is prior art to the ’912 patent. *Id.* at 10–12. In particular, we determined that neither the Petition nor the evidence cited therein, which included the Original Florio Declaration, supported Petitioner’s contention that Flinchbaugh I was disseminated or otherwise accessible to the public before the effective filing date of the ’912 patent. *Id.* at 11–12. Because each of the asserted grounds of unpatentability relied upon Flinchbaugh I, we found Petitioner did not show a reasonable

---

<sup>1</sup> Flinchbaugh et al., *Autonomous Scene Monitoring System*, Proceedings of the Joint 10th Annual Government-Industry Security Technology Symposium & Exhibition, June 20–23, 1994, pp. 205–209. (Ex. 1005, “Flinchbaugh I”).

likelihood of prevailing with respect to at least one of the claims challenged in the petition, and we determined not to institute an *inter partes* review. *Id.* at 12.

Petitioner filed a Request for Rehearing of our Decision. Paper 20 (“Rehearing Request” or “Reh. Req.”). In its Request, Petitioner contends we erred by focusing on the Original Florio Declaration and by failing to address the evidence of publication on the face of the Flinchbaugh I. Req. Reh’g 1–2. Additionally, Patent Owner requested review by the Precedential Opinion Panel (*see* Req. Reh’g. 3), which was denied (Paper 23).

For the reasons set forth below, Petitioner’s Request for Rehearing is *denied*.

## II. ANALYSIS

### A. *Legal Standards*

The party challenging a decision in a request for rehearing bears the burden of showing the decision should be modified. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d). The request for rehearing “must specifically identify all matters the party believes the Board misapprehended or overlooked, and the place where each matter was previously addressed.” *Id.* We review our Decision denying institution under an abuse of discretion standard. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.71(c). An abuse of discretion may arise if based on an erroneous interpretation of law, if a factual finding is not supported by substantial evidence, or if the decision represents an unreasonable judgment in weighing relevant factors. *Star Fruits S.N.C. v. United States*, 393 F.3d 1277, 1281 (Fed. Cir. 2005).

Under 35 U.S.C. § 311(b), a petitioner in an *inter partes* review may only challenge the claims of a patent based on “prior art consisting of patents

or printed publications.” Whether a reference qualifies as a “printed publication” involves a case-by-case inquiry into the facts and circumstances surrounding the reference’s disclosure to members of the public. *In re Klopfenstein*, 380 F.3d 1345, 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2004). The key inquiry is whether the reference was made “sufficiently accessible to the public interested in the art” before the effective filing date. *In re Lister*, 583 F.3d 1307, 1311 (Fed. Cir. 2009). A reference is considered “publicly accessible” upon a satisfactory showing that the document has been “disseminated or otherwise made available to the extent that persons interested and ordinarily skilled in the subject matter or art exercising reasonable diligence[] can locate it.” *Kyocera Wireless Corp. v. ITC*, 545 F.3d 1340, 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2008) (citation and internal quotation marks omitted).

After Petitioner filed its Request, the Board issued a Precedential Opinion Panel Decision in *Hulu LLC v. Sound View Innovations, LLC*, IPR2018-01039, Paper 29 (PTAB Dec. 20, 2019) (precedential). In that decision, the panel held that at the institution stage, the petition must identify, with particularity, evidence sufficient to establish a reasonable likelihood that the reference was publicly accessible before the critical date of the challenged patent and, therefore, there is a reasonable likelihood that it qualifies as a printed publication. *Id.* at 13. *Hulu* explains there is no presumption in favor of finding that a reference is a printed publication. Rather, “the burden is on the petitioner to identify with particularity evidence sufficient to establish a reasonable likelihood that the reference was publicly accessible before the critical date of the challenged patent, and therefore that there is a reasonable likelihood that it qualifies as a printed publication.” *Id.* at 16. *Hulu* further states that “indicia on the face of a reference, such as printed dates and stamps, are considered as part of the

totality of the evidence” to determine that an asserted reference was publicly accessible. *Id.* at 17–18.

In its Request for Rehearing, Petitioner contends the Decision “focused on errors made in the original Florio Declaration” but that the declaration “was *not* the only evidence of publication of the Flinchbaugh I reference.” Req. Reh’g 4. Petitioner asserts “the Petition and the face of Flinchbaugh I, to which it cites (Ex. 1005), establish the publication status of Flinchbaugh I, at least for institution purposes, *without* considering the Florio Declaration at all.” *Id.* (citing Pet. 2–3); *see also id.* at 2 (stating the “Board did not address the evidence of publication on the face of the Flinchbaugh I reference itself—which was expressly cited by Petitioners” and that the “indicia on the face of Flinchbaugh I is strong evidence that Flinchbaugh I qualifies as a printed publication”).

The Petition, however, does not contain any argument that indicia on the face of Flinchbaugh I is evidence of publication. Petitioner directs us to pages 2–3 of the Petition. Reg. Reh’g 4–5. These pages, however, merely state that (1) Flinchbaugh I is one of the references relied upon to show obviousness of the challenged claims (*see* Pet. 2) and that (2) “Flinchbaugh was published in the Proceedings of the 10th Annual Joint Government-Industry Security Technology Symposium& Exhibition. The Symposium occurred in June 1994 and the Proceedings were published by at least 1995” (Pet. 3 (citing Ex. 1007 ¶¶ 27–31)).

Patent Owner, in its Preliminary Response, argued that Petitioner’s evidence was insufficient to establish that either the Flinchbaugh I or Kellogg references were printed publications. *See* Prelim. Resp. 15–23. Petitioner did not seek authorization to file a reply to present any arguments or to identify with particularity any evidence to establish a reasonable

# 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.