

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

Case: IPR2019-00236

U.S. Patent No. 7,868,912
Issue Date: January 11, 2011

Title: Video Surveillance System Employing Video Primitives

DECLARATION OF JOHN R. GRINDON, D.Sc.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. BACKGROUND AND QUALIFICATIONS.....2

II. MATERIALS CONSIDERED7

III. LEGAL STANDARDS FOR PATENTABILITY10

 A. Anticipation Analysis: 35 U.S.C. § 102.....11

 B. Obviousness Analysis: 35 U.S.C. § 10312

IV. THE '912 PATENT.....17

 A. Overview17

 B. Prosecution History21

 1. Original Examination.....21

 2. *Inter partes* and *ex partes* reexamination22

 3. Prior Proceedings Involving Related Patents.....23

 C. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art25

V. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION26

 A. Single Processor or Multiple Processors (claims 6-22)27

 B. “filtering”28

 C. Independence-based limitations31

 1. Independence Argument (1): requires identifying an event that refers to one or more objects engaged in an activity by analyzing the detected attributes.....34

 2. Independence Argument (3): the identified event is not one of the detected attributes.....35

 3. Independence Argument (2): the detected attributes are “independent” of the event identified or detected40

D.	analyzing “only” certain attributes	49
VI.	PRIORITY DATE	51
VII.	OVERVIEW OF PRIOR ART	57
A.	State of the Prior Art and Applicant Admitted Prior Art	57
B.	<i>Talmon</i>	59
C.	<i>Aspectus</i>	62
D.	<i>Brill</i>	63
E.	Motivation to Combine <i>Talmon</i> with <i>Aspectus</i> or <i>Brill</i>	67
1.	<i>Talmon</i> and <i>Aspectus</i>	67
2.	<i>Talmon</i> and <i>Brill</i>	68
VIII.	NEW ISSUES OF PATENTABILITY	70
A.	Dispute Regarding the Independence-Based Claim Elements in the Prior Proceedings	70
B.	Dispute Regarding Priority Date	73
IX.	CLAIMS 1-4 and 6-36 OF THE '912 PATENT ARE UNPATENTABLE OVER THE PRIOR ART	74
A.	Ground 1: <i>Talmon</i> anticipates claims 1-4 and 6-36	74
1.	Independent Claim 1	74
2.	Claims 2, 7, 10, 14, and 21	86
3.	Claims 3, 8, 11	87
4.	Claim 4	89
5.	Independent Claim 6	90
6.	Independent Claim 9	93

7.	Independent Claim 12	95
8.	Claim 13	97
9.	Claim 15	98
10.	Claim 16	98
11.	Claim 17	99
12.	Independent Claim 18	99
13.	Claims 19, 22	104
14.	Claim 20	104
15.	Claims 23-25	105
16.	Claims 26-29	109
17.	Claims 30-33	113
18.	Claims 34-36	118
B.	Grounds 2-3: Obviousness of Claims 1-4, 6-36	119
1.	“event that is not one of the [determined/detected] attributes” and “combination of the [received] [determined] attributes” [All Claims]	119
2.	Claims 3, 8, 11	121
3.	Claim 18 – <i>Talmon</i> in view of <i>Aspectus</i> or <i>Brill</i>	124
4.	Claims 26-33 – <i>Talmon</i> in view of <i>Aspectus</i> or <i>Brill</i>	124
X.	CONCLUSION	125

I, Dr. John R. Grindon, declare as follows:

1. I make this Declaration based upon my own personal knowledge and, if called upon to testify, would testify competently to the matters stated herein.

2. I have been asked by Axis Communications AB, Canon Inc., and Canon U.S.A., Inc. (collectively “Petitioner”) to provide technical assistance in connection with the Petition for *inter partes* review of U.S. Patent No. 7,868,912 (“the ’912 patent”). This Declaration, which I understand will be filed with the Petition, is a statement of certain opinions I have formed on issues related to the patentability of claims 1-4 and 6-36 of the ’912 patent.

3. It is my opinion that each of claims 1-4 and 6-36 of the ’912 Patent is unpatentable in view of the identified prior art. My opinions are stated in detail in this Declaration, with reference to the exhibits attached to the Petition and any additional exhibits attached to my Declaration.

4. I am being paid at my customary rate of \$500 per hour for my time spent in study, preparation, and testifying in this matter. I am also being reimbursed for reasonable and customary expenses associated with my work. No portion of my compensation is dependent or otherwise contingent upon the specifics of my testimony or the results of this matter. My compensation is not contingent upon the outcome of this *inter partes* review.

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.