

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In Re Patent of : Peter L. VENETIANER et al.  
Patent No. : 7,868,912  
Issued : January 11, 2011  
Title : VIDEO SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM EMPLOYING  
VIDEO PRIMITIVES  
Application Serial No. : 11/098,385  
Filed : April 5, 2005  
Requester : Bosch Security Systems, Inc.

**VIA EFS-WEB**

Mail Stop *Inter Partes* Reexam  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

**REQUEST FOR *INTER PARTES* REEXAMINATION  
OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,868,912 PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.915**

SIR:

Bosch Security Systems, Inc. (“Requester”), through its undersigned counsel, hereby respectfully requests *inter partes* reexamination of U.S. Patent No. 7,868,912 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 311 *et seq.* and the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 1.902 *et seq.*

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. IDENTIFICATION PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.915(b)(1) ..... 1

II. COPY OF '912 PATENT PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.915(b)(5)..... 1

III. CERTIFICATION PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.915(b)(7)..... 1

IV. IDENTIFICATION OF REAL PARTY IN INTEREST PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.915(b)(8) ..... 1

V. PROCEEDINGS RELATED TO '912 PATENT ..... 1

VI. THE '912 PATENT AND ITS PROSECUTION ..... 3

VII. CITATIONS OF PRIOR ART PATENTS AND PRINTED PUBLICATIONS THAT ARE PRESENTED TO PROVIDE A SHOWING THAT THERE IS A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT THE REQUESTER WILL PREVAIL WITH RESPECT TO AT LEAST ONE OF THE CLAIMS CHALLENGED IN THIS REQUEST PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.915(b)(2) ..... 13

VIII. STATEMENTS POINTING OUT EACH SHOWING OF A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT THE REQUESTER WILL PREVAIL WITH RESPECT TO AT LEAST ONE OF THE CLAIMS CHALLENGED IN THIS REQUEST PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.915(b)(3) ..... 17

IX. DETAILED EXPLANATIONS PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.915(b)(3) ..... 19

    1. Claims 1 to 3 and 6 to 22 Are Anticipated by Gilge Under 35 U.S.C. § 102.. 19

    2. Claims 4 and 5 Are Unpatentable in View of Gilge Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 ..24

    3. Claims 1 to 4 and 6 to 22 Are Anticipated by Lipton et al. Under 35 U.S.C. § 102.....25

    4. Claim 5 Is Unpatentable in View of Lipton et al. Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 .....29

    5. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11 to 13, 15 to 20, and 22 Are Anticipated by Courtney Under 35 U.S.C. § 102.....29

    6. Claims 2, 5, 7, 10, 14, and 21 Are Unpatentable in View of Courtney Under 35 U.S.C. § 103..... 34

    7. Claims 1 to 3 and 6 to 22 Are Anticipated by Black et al. Under 35 U.S.C. § 102..... 35

    8. Claims 4 and 5 Are Unpatentable in View of Black et al. Under 35 U.S.C. § 103..... 37

    9. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11 to 13, 15 to 20, and 22 Are Anticipated by Brodsky et al. Under 35 U.S.C. § 102 ..... 38

    10. Claim 5 Is Unpatentable in View of Brodsky et al. Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 ...40

11.	Claims 2, 7, 10, 14, and 21 Are Unpatentable in View of the Combination of Brodsky et al. and Liu et al. Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 .....	41
12.	Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11 to 13, 15 to 20, and 22 Are Anticipated by Olson et al. Under 35 U.S.C. § 102.....	43
13.	Claims 2, 5, 7, 10, 14, and 21 Are Unpatentable in View of Olson et al. Under 35 U.S.C. § 103.....	46
14.	Claims 1 to 22 Are Unpatentable in View of the Combination of Shotton et al. and Liu et al. Under 35 U.S.C. § 103.....	47
15.	Claims 1 to 22 Are Unpatentable in View of the Combination of Greenhill et al. and Rottman Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 .....	51
16.	Claims 1 to 22 Are Unpatentable in View of the Combination of Brown et al. and Gilge Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 .....	57
17.	Claims 1 to 22 Are Unpatentable in View of the Combination of Brown et al. and Lipton et al. Under 35 U.S.C. § 103.....	63
18.	Claims 1 to 22 Are Unpatentable in View of the Combination of Brown et al. and Courtney Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 .....	64
19.	Claims 1 to 22 Are Unpatentable in View of the Combination of Brown et al. and Black et al. Under 35 U.S.C. § 103.....	66
20.	Claims 1 to 22 Are Unpatentable in View of the Combination of Brown et al. and Brodsky et al. Under 35 U.S.C. § 103.....	67
21.	Claims 1 to 22 Are Unpatentable in View of the Combination of Brown et al. and Olson et al. Under 35 U.S.C. § 103.....	68
22.	Claims 1 to 22 Are Unpatentable in View of the Combination of Brown et al., Shotton et al., and Liu et al. Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 .....	70
23.	Claims 1 to 22 Are Unpatentable in View of the Combination of Brown et al., Greenhill et al., and Rottman Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 .....	71
X.	REQUESTER’S PROPOSED GROUNDS OF REJECTION.....	72
XI.	FEE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.915(a).....	74
XII.	CERTIFICATION PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.915(b)(6).....	74
XIII.	CONCLUSION.....	75

## EXHIBITS

- Exhibit 1 U.S. Patent No. 7,868,912 entitled “Video Surveillance System Employing Video Primitives,” issued January 11, 2011 to Peter L. Venetianer, Alan J. Lipton, Andrew J. Chosak, Matthew F. Frazier, Niels Haering, Gary W. Myers, Weihong Yin, and Zhong Zhang.
- Exhibit 2 “Complaint” filed on June 29, 2011 in *In the Matter of Certain Video Analytics Software, Systems, Components Thereof, and Products Containing Same*, U.S. International Trade Commission Investigation No. 337-TA-795.
- Exhibit 3 “Notice of Institution of Investigation” issued on July 27, 2011 for U.S. International Trade Commission Investigation No. 337-TA-795.
- Exhibit 4 “Response of Bosch Security Systems, Inc. and Robert Bosch GmbH to the Complaint of ObjectVideo, Inc. Under Section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as Amended, and Notice of Investigation” filed September 6, in U.S. International Trade Commission Investigation No. 337-TA-795.
- Exhibit 5 Proposed Claim Constructions of Requester and Robert Bosch GmbH, filed October 26, 2011 in U.S. International Trade Commission Investigation No. 337-TA-795.
- Exhibit 6 “Joint Claim Construction Chart” filed October 28, 2011 in U.S. International Trade Commission Investigation No. 337-TA-795.
- Exhibit 7 “Amended Complaint” filed May 11, 2011 in *OBJECTVIDEO, INC. v. ROBERT BOSCH GMBH et al.*, Case No. 3:11-cv-00217-JAG (E.D. Va.).
- Exhibit 8 “Bosch Security Systems, Inc.’s Answer and Counterclaims to ObjectVideo Inc.’s Amended Complaint” filed June 8, 2011 in *OBJECTVIDEO, INC. v. ROBERT BOSCH GMBH et al.*, Case No. 3:11-cv-00217-JAG (E.D. Va.).
- Exhibit 9 “Reply to Counterclaims of Bosch Security Systems, Inc.,” filed June 22, 2011 in *OBJECTVIDEO, INC. v. ROBERT BOSCH GMBH et al.*, Case No. 3:11-cv-00217-JAG (E.D. Va.).
- Exhibit 10 “Order” Granting Motion to Stay, dated August 10, 2011 in *OBJECTVIDEO, INC. v. ROBERT BOSCH GMBH et al.*, Case No. 3:11-cv-00217-JAG (E.D. Va.).
- Exhibit 11 U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 11/098,385, filed April 5, 2005 by Peter L. Venetianer, Alan J. Lipton, Andrew J. Chosak, Matthew F. Frazier, Niels Haering, Gary W. Myers, Weihong Yin, and Zhong Zhang.
- Exhibit 12 Listing of Prior Art Patents and Printed Publications that Provide a Showing that There Is a Reasonable Likelihood that the Requester Will

Prevail With Respect To At Least One of the Claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,868,912.

- Exhibit 13 German Patent Publication No. DE 101 53 484 A1 by Gilge.
- Exhibit 14 Certified English Translation of German Patent Publication No. DE 101 53 484 A1.
- Exhibit 15 “ObjectVideo Forensics: Activity-Based Video Indexing and Retrieval For Physical Security Applications,” Lipton et al.
- Exhibit 16 U.S. Patent No. 5,969,755 to Courtney.
- Exhibit 17 “Wide Area Surveillance with a Multi Camera Network,” Black et al.
- Exhibit 18 “Visual Surveillance in Retail Stores and in the Home,” Brodsky et al.
- Exhibit 19 “A New Network-Based Intelligent Surveillance System,” Liu et al.
- Exhibit 20 “Moving Object Detection and Event Recognition Algorithms for Smart Cameras,” Olson et al.
- Exhibit 21 “Object Tracking and Event Recognition in Biological Microscopy Videos,” Shotton et al.
- Exhibit 22 “VIGILANT: Content-Querying of Video Surveillance Streams,” Greenhill et al.
- Exhibit 23 German Patent Publication No. DE 198 48 490 by Rottman.
- Exhibit 24 Certified English Translation of German Patent Application Publication DE 198 48 49.
- Exhibit 25 U.S. Patent No. 7,447,331 to Brown et al.
- Exhibit 26 Certificate of Service Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.915(b)(6)

# 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.