

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

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

Petitioners,

v.

Avigilon Fortress Corporation,

Patent Owner.

---

Case No. IPR2019-00311

U.S. Patent No. 7,932,923

---

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

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**I. INTRODUCTION .....1**

**II. BACKGROUND .....4**

A. The ’923 Patent .....4

B. Overview of the Claims of the ’923 Patent .....5

C. The Petition Proposes One Anticipatory Challenge and One Obviousness Challenge .....6

**III. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL.....7**

**IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.....8**

A. “attributes of the object” (Claims 1-7, 9-19, 22-28, 30-41); “attributes of each of the detected first and second objects” (Claims 8, 29); “attributes of the detected objects” (Claims 20, 21).....8

B. “new user rule” (Claims 1-41) .....9

C. “applying” (Petitioners’ “Independence Argument (1)” Discussion) (Claims 1-41).....10

D. “event” (Petitioners’ “Independence Argument (3)” Discussion) (Claims 1-41).....11

E. “independent” (Petitioners’ “Independence Argument (2)” Discussion) (Claims 1-41).....12

F. “wherein the applying the new user rule to the plurality of detected attributes comprises applying the new user rule to only the plurality of detected attributes” (Claims 1-19, 22-29); “wherein the analysis of the combination of the attributes to detect the event comprises analyzing only the combination of the attributes” (Claims 20-21); “wherein the applying the selected new user rule to the plurality of attributes stored in memory comprises applying the selected new user rule to only the plurality of attributes stored in memory” (Claims 30-41).....15

G. “a video device” (Claims 9, 20, and 30) .....18

H. Means-Plus-Function Claims .....19

**V. THE BOARD SHOULD REJECT THE PETITION IN ITS ENTIRETY .....19**

A. Petitioners Fail to Prove *Kellogg* Is a “Printed Publication” .....19

1. Petitioners Fail to Provide Competent Evidence of *Kellogg*’s Publication.....19

B. Petitioners Fail to Prove *Brill* Is a “Printed Publication”.....25

1. Petitioners Provide No Evidence That *Brill* Was Published .....25

2. Petitioners Fail to Provide Adequate Evidence *Brill* Was Meaningfully Indexed.....28

C. The Art Presented Is Cumulative to That Considered in Prior Reexamination.....29

D. There Is No Motivation to Combine *Kellogg* and *Brill* .....37

E. Ground 1: Petitioners Fail to Prove *Kellogg* Anticipates Claims 1-41 .....38

1. Overview of *Kellogg*.....38

2. Petitioners Fail to Show *Kellogg* Teaches “detecting an object in a video from a single camera” (Claims 1-41).....39

3. Petitioners Fail to Show *Kellogg* Teaches “identifying an event of the object that is not one of the detected attributes of the object by applying the new user rule to the plurality of detected attributes, wherein the applying the new user rule to the plurality of detected attributes comprises applying the new user rule to only the plurality of detected attributes” (Claims 1-41).....45

4.	Petitioners Fail to Show <i>Kellogg</i> Teaches “the plurality of attributes that are detected are independent of which event is identified” (Claims 1-41) .....	49
5.	Petitioners Fail to Show <i>Kellogg</i> Teaches “selecting the new user rule comprises selecting a subset of the plurality of attributes for analysis” (Claims 2, 4, 7, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 23, 25, 28, 32, 33, 34, 35, 38) .....	51
6.	Petitioners Fail to Show <i>Kellogg</i> Teaches “a video device” (Claims 9, 20, and 30).....	53
F.	Ground 2: Petitioners Fail to Prove <i>Kellogg</i> in Combination with <i>Brill</i> Renders Claims 1–4 Obvious .....	55
1.	Overview of <i>Brill</i> .....	55
2.	Petitioners Fail to Show <i>Kellogg</i> in Combination with <i>Brill</i> Renders Obvious “detecting an object in a video from a single camera” (Claims 1-41).....	57
3.	Petitioners Fail to Show <i>Kellogg</i> in Combination with <i>Brill</i> Renders Obvious “the plurality of attributes that are detected are independent of which event is identified” (Claims 1-41) .....	60
4.	Petitioners Fail to Show <i>Kellogg</i> in Combination with <i>Brill</i> Renders Obvious “identifying an event of the object that is not one of the detected attributes of the object by applying the new user rule to the plurality of detected attributes; wherein the applying the new user rule to the plurality of detected attributes comprises applying the new user rule to only the plurality of detected attributes” (Claims 1-41) .....	60
<b>VI.</b>	<b>CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>62</b>

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Acceleration Bay, LLC v. Activision Blizzard Inc.</i> , 908 F.3d 765 (Fed. Cir. 2018) .....	20, 22, 23, 24
<i>Axis Comm'ns v. Avigilon Fortress Corp.</i> , IPR2018-00138 .....	8
<i>Blue Calypso, LLC v. Groupon, Inc.</i> , 815 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	25
<i>In re Cronyn</i> , 890 F.2d 1158 (Fed. Cir. 1989) .....	22
<i>Crystal Semiconductor Corp. v. TriTech Microelectronics Int'l, Inc.</i> , 246 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2001) .....	18
<i>Ford Motor Co. v. Versata Dev. Group, Inc.</i> , IPR2016-01019, Paper 9 (Oct. 4, 2016) .....	25, 26, 27
<i>Ford Motor</i> , IPR 2016-01019 .....	26
<i>In re Hall</i> , 781 F.2d 897 (Fed. Cir. 1986) .....	20, 22, 28
<i>Harmonic Inc. v. Avid Tech., Inc.</i> , 815 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	36
<i>Impax Labs., Inc. v. Aventis Pharms, Inc.</i> , 545 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....	41
<i>In re Klopfenstein</i> , 380 F.3d 1345 (Fed. Cir. 2004) .....	26, 27
<i>Neil Zeigmann, N.P.Z., Inc. v. Stephens</i> , IPR2015-01860, Paper 13 (Sept. 6, 2017) .....	37
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) .....	12

# 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.