

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

UNIFIED PATENTS, LLC,
Petitioner,

v.

ELECTRONICS AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS RESEARCH INSTITUTE,
Patent Owner

Case No. IPR2021-00827
Patent No. 9,781,448

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	OVERVIEW OF THE '448 PATENT	3
III.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	7
	A. "Prediction Value"	8
IV.	OVERVIEW OF THE PRIOR ART	16
	A. Moon.....	16
	B. Teng.....	18
	C. Wilkins.....	19
V.	THE PETITION'S PROPOSED GROUNDS OF UNPATENTABILITY ARE DEFECTIVE.....	21
	A. Ground 1 Is Deficient	21
	1. The <i>Moon-Teng-Wilkins</i> Combination Fails to Provide a "Second Filter" to Apply to a "Prediction Value" of the Current Block "When [] Intra-Prediction for the Current Block is Performed"	21
	2. The <i>Moon-Teng-Wilkins</i> Combination Fails to Determine Whether to Apply a Filter Based on a "Size" of the Current Block	27
	a) <i>Wilkins</i> 's "split mode" and "non-split mode" intra- prediction parameters are inapplicable to the boundary strengths (Bs) on which <i>Moon</i> determines "whether" to apply a filter.....	28
	b) <i>Wilkins</i> evaluates "split mode" and "non-split mode" intra-prediction parameters only after making a decision "whether" to apply a filter	48
	c) <i>Wilkins</i> 's "split mode" and "non-split mode" intra- prediction parameters are attributes that apply to	

macroblocks of a fixed size, and therefore do not indicate a “size of the current block” in *Wilkins* or the proposed combination53

3. The *Moon-Teng-Wilkins* Combination Fails to Determine Whether to Apply a Filter Further Based on an “Intra Prediction Mode” of the Current Block59

B. Ground 2 Is Deficient62

1. The *Moon-Teng* Combination Fails to Provide a “Second Filter” to Apply to a “Prediction Value” of the Current Block “When [] Intra-Prediction for the Current Block is Performed”62

VI. UNIFIED’S PAYING SEP VIDEO ZONE MEMBERS ARE RPIS68

A. *SharkNinja* Does Not Permit Ignoring The RPI Issue Here69

B. Unified’s Paying Video Zone Members Are RPIs.....72

1. Unified is a for-profit business that files IPRs for “customers” to reduce their patent exposure72

2. Unified brings IPRs on behalf of its SEP Video Codec Zone, without infringement concerns to itself75

3. Unified considers its customers’ interests when filing IPRs, and represents its customers’ interests here.....76

4. Unified’s Unnamed Members are clear beneficiaries of this IPR, with pre-existing, established relationships.....78

VII. CONCLUSION.....78

EXHIBITS

- | | |
|--------------|--|
| Exhibit 2001 | Declaration of Kayvan Noroozi in Support of <i>Pro Hac Vice</i> Admission |
| Exhibit 2002 | Transcript of Deposition of Kevin Jakel, IPR2021-00275, March 16, 2021 (Redacted Public Version) |
| Exhibit 2003 | Transcript of Deposition of Kevin Jakel, IPR2019-00194, August 23, 2019 (Redacted Public Version) |
| Exhibit 2004 | Transcript of Deposition of Kevin Jakel, IPR2019-00482, October 15, 2019 (Redacted Public Version) |
| Exhibit 2005 | Unified Press Release re: OPAL & OVAL |
| Exhibit 2006 | Unified Proposal and Presentation (Redacted Public Version) |
| Exhibit 2007 | Unified Proposal and Report (Redacted Public Version) |
| Exhibit 2008 | Unified Press Release re ETRI Patent Challenged |

I. INTRODUCTION

Institution of the present Petition for *inter partes* review should be denied.

The inventions described and claimed in the '448 patent relate to video coding, and the “intra prediction” aspect of video coding in particular. This is reflected in limitations of the Challenged Claims, for example, directed to a processor that performs “intra prediction,” and when doing so, (1) “determines whether to apply a second filter to a prediction value of [a] current block” and (2) “applies the second filter to the prediction value of the current block” in accordance with the determination. EX1001, 12:19-21, 12:47-50.

Confronted with these limitations, the Petition was unable to identify prior art that actually filters a “prediction value” of a block *when* “intra prediction” is performed. Indeed, as explained in Section III.A below, “intra prediction” corresponds to a distinct phase of video coding that involves generation of “prediction values” for a prediction block. But in a transparent attempt to stretch the prior art onto the claimed inventions, the Petition disregards the requirement for the second filter to operate on a “prediction value” when intra-prediction is performed. In both Grounds 1 and 2, the Petition instead relies on a “deblocking filter 120” from *Moon* as allegedly providing the recited “second filter”—despite *Moon*'s filter having an entirely different function of filtering “reconstructed” values outside of the “intra prediction” process. *Infra*, Sections V.A.1, V.B.1.

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.