

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

META PLATFORMS, INC.,
Petitioner

v.

THALES VISIONIX, INC.,
Patent Owner

U.S. PATENT NO. 6,922,632

IPR2022-01304

**PATENT OWNER'S OBJECTIONS TO
PETITIONER'S DEMONSTRATIVE EXHIBITS**

December 5, 2023

Pursuant to the Order Setting Oral Argument, Paper No. 40, Patent Owner Thales Visionix, Inc. (“Patent Owner”) objects as follows to the demonstrative exhibits filed by Petitioner Meta Platforms, Inc. (“Petitioner”), Ex. 1041.

- **Slide 26**: Patent Owner objects to Petitioner’s demonstrative slide 26 as improper new argument because Petitioner’s annotated figure is not present in any of the Papers in the record, and the slide incorrectly represents this new annotated figure as a figure provided in the Petition and referred to by Patent Owner in Patent Owner’s Response.
- **Slides 51-52**: Patent Owner objects to Petitioner’s demonstrative slides 51-52 as improper new argument because Petitioner did not discuss LED selection as applied to claims 12-13 of the ’632 patent in any Papers; the discussion of LED selection in the cited Papers applies to claim 11.
- **Slide 54**: Patent Owner objects to Petitioner’s demonstrative slide 54 as improper new evidence and argument because Petitioner did not cite to the “i” entry in Table 1 in any of the Papers in connection with claim 2 of the ’632 patent, and did not advance any argument about two “Table 1” and “Table 4” software modules.
- **Slide 56**: Patent Owner objects to Petitioner’s demonstrative slide 56 as improper new evidence because the cited portion of the patent was not referenced in any Papers.

- **Slides 62-63**: Patent Owner objects to Petitioner’s demonstrative slides 62-63 as improper new argument, because Petitioner did not rely on a “HiBall Trigger” in any of the Papers.

Copies of the objected-to slides are attached.

Date: December 5, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ D. Shayon Ghosh

Meredith Martin Addy (Reg. No. 37,883)

ADDYHART P.C.

10 Glenlake Parkway

Suite 130

Atlanta, GA 30328

312.320.4200

312.264.2547 (fax)

meredith@addyhart.com

*Lead Counsel for Patent Owner Thales
Visionix Inc.*

Robert P. Hart (Reg. No. 35,184)

Gregory B. Gulliver (Reg. No. 44,138)

Brandon C. Helms (Reg. No. 61,742)

ADDYHART P.C.

401 N. Michigan Avenue

Suite 1200-1

Chicago, IL 60611

Thales-Meta-IPRs@addyhart.com

*Backup Counsel for Patent Owner Thales
Visionix Inc.*

David M. Krinsky (Reg. No. 72,339)

WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY LLP

680 Maine Avenue SW

Washington, DC 20024

T: (202) 434-5000
F: (202) 434-5029
dkrinsky@wc.com


*Lead Counsel for Real-Party-in-Interest
Gentex Corp. and Backup Counsel for Patent
Owner Thales Visionix Inc.*

Adam D. Harber (*pro hac vice*)
Melissa B. Collins (*pro hac vice*)
D. Shayon Ghosh (Reg. No. 75,865)
Arthur J. Argall III (Reg. No. 73,005)
WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY LLP
680 Maine Avenue SW
Washington, DC 20024
T: (202) 434-5000
F: (202) 434-5029
Gentex-IPR@wc.com

*Backup Counsel for Real-Party-in-Interest
Gentex Corp. and Patent Owner Thales
Visionix Inc.*

The Petition Identified Two Separate “Subsystem

The Petition never expressly states which particular parts of the Horton system constitute the claimed “sensor subsystem.” See *id.*, 60. The Institution Decision, however, credited the Petition’s contention that “Horton discloses that the tracking system includes accelerometers 1-6 that are initialized using calibration routine 48 and provide acceleration data 35 to the estimation subsystem,” *id.*, as identifying the “sensor subsystem,” Paper 10, 30. As best as Patent Owner can tell, this appears to correspond with the red annotation of Horton’s Figure 3 that Petitioner provides on page 59 of the Petition. See also *id.* (noting Petitioner’s reliance on “accelerometer bias and scaling 50” and “accelerometer mounting data 46” from Figure 3); Baillot, ¶¶414-416.



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.