

Filed on behalf of Patent Owner

By: Todd R. Walters, Esq.
Roger H. Lee, Esq.
Andrew R. Cheslock, Esq.
Mythili Markowski, Ph.D., Esq.
Adam R. Banes, Esq.
BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC
1737 King Street, Suite 500
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
Main Telephone (703) 836-6620
Main Facsimile (703) 836-2021
todd.walters@bipc.com
roger.lee@bipc.com
andrew.cheslock@bipc.com
mythili.markowski@bipc.com
adam.banes@bipc.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ALIGN TECHNOLOGY, INC.
Petitioner

v.

3SHAPE A/S
Patent Owner

Case No. PGR2018-00103
Patent 9,962,244

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO THE PETITION
FOR POST-GRANT REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 9,962,244**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. STATEMENT OF THE PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED	1
III. TECHNICAL BACKGROUND AND THE '244 PATENT	2
A. Thiel425, Thiel576, and Fisker	2
B. The '244 Patent	3
C. The Claims of the '244 Patent.....	4
IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	6
V. ARGUMENT.....	8
A. Petitioner Fails to Establish that It Is More Likely than Not that Fisker and Szeliski (Ground 1) and Fisker and Matsumoto (Ground 2) Render Claims 1-5, 7-10, 15, 16, 18, 21-22, 24, 26, and 28 Obvious.....	8
1. Fisker does not disclose or suggest “the data processing system also configured to <i>derive surface color information</i> for the block of said image sensor pixels <i>from at least one of the 2D images used to derive the surface geometry information</i> ”	9
a. Fisker’s disclosure of “scanning” of a surface shape and color relates to a general process of obtaining image data, not to the selection of a specific 2D image	10
b. Fisker’s disclosure of “simultaneous scanning” and “scanned together” to obtain surface shape and color relates to Fisker’s general process of scanning, not the selection of a specific 2D image	12

- c. “Simultaneous scanning” cannot mean obtaining surface geometry and color at the same single moment in time because “simultaneous scanning” encompasses obtaining multiple images at *varying* times.....14
 - d. Nothing in the ’244 Specification indicates that “simultaneous scanning” would somehow result in deriving surface geometry and surface color information from the same 2D image.....16
 - 2. Petitioner fails to explain how and why Fisker’s Fig. 9 embodiment would have been combined with Fisker’s white light embodiment to somehow arrive at the claimed invention.....19
 - a. The Fig. 9 embodiment of Fisker does not produce a “multichromatic probe light” as claimed.....19
 - b. Petitioner fails to explain how and why Fisker’s Fig. 9 embodiment would have been combined with Fisker’s white light embodiment.....22
 - 3. Szeliski and Matsumoto each fail to cure the deficiencies of Fisker25
 - 4. The dependent claims would not have been obvious over the combination of Fisker and either Szeliski or Matsumoto26
- B. Petitioner Fails to Satisfy Its Burden with Respect to Grounds 3 and 427
 - 1. Petitioner fails to demonstrate that independent claim 29 would have been obvious.....27
 - 2. Yamada and Suzuki each fail to cure the deficiencies of Fisker.....29

..

C. Petitioner Fails to Establish that It Is More Likely than Not that Fisker, Szeliski, and Yamada (Ground 5), Fisker, Szeliski, and Suzuki (Ground 6), Fisker, Matsumoto, and Yamada (Ground 7), and Fisker, Matsumoto, and Suzuki (Ground 8) render claim 12 Obvious30

D. Petitioner Fails to Establish that It Is More Likely than Not that Thiel425, Thiel576, and Szeliski (Ground 9) and Thiel425, Thiel576, and Matsumoto (Ground 10) Render Claims 1, 22, and 24 Obvious.....32

1. Neither Thiel425 nor Thiel576 discloses or suggests “the data processing system also configured to *derive surface color information* for the block of said image sensor pixels *from at least one of the 2D images used to derive the surface geometry information*”32

a. Petitioner concedes that Thiel425 does not disclose deriving surface color information from a 2D image.....32

b. Thiel576 does not disclose or suggest deriving both surface geometry information and surface color information from the same at least one 2D image.....33

2. It would not have been obvious to combine Thiel425 and Thiel576 to arrive at the claimed subject matter35

a. Petitioner and its expert cite to no evidence, underlying facts, or data which demonstrate that the missing claim limitation would have been obvious.....35

b. Petitioner fails to explain how and why a POSITA would have modified Thiel425 with the teachings of Thiel576 to arrive at the claimed invention37

3. Szeliski and Matsumoto fail to cure the deficiencies of Thiel425 and Thiel576.....41

...

4.	Dependent claims 22 and 24 would not have been obvious over the alleged combination of Thiel425 and Thiel576 with either Szeliski or Matsumoto.....	42
E.	Petitioner Fails to Establish that It Is More Likely than Not that Thiel425, Thiel576, and Yamada (Ground 11) and Thiel425, Thiel576, and Suzuki (Ground 12) Render Claim 29 Obvious	43
1.	Claim 29 would not have been obvious for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1	43
2.	Yamada and Suzuki each fail to cure the deficiencies of Thiel425 and Thiel576.....	45
F.	Petitioner Fails to Establish that It Is More Likely than Not that Thiel425, Thiel576, Szeliski, and Fisker (Ground 13) and Thiel425, Thiel576, Matsumoto, and Fisker (Ground 14) Render Claims 2-5, 7-10, 15, 16, 18, 21, 26, and 28 Obvious.....	46
VI.	DISCRETION TO INSTITUTE.....	48
A.	The Petition Should Be Denied in View of the Virtually Identical IPRs Filed by Petitioner	48
B.	The Petition Should Be Denied Under § 325(d)	50
1.	Petitioner overlooks the examiner’s reasons for allowance citing features common to the independent claims	50
2.	The Patent Office previously determined that pre-AIA law applies.....	53
VII.	CONCLUSION.....	54
APPENDIX A - LIST OF EXHIBITS		
CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE WITH 37 C.F.R. § 42.24		
CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE		

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.