

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](mailto:todd.walters@bipc.com)  
[roger.lee@bipc.com](mailto:roger.lee@bipc.com)  
[andrew.cheslock@bipc.com](mailto:andrew.cheslock@bipc.com)  
[mythili.markowski@bipc.com](mailto:mythili.markowski@bipc.com)  
[adam.banes@bipc.com](mailto: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. PGR2018-00104  
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 .....	8
V. ARGUMENT.....	9
A. Petitioner Fails to Establish that It Is More Likely than Not that Fisker and Tanaka Render Claims 31 and 32 Obvious (Ground 1) .....	10
1. Fisker does not disclose or suggest “the data processing system also configured to <i>derive surface color</i> <i>information</i> for the block of said image sensor pixels <i>from at least one of the 2D images used to derive the</i> <i>surface geometry information”</i> recited in claim 31 .....	10
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 .....	11
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 .....	13

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 <i>varying</i> times.....	15
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.....	17
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.....	20
a.	The Fig. 9 embodiment of Fisker does not produce a “multichromatic probe light” as claimed.....	21
b.	Petitioner fails to provide any reason why or explanation of how Fisker’s Fig. 9 embodiment would have been combined with Fisker’s white light embodiment.....	23
3.	Tanaka fails to cure the deficiencies of Fisker .....	26
4.	Petitioner fails to demonstrate that independent claim 32 would have been obvious.....	27
B.	Petitioner Fails to Establish that It Is More Likely than Not that Fisker and Suzuki (Ground 2) and Fisker and Cai (Ground 3) Render Claim 34 Obvious.....	29
1.	Claim 34 would not have been obvious for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 31.....	29
2.	Suzuki and Cai each fail to cure the deficiencies of Fisker.....	31
C.	Petitioner Fails to Establish that It Is More Likely than Not that Thiel425, Thiel576, and Tanaka Render Claims 31 and 32 Obvious (Ground 4) .....	32

..

1.	Neither Thiel425 nor Thiel576 discloses or suggests “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> ” recited in independent claim 31 .....	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 matter .....	35
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 invention .....	37
3.	Tanaka fails to cure the deficiencies of Thiel425 and Thiel576 .....	41
4.	Petitioner fails to demonstrate that independent claim 32 would have been obvious.....	42
D.	Petitioner Fails to Establish that It Is More Likely than Not that Thiel425, Thiel576, Fisker, and Suzuki (Ground 5) and Thiel425, Thiel576, Fisker, and Cai (Ground 6) Render Claim 34 Obvious .....	44
1.	Claim 34 would not have been obvious for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 31 .....	44

...

2.	Fisker, Suzuki, and Cai each fail to cure the deficiencies of Thiel425 and Thiel576.....	46
VI.	DISCRETION TO INSTITUTE.....	47
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) .....	49
1.	Petitioner overlooks the examiner’s reasons for allowance citing features common to the independent claims .....	49
2.	The Patent Office previously determined that pre-AIA law applies.....	52
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.