UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SONY INTERACTIVE ENTERTAINMENT LLC,

Petitioner

V.

TECHNO VIEW IP, INC.,

Patent Owner

Case IPR2018-01045

U.S. Patent 8,206,218

PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.107(a)



TABLE OF CONTENTS

TAB	E OF AUTHORITIESi	V
TABl	E OF EXHIBITS	V
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	TECHNOLOGY BACKGROUND	3
A.	Conventional 3D Image Decoding Methods	3
В.	The '218 Patent: Manuel Rafael Gutierrez Novelo Invents A New Compatible Method For Displaying 3D Images In A Videogame	6
III.	II. SUMMARY OF THE PETITIONER'S PROPOSED GROUNDS FOR REVIEW	
IV.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	7
V.	THE SCOPE AND CONTENT OF THE PRIOR ART	7
A.	Johnson (Ex. 1008)	8
B.	Bar-Nahum (Ex. 1005)	9
C.	Scallie (Ex. 1006)	0
D. Meijers (Ex. 1007)		1
E.	Woo (Ex. 1008)1	2
VI.	PETITIONER DID NOT DEMONSTRATE THAT IT IS MORE LIKELY THAN NOT TO PREVAIL ON ANY CHALLENGED CLAIM OF THE '218 PATENT1	2
A.	The Petitioner Failed to Demonstrate That The Claims Are Obvious Over Johnson in view of Bar-Nahum.	3
	1. The Combination of References Does Not Teach Or Suggest "calculating, with a processor of the videogame system, second spatial coordinates of a second eye view of	



	the virtual object in the videogame in three dimensional space by coordinate transformation equations using the calculated first position coordinates of the first eye view and the position of the virtual object in the videogame" As Recited in Claim 7.
2.	The Combination of References Does Not Teach Or Suggest "wherein calculating the second position coordinates of the second eye view comprises obtaining spatial coordinates by coordinate transformation equations given the location of a first virtual camera corresponding the first eye view" As Recited in Claim 5
3.	The Combination of References Does Not Teach Or Suggest "increasing the first and second buffer memory prior to generating the first eye view and second eye view image in the videogame" As Recited in Claim 8
4.	The Combination of References Does Not Teach Or Suggest "cleaning first and second buffers" As Recited in Claim 13
5.	Petitioner Failed To Show It Would Be Obvious To Combine The References To Achieve The Claimed System 20
	ner Failed To Demonstrate That The Claims Are Obvious callie in view of Meijers, Woo, and Bar-Nahum
1.	The Combination of References Does Not Teach Or Suggest "calculating, with a processor of the videogame system, second position coordinates of a second eye view of the object in three dimensional space using the calculated first eye position coordinates" As Recited in Claim 1 or "calculating, with a processor of the videogame system, second spatial coordinates of a second eye view of the virtual object in the videogame in three dimensional space by coordinate transformation equations using the calculated first position coordinates of the first eye view and the position of the virtual object in the videogame" As



B.

		Recited in Claim 7.	23
	2.	Petitioner Failed To Show It Would Be Obvious To Combine The References To Achieve The Claimed System As Recited in Claims 1 and 7.	26
	3.	The Combination of References Does Not Teach Or Suggest "wherein calculating the second position coordinates of the second eye view comprises obtaining spatial coordinates by coordinate transformation equations given the location of a first virtual camera corresponding to the first eye view" As Recited in Claim 5.	28
	4.	Petitioner Failed To Show It Would Be Obvious To Combine The References To Achieve A System That Involved "closing the first and second buffers" As Recited in Claim 13	29
	5.	The Combination of References Does Not Teach Or Suggest "increasing the first and second buffer memory prior to generating the first eye view and second eye view image in the videogame" As Recited in Claim 8.	30
VII.	CONCLU	SION	32



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

<u>Cases</u>
Graham v. John Deere Co.,
383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966)
KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.,
550 U.S. 398 (2007)
OSRAM Sylvania, Inc. v. Am Induction Techs., Inc.,
701 F.3d 698 (Fed. Cir. 2012)
Other Authorities
Epistar, et al. v. Trustees Of Boston University,
IPR2013-00298, Paper No. 18 (P.T.A.B. November 15, 2103)
Rules
MPEP § 2141.01
MPEP § 2141.02
Regulations
37 C.F.R. § 42.108(c)



DOCKET

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.

