

On Wednesday, May 8, 2024 at 12:45:50 PM PDT, Chian Chiu Li <xccli2002@yahoo.com> wrote:

Hi Ms. Gerukos,

Thank you very much for the help. Here are errors (which I think should be addressed) and proposed corrections with regard to the hearing transcript (IPR2023-00560). The two errors reported last time are included.

At page 18, line 21, the sentence “They are obviously strong, and they’re 103” should be “They are obviousness grounds under 103”.

At page 18, line 22, “Among the tentative claims, Claim 1, 8, and 14, in the tentative claims” should be “Among the challenged claims, claim 1, 8, and 14 are independent claims.”

At page 18-19, line 25-01, “Moving to Slide 3, we have prior art of Claim 1 here, (INDISCERNIBLE) 1 and 2.” should be “Moving to slide 3. We have part of claim 1 here, showing clause 1 and 2.”

At page 19, line 2, “(INDISCERNIBLE), and “only after” limitation are recited.” should be “An act and “only after” limitation are recited.”

At page 19, line 5, “such as fix the device.” should be “such as shakes the device.”

At page 19, line 19-20, “So the trigger using proximity events has some job act” should be “So the trigger using proximity event has some drawbacks”.

At page 19, line 23, “that’s -- the Ryu reference discloses the “only after” limitation.” should be “does the Ryu reference disclose the “only after” limitation?”

At page 19, line 25, “Some key tasks of this method are underlined.” should be “Some key parts of Ryu’s method are underlined.”

At page 19-20, line 25-01, “Ryu decides when it is determining that...” should be “Ryu recites “when it is determined that ...””

At page 20, line 20-21, “That is performed gaze detection after detecting the act” should be “That is, performs gaze detection after detecting the act”.

At page 20-21, line 25-01, “When you look at this, you see the issue that Petitioner’s own statement supports the assertion” should be “When you look at this, you see the issue. Does Petitioner’s own statement support the assertion?”

At page 21, line 7-8, “that’s the process of 103 -- then activates a function of ...” should be “that the processor 103 then activates a function of ...”

At page 22, line 7-8, “because he does not exclude other figures” should be “because he does not exclude other triggers”.

At page 22, line 17-18, “Ryu’s method, explained by Ryu, uses a location act for a trigger for gaze detection.” should be “In Ryu’s method explained above, Ryu uses a rotation act as the trigger for gaze detection.”

At page 23, line 10-11, “So now we actually see Ryu and Patent `564 (INDISCERNIBLE) different purposes” should be “So now we actually see Ryu and Patent `564 have different purposes”.

At page 23, line 12-13, “Ryu just uses the location act as a trigger” should be “Ryu just uses the rotation act as a trigger”.

At page 24, line 7, “Those triggers might have some job acts” should be “Those triggers might have some drawbacks”.

At page 25-26, line 25-03, “I explained in Patent Owner’s response the cited references, including (INDISCERNIBLE), the Ryu, Hodge, and Stallings, to now disclose the “only after” limitation, either alone or in combination” should be “As explained in Patent Owner’s response, the cited references, including Ryu, Hodge, and Stallings, do not disclose the “only after” limitation, either alone or in combination”.

Please let me know if there is any. Thank you again.

Best Regards,

Chian Chiu Li
Patent Owner
Phone: 408-417-0455
Email: xccli2002@yahoo.com

On Monday, May 6, 2024 at 05:13:30 AM PDT, Gerukos, Sylvia <sylvia.gerukos1@uspto.gov> wrote:

Good Morning,

Please see the panels response below.

The panel appreciates Patent Owner's corrections. Patent Owner's email has been entered as Exhibit 3001 and may be referenced if needed in the future.- Panel

v/r

Sylvia Gerukos

Administrative Management Specialist

Phone: 571-270-0188

Email: Sylvia.Gerukos1@uspto.gov

From: Chian Chiu Li <xccli2002@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 2, 2024 1:10 PM
To: Gerukos, Sylvia <Sylvia.Gerukos1@uspto.gov>
Cc: PTAB Hearings <PTABHearings@USPTO.GOV>
Subject: IPR2023-00560 - Hearing Transcript Issues

CAUTION: This email has originated from a source outside of USPTO. **PLEASE CONSIDER THE SOURCE** before responding, clicking on links, or opening attachments.

Hi Ms. Gerukos,

I'd like to report some errors in hearing transcript (IPR2023-00560) published yesterday. Maybe because I did not speak loudly enough or spoke too fast, some words were not recorded correctly. Below are two examples.

On page 18, line 5 from the bottom, the sentence "They are obviously strong, and they're 103" should be "They are obviousness grounds under 103".

On page 18, line 4 from the bottom, "Among the tentative claims, Claim 1, 8, and 14, in the tentative claims" should be "Among the challenged claims, claim 1, 8, and 14 are independent claims."

Is there a way to correct these and other errors in the transcript? The errors seem noncritical issues. Thank you.

Best Regards,

Chian Chiu Li

Patent Owner

Cell: 408-417-0455

Email: xccli2002@yahoo.com