

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

NEARMAP US, INC.,
Petitioner

v.

EAGLE VIEW TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,
Patent Owner

Case IPR2024-00716
Patent 10,671,648

**PETITIONER’S AUTHORIZED REPLY TO PATENT OWNER’S
PRELIMINARY RESPONSE¹**

¹ This paper was authorized by the Board during an August 2, 2024 teleconference.

Emphasis herein is added unless noted, and abbreviations are as in the Petition
(Pap.2, “Pet.”).

LIST OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit	Description
EX1001	U.S. Patent No. 10,671,648
EX1002	U.S. Patent No. 10,671,648 File History
EX1003	Declaration of Cyrus Shahabi, Ph.D.
EX1004	U.S. Patent No. 9,501,507 (Harris)
EX1005	U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2009/0132316 (Florance)
EX1006	U.S. Patent No. 8,401,877 (Salvagio)
EX1007	U.S. Patent No. 8,260,775 (Ahn)
EX1008	Samet, H., “Foundations of Multidimensional and Metric Data Structures” (2006)
EX1009	U.S. Pub. No. 2016/0210326 (Tolman)
EX1010	U.S. Patent No. 9,927,941 (Steimle)
EX1011	U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2009/0063424 (Iwamura)
EX1012	Plaintiffs’ Opposition to Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss Based on Unpatentability Under 35 U.S.C. § 101, Dkt. 297, <i>Eagle View Technologies Inc., and Pictometry International Corp v. Nearmap US, Inc., Nearmap Australia Pty Ltd, and Nearmap Ltd</i> , C.A. No. 2:21-cv-00283-TS-DAO (D. Utah May 16, 2023)
EX1013	<i>U.S. District Courts—National Judicial Caseload Profile</i> , available at https://www.uscourts.gov/sites/default/files/data_tables/fcms_na_distprofile1231.2023.pdf (Dec. 31, 2023)
EX1014	Fourth Amended Patent Case Scheduling Order, Dkt. 372, <i>Eagle View Technologies Inc., and Pictometry International Corp v. Nearmap US, Inc., Nearmap Australia Pty Ltd, and Nearmap Ltd</i> , C.A. No. 2:21-cv-00283-TS-DAO (D. Utah Dec. 27, 2023)
EX1015	Gotlieb, L., “Computing Joins of Relations,” SIGMOD ’75: Proceedings of the 1975 ACM SIGMOD international conference on Management of data (May 1975)
EX1016	Declaration of Sayem Osman

Patent Owner Eagle View Technologies, Inc.’s (“PO”) Preliminary Response (Pap.6, “POPR”) affirmatively *deletes* language from the quotes relied on in the Petition to support its false suggestion that Petitioner failed to explain how Harris teaches the “indicative of time history” limitation. POPR.20. For example, the POPR purports to provide this list of mappings from the Petition at 21:

At limitation [12.a.4], the Petition lists the following quotations from Harris as allegedly mapping to some time-related features:

- “a temporal component.” Petition, 32-33; EX1004, 1:6-8, 1:38-50, 4:19-33, 7:47-59.
- “one or more values representing a temporal component.” Petition, 32; EX1004, 5:59-6:6.
- “a time value indicating an approximate time the incident in the crime reported occurred.” Petition, 32; EX1004, 1:38-50.
- “the temporal component may comprise one or more values indicating a point in time or range of time.” Petition, 32; EX1004, 2:50-67.
- “temporal components with particular year time spans and/or particular hour time spans.” Petition, 32; EX1004, 8:36-57.
- “within the past five years.” Petition, 33; EX1004, 4:44-59.
- “within the past five hours.” Petition, 33; EX1004, 4:44-59.

While each of these passages generally refers to time-related data, the Petition never explains how any of these features are “indicative of a time history.” The

But each of PO’s snippets carves out just the *temporal* component of Harris’s disclosures mapped in the Petition (Pet.32-33) while *deleting* the language linking *the associated geospatial component* (yellow below) with each temporal component to indicate a time history. The (yellow) deleted portions of the quotes,

as shown in the Petition, read as follows:

associated geographic point on earth;	and at least a portion of the plurality of data items further being associated with one or more time identifiers including one or more time or time periods indicative of a time history of an associated data item regarding the associated geographic point on earth (e.g., the “geo-temporal data... includes both a geospatial component and a temporal component”; “data that includes one or more values representing a geospatial component and one or more values representing a temporal component”; “geo-temporal input data is received that is associated with a geospatial component and a temporal component” such as “a time value indicating an approximate time the incident in the crime reported occurred”; “geospatial component may comprise one or more stored data values indicating a geographic location and the temporal component may comprise one or more values indicating a point in time or range of time”; “data objects associated with particular geographic regions and that are associated with temporal components with particular year time spans and/or particular hour time spans”; “all activities within a single city
---------------------------------------	--

Claim 12	Prior Art
	block within the past five years to all activities within an entire city within the past five hours”). E.g., EX1003, ¶¶96-125, 134;

Thus, for example, the POPR (at 21) clips the Petition’s *actual* mapping of time history disclosures including “**all activities within a single city block within the past five years**” and “**all activities within an entire city within the past five hours**” to nothing more than “within the past five years” and “within the past five hours.” See also Pet. 33 (citing EX1003, ¶¶96-125, 134).

And (as throughout the POPR) here the POPR also ignores the detailed discussions *preceding* the charts to give this false impression, including the

detailed introduction of Harris (Pet.17-22) explaining, *e.g.*,

C. Anticipation and Obviousness Grounds

1. Harris (EX1004)—art under at least AIA §102(a)(2)

Harris (“Geo-Temporal Indexing and Searching”) discloses systems and methods for “facilitating low latency searches of *large and dynamic data sets that include geo-temporal data*,” including geo-temporal data indicating a particular point on earth and indicating a point in time or range of time. EX1004, 2:1-3, 2:54-58, 5:65-6:2 (“one or more numerical values specifying a longitude and latitude”); EX1003, ¶55. Harris further discloses its geo-temporal data includes property information, disclosing, *e.g.*, “stored data objects pertaining to a particular geographic area around *the user’s home*,” EX1004, 9:56-61, and information about “access to a *building*,” EX1004, 4:21-25. EX1003, ¶56. Harris thus discloses aggregating data having a geo-spatial component (including a geographic location identifier) and temporal component for querying, including, *e.g.*, “computer systems and methods for *indexing and searching geo-temporal data* stored in a data repository,” EX1004, 2:50-53, and expressly discloses aggregating such data from multiple sources—“geo-temporal data may be obtained from potentially *multiple disparate data sources*,” EX1004, 3:1-11, Figs.1, 3, EX1003, ¶57:

See also, e.g., Pet.20-21 (describing how Harris “discloses querying its aggregated data associated with *one or more geographic location identifiers and time periods*” using “*geographical areas of interest and... points in time or time ranges of interest*”), 4-5 (summarizing “**BACKGROUND ART**” known to POSITA, including Harris, showing this limitation).

Respectfully submitted,

August 16, 2024

By: /J. Steven Baughman/
J. Steven Baughman

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that a copy of the foregoing has been served in its entirety on the Patent Owner (“PO”). Pursuant to agreement with PO’s counsel, the copy has been served on August 16, 2024, by causing the aforementioned document to be electronically mailed to the following attorneys for PO listed below:

Counsel Authorized to Accept Service:	Gregory P. Webb HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP 6000 Headquarters Dr. Suite 200 Plano, TX 75024 greg.webb@haynesboone.com Patricia Hauglum HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP 6000 Headquarters Dr. Suite 200 Plano, TX 75024 patricia.hauglum@haynesboone.com By Electronic Mail
---	--

Dated: August 16, 2024

**GROOMBRIDGE, WU, BAUGHMAN &
STONE LLP**

/Sayem Osman/
Sayem Osman