

From: [Trials](#)
To: [Nguyen, Jean](#); [Trials](#)
Cc: [Quincy Lu](#); [Arjomand, Mehran](#); [Jim Glass](#); [Yap, Alex S.](#); [MoFo Insta360-IPRs](#); [Joseph Milowic III](#); [John McKee](#); [QE-GoPro-Arashi Vision](#); [Patrick Schmidt](#)
Subject: RE: IPR2024-00984: Request for Authorization to File Motion to Strike Sur-reply Arguments
Date: Tuesday, September 16, 2025 12:57:27 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Counsel,

The Board has considered the parties' e-mails. Petitioner may file a motion to strike addressing the issues in Petitioner's e-mail and not exceeding five pages within 5 business days of the Board's approval of Petitioner's request. Patent Owner may file a response not exceeding five pages with within 5 business days of the service of the opening motion.

Regards,

Andrew Kellogg,
Deputy Chief Clerk, Trials
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
USPTO
andrew.kellogg@uspto.gov
(571) 272-5366



From: Nguyen, Jean <JNguyen@mofo.com>
Sent: Monday, September 15, 2025 9:04 PM
To: Trials <Trials@USPTO.GOV>
Cc: Quincy Lu <quincylu@quinnemanuel.com>; Arjomand, Mehran <MArjomand@mofo.com>; Jim Glass <jimglass@quinnemanuel.com>; Yap, Alex S. <AYap@mofo.com>; MoFo_Insta360-IPRs <MoFo_Insta360-IPRs@mofo.com>; Joseph Milowic III <josephmilowic@quinnemanuel.com>; John McKee <johnmckee@quinnemanuel.com>; QE-GoPro-Arashi Vision <qe-gopro-arashivision@quinnemanuel.com>; Patrick Schmidt <patrickschmidt@quinnemanuel.com>
Subject: RE: IPR2024-00984: Request for Authorization to File Motion to Strike Sur-reply Arguments

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

Dear Honorable Board,

Petitioner is available for a conference between 1:30-2:30 pm and 4-5 pm ET on Wed., Sept. 17, or between 12-2 pm PT on Friday, Sept. 19 in the event the Board determines that a

conference is necessary.

Petitioner is surprised at Patent Owner's contentions that Petitioner's request is premature, considering that Petitioner had provided its detailed request to Patent Owner since August 30. Patent Owner delayed providing its position on whether it would oppose Petitioner's request until today, even though the parties have corresponded and met and conferred on this issue multiple times.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jean Nguyen
Counsel for Petitioner

From: Quincy Lu <quincylu@quinnemanuel.com>
Sent: Monday, September 15, 2025 10:23 AM
To: Nguyen, Jean <JNguyen@mofo.com>; Trials <Trials@USPTO.GOV>
Cc: Arjomand, Mehran <MArjomand@mofo.com>; Jim Glass <jimglass@quinnemanuel.com>; Yap, Alex S. <AYap@mofo.com>; MoFo_Insta360-IPRs <MoFo_Insta360-IPRs@mofo.com>; Joseph Milowic III <josephmilowic@quinnemanuel.com>; John McKee <johnmckee@quinnemanuel.com>; QE-GoPro-Arashi Vision <qe-gopro-arashivision@quinnemanuel.com>; Patrick Schmidt <patrickschmidt@quinnemanuel.com>
Subject: RE: IPR2024-00984: Request for Authorization to File Motion to Strike Sur-reply Arguments

External Email

Dear Honorable Board,

Petitioner's email is premature, as Petitioner did not obtain Patent Owner's position before sending its request. Specifically, Petitioner requested Patent Owner's position on Friday, 9:30 pm ET, and sent the below email over the weekend before receiving Patent Owner's response. Petitioner has also yet to request Patent Owner's availability for a conference with the board. Should the Board require a hearing, Patent Owner is available today, between 2-3 and 4-5 pm ET and tomorrow between 1-5 pm ET.

Patent Owner opposes Petitioner's request. Each of the alleged "new" arguments that are subject to Petitioner's request, copied below, were either set forth in Patent Owner's response or properly responsive to Petitioner's reply arguments:

1. *"There is a presumption of nexus for secondary considerations"*: This argument

was originally set forth in the POR at 42-51.

2. *“Meulen already describes how to perform scaling, and Chao itself does not provide the details regarding scaling”*: This argument was originally set forth at POR 30-33.
3. *“The ’413 claims do not encompass all of the embodiments disclosed in the specification ...”*: Patent Owner’s Surreply does not argue the ’413 claims do not encompass all embodiments. This argument is also properly responsive to Petitioner’s mischaracterization of the ’413 patent.
4. *“Meulen’s disclosures of “one” in “one or more display regions” means it performs uniform compression along at least one axis”*: This argument was originally set forth in the POR at 40 and is properly responsive to Petitioner’s new Reply argument; specifically, that Meulen’s “image compression and/or scaling” can only refer to non-uniform compression/scaling. Petitioner did not raise this argument in the Petition. Should Patent Owner’s responsive argument be struck, Petitioner’s argument in their Reply at 19 should also be struck.
5. *“The Petition’s Fleming and Obara-Liu combinations involve performing aspect ratio conversion on a separate device ...”* Patent Owner’s Surreply does not claim that the **Petition** made this “separate device” argument but rather that Petitioner’s **Reply** presented this as a new argument. Petitioner did not raise this argument in the Petition. Should Patent Owner’s responsive argument be struck, Petitioner’s argument in their Reply at 20-21 should also be struck.

Respectfully submitted,
Quincy Lu

Quincy Lu
Of Counsel, Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP

From: Nguyen, Jean <JNguyen@mofo.com>

Sent: Sunday, September 14, 2025 4:35 PM

To: Trials <Trials@USPTO.GOV>

Cc: Arjomand, Mehran <MArjomand@mofo.com>; Jim Glass <jimglass@quinnemanuel.com>; Yap, Alex S. <AYap@mofo.com>; MoFo_Insta360-IPRs <MoFo_Insta360-IPRs@mofo.com>; Joseph Milowic III <josephmilowic@quinnemanuel.com>; John McKee <johnmckee@quinnemanuel.com>; QE-GoPro-Arashi Vision <qe-gopro-arashivision@quinnemanuel.com>; Patrick Schmidt <patrickschmidt@quinnemanuel.com>

Subject: IPR2024-00984: Request for Authorization to File Motion to Strike Sur-reply Arguments

[EXTERNAL EMAIL from jnguyen@mofo.com]

Dear Honorable Board,

Petitioner respectfully requests authorization to file a motion to strike the following arguments in Patent Owner's Sur-reply (Paper 37) in IPR2024-00984, as they present improper new theories of unpatentability:

1. There is a presumption of nexus for secondary considerations (Sur-reply at 24-25);
2. Meulen already describes how to perform scaling, and Chao itself does not provide the details regarding scaling (Sur-reply at 21-22);
3. The '413 claims do not encompass all of the embodiments disclosed in the specification, despite its expert testifying to the contrary (Sur-reply at 23-24; EX1015 at 21:13-24:4);
4. Meulen's disclosures of "one" in "one or more display regions" means it performs uniform compression along at least one axis (Sur-reply at 24); and
5. The Petition's Fleming and Obara-Liu combinations involve performing aspect ratio conversion on a separate device and re-uploading the image back to the camera's display (Sur-reply at 27).

Petitioner requests the following:

- **Opening motion:** 5 pages to be filed within 5 business days of the Board's approval of Petitioner's request
- **Opposition:** 5 pages to be filed within 5 business days of the service of the opening motion

Petitioner and Patent Owner have conferred, and Patent Owner has not indicated whether or not it opposes this request.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jean Nguyen
Counsel for Petitioner

=====

This message may be confidential and privileged. Use or disclosure by anyone other than an intended addressee is prohibited. If you received this message in error, please delete it and advise the sender by reply email. Learn about Morrison & Foerster LLP's [Privacy Policy](#).

=====

This message may be confidential and privileged. Use or disclosure by anyone other than an intended

addressee is prohibited. If you received this message in error, please delete it and advise the sender by reply email. Learn about Morrison & Foerster LLP's [Privacy Policy](#).