

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

INTELLIGENT PROTECTION MANAGEMENT CORP.,  
Petitioner,

v.

CISCO TECHNOLOGY, INC.,  
Patent Owner

---

Case No. IPR2025-01588  
U.S. Patent No. 8,830,293

---

**PATENT OWNER'S BRIEFING ON**  
**IMPACT OF *REVVO* DECISION**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. EFFECT OF THE “VIDEO FRAME” CONSTRUCTION .....2  
II. EFFECT OF THE ORDER-OF-STEPS CONSTRUCTION.....4  
III. CONCLUSION.....5

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Page(s)**

**Cases**

*Cambridge Mobile Telematics, Inc. v. Sfara, Inc.*,  
IPR2024-00952, Paper 12 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 13, 2024).....1

*Revvo Techs., Inc. v. Cerebrum Sensor Techs., Inc.*,  
IPR2025-00632, Paper 20 (P.T.A.B. Nov. 3, 2025)..... 1, 2, 3, 5

**PATENT OWNER'S EXHIBIT LIST**

<b>Exhibit No.</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>
2001	News article reporting Cisco's acquisition of WebEx, retrieved from <a href="https://www.nbcnews.com/id/wbna17627369">https://www.nbcnews.com/id/wbna17627369</a> (last visited Nov. 19, 2025)
2002	Cisco webpage giving usage statistics, retrieved from <a href="https://www.cisco.com/c/en_sg/products/conferencing/index.html">https://www.cisco.com/c/en_sg/products/conferencing/index.html</a> (last visited Nov. 19, 2025)
2003	Complaint filed in <i>Paltalk Holdings, Inc. v. WebEx Commc'ns, Inc.</i> , No. 6:21-cv-757
2004	Aug. 26, 2024 Court Transcript from <i>Paltalk Holdings, Inc. v. WebEx Commc'ns, Inc.</i> , No. 6:21-cv-757
2005	Intelligent Protection Management Corp. SEC Form 8-K, Jan. 2, 2025, retrieved from <a href="https://sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/1355839/000121390025000379/ea0226465-8k_intelli.htm">sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/1355839/000121390025000379/ea0226465-8k_intelli.htm</a> (last visited Oct. 27, 2025)
2006	Complaint filed in <i>Cisco Sys., Inc. v. Intelligent Prot. Mgmt. Corp.</i> , No. 1:25-cv-271
2007	Defendant's Initial Invalidity Contentions in <i>Cisco Sys., Inc. v. Intelligent Prot. Mgmt. Corp.</i> , No. 1:25-cv-271
2008	Webex Suite webpage, retrieved from <a href="https://www.webex.com/suite/collaboration-suite.html">https://www.webex.com/suite/collaboration-suite.html</a> (last visited Dec. 8, 2025)
2009	Cisco Meeting Server webpage, retrieved from <a href="https://www.cisco.com/c/en/us/products/conferencing/meeting-server/index.html">https://www.cisco.com/c/en/us/products/conferencing/meeting-server/index.html</a> (last visited Dec. 8, 2025)
2010	Cisco RoomOS webpage, retrieved from <a href="https://www.webex.com/us/en/solutions/roomos.html">https://www.webex.com/us/en/solutions/roomos.html</a> (last visited Dec. 8, 2025)
2011	Cisco Conferencing Products webpage, retrieved from <a href="https://www.cisco.com/c/en/us/products/conferencing/product-listing.html">https://www.cisco.com/c/en/us/products/conferencing/product-listing.html</a> (last visited Dec. 8, 2025)
2012	Petitioner's proposed constructions of claim terms in the district court litigation dated December 16, 2025
2013	Gary J. Sullivan, <i>Video Compression—From Concepts to the H.264/AVC Standard</i> (IEEE Jan. 2005)

<b>Exhibit No.</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>
2014	Excerpt from <i>Concise Oxford American Dictionary</i> (Oxford Univ. Press, 2006)

The Director made clear that “when a petitioner takes alternative positions before the Board and a district court, that petitioner should, at a minimum, explain why alternative positions are warranted.” *Revvo Techs., Inc. v. Cerebrum Sensor Techs., Inc.*, IPR2025-00632, Paper 20 at 3-4 (P.T.A.B. Nov. 3, 2025) (precedential) (citing *Cambridge Mobile Telematics, Inc. v. Sfara, Inc.*, IPR2024-00952, Paper 12 at 8-9 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 13, 2024) (informative)). On December 16, 2025—*after* *Revvo* was designated precedential on November 3, 2025 and *after* Patent Owner’s Discretionary Denial Brief was filed on December 9, 2025—Petitioner served proposed claim constructions on Patent Owner Cisco in the parallel district court litigation. EX2012.

Patent Owner highlights the following proposed constructions that implicate *Revvo*.

Claim #	Term	Proposed Construction
All	Video frames / frame	One of a series of <i>discrete</i> images forming a realtime video stream
5 and 17	the order of the second scaling, removing, and superimposing steps in “wherein combining further comprises:”	(1) removing... then (2) generating... and then (3) superimposing...

EX2012. For these terms, Petitioner asserts, in the instant Petition, that “no claim terms need to be construed by the Board at this time, and all should be given their ordinary meanings to the extent they are not indefinite.” Pet. at 11. In other words,

Petitioner is advancing a narrower construction in the district court while attempting to advance a broader construction in the instant IPR. And “[o]rdinarily, that would mean a denial of institution.” *Revvo*, at 5.

## I. EFFECT OF THE “VIDEO FRAME” CONSTRUCTION

The Petitioner's district court construction of “video frames” and “frame” requires “one of a series of *discrete* images forming a realtime video stream.” EX2012. But the Petition never even attempts to explain how the proposed construction is consistent with the ordinary meaning of the term or how the prior art references include a disclosure of “discrete” images. *See e.g.*, Pet at 20.

The requirement that “video frames” and “frames” be composed of *discrete* images may not be consistent with the ordinary meaning—and, in fact, may render the term significantly narrower—because in a videoconferencing context, the frames of a videoconferencing stream are usually not “discrete” from one another. “Discrete” usually refers to information that are “individually separate and distinct.” EX2014 at 256. But in modern computer systems, video frames usually rely on compression schemes (*e.g.*, MPEG) that encode and transmit the video frames as a set of *interrelated* images that contain information regarding only the *changes* in the video scene *relative to the previous image or images*. *See e.g.* EX2013 at 19-20 (“improved compression performance can be achieved by taking advantage of the large amount of temporal redundancy in video content.... video can be represented

## Patent Owner’s Brief on Impact of Revvo Decision

more efficiently by sending only the changes in the video scene rather than coding all regions repeatedly.”). Petitioner’s proposed construction in the district court appears to be an effort by the Petitioner to try to argue that video conferencing system that rely on a compression mechanism do not read on the claims.<sup>1</sup> *See Revvo* at 4 (discouraging “seeking broader constructions at the Board to support a patentability challenge while seeking narrower constructions in litigation to avoid infringement liability.”). Petitioner never even attempts to explain such differences between the constructions advanced in the district court to that advanced in the instant Petition.

But Petitioner’s problems do not end there. Adopting Petitioner’s district court construction of “video frames/frame” would mean that Petitioner has not met its burden to demonstrate unpatentability for any of the challenged claims with a reasonable likelihood of success. Specifically, claim 1 requires:

Claim	Limitation
[1.a]	receiving at least first and second real-time video streams, each of the first and second real-time video streams comprising <b>video frames</b> containing a picture comprising a subject image and a background image;

---

<sup>1</sup> To be clear, Patent Owner does not adopt Petitioner’s proposed construction nor does Patent Owner agree that the proposed construction would necessarily read out video frames that rely on compression schemes.

EX1001 at 10:3-6. The Petition relies on Tysso (U.S. Patent No. 8,345,082) but merely argues that Tysso “discloses receiving real-time video streams with video frames containing a picture comprising a subject image and a background image.” Pet. at 20. There is no discussion or explanation of how or why Tysso meets the proposed “discrete” requirement in Petitioner’s district court construction. And for every other independent claim—which all recite “video frames”—the Petition merely points back to its analysis of [1.a]. *See, e.g.*, Pet. at 49-50, 56, 67, 68.

## II. EFFECT OF THE ORDER-OF-STEPS CONSTRUCTION

For dependent claims 5 and 17 that recite “combining further comprises: removing ...; generating ...; and superimposing...,” Petitioner additionally proposes in the district court a particular order of operation by requiring “(1) removing... *then* (2) generating... and *then* (3) superimposing...” EX2012. And again, Petitioner fails to address the inconsistent claim construction positions. Moreover, adopting Petitioner’s proposed order of steps would mean that Petitioner has not met its burden to demonstrate unpatentability for claims 5 and 17 with a reasonable likelihood of success because the Petition also fails to address whether the prior art meets the proposed order of steps. Pet. at 43-45, 60, 66, 70.

Petitioner is again advancing a narrower construction in the district court (requiring a particular order)—likely in an attempt to avoid infringement—while advancing a broader construction (allowing any order) in this instant Petition—likely

in an attempt to provide more flexibility in its unpatentability arguments. And such gamesmanship should be discouraged. *Revvo* at 4.

### III. CONCLUSION

For the reasons discussed above, Patent Owner Cisco respectfully requests that the Director exercise his discretion to deny institution.

Dated: February 19, 2026

Respectfully submitted,

/Yung-Hoon Ha/

Yung-Hoon Ha (Reg. No. 56,368)

yha@desmaraisllp.com

DESMARAIS LLP

230 Park Avenue

New York, NY 10169

212-351-3400 (telephone)

212-351-3401 (facsimile)

*Lead Counsel for Patent Owner*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(e), the undersigned certifies that a complete copy of Patent Owner's Brief on Impact of *Revvo* Decision and corresponding exhibits were caused to be served on counsel of record for the Petitioner by filing this document through PTACTS and by sending this document via electronic mail to the following addresses:

Wayne M. Helge (Reg. No. 56,905)  
whelge@bdiplaw.com  
Bunsow De Mory LLP  
277 S. Washington St.,  
Suite 210, #1088  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
Telephone: 571-208-0186  
Facsimile: 415-426-4744

James T. Wilson (Reg. No. 41,439)  
jwilson@bdiplaw.com  
Bunsow De Mory LLP  
277 S. Washington St., Suite 210, #1088  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
Telephone: 571-222-1022  
Facsimile: 415-426-4744

erobinson@bdiplaw.com.

Dated: February 19, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

/Yung-Hoon Ha/  
Yung-Hoon Ha (Reg. No. 56,368)  
yha@desmaraisllp.com  
DESMARAIS LLP  
230 Park Avenue  
New York, NY 10169  
212-351-3400 (telephone)  
212-351-3401 (facsimile)

*Lead Counsel for Patent Owner*