

Paper No.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

XILINX, INC, Petitioner

v.

Patent of INTELLECTUAL VENTURES MANAGEMENT, LLC,  
Patent Owner.

Patent No. 5,632,545

Issue Date: May 27, 1997

Title: ENHANCED VIDEO PROJECTION SYSTEM

Reply Report Of Dr. A. Bruce Buckman

Inter Partes Review No. IPR2013-00029

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. SUMMARY OF OPINIONS .....	2
III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	2
A. “Light-Shutter Matrix System” .....	2
B. “Video Controller Adapted For Controlling The Light-Shutter Matrices” .....	4
C. “Equivalent Switching Matrices” .....	5
IV. OPINIONS REGARDING CHALLENGE NO. 2: OBVIOUSNESS IN VIEW OF FLASCK .....	5
A. Flasck Teaches A Video Projection System .....	6
B. Flasck Discloses A “Light-Shutter Matrix System” .....	9
V. OPINIONS REGARDING CHALLENGE NO. 3: OBVIOUSNESS BY TAKANASHI AND LEE .....	12
A. Takanashi Discloses A Light-Shutter Matrix System .....	12
B. Lee Discloses A Video Controller .....	19
C. Takanashi Discloses Equivalent Switching Matrices .....	19
VI. CONCLUSION.....	20

## I. INTRODUCTION

1. I am making this declaration at the request of Xilinx in IPR2013-00029 of US Patent No 5,632,545 (“the ’545 Patent”) to Kikinis.

2. I previously submitted a declaration explaining why the ’545 patent is invalid. That declaration is marked as XLNX-1006, and sets forth my experience, qualifications, publications, materials considered and compensation.

3. As described in my prior declaration, I have over forty years of experience in the field of optics, including thirty-five years of experience as a professor in the electrical engineering department of the University of Texas at Austin. During this time, my teaching and research have focused on a wide range of topics in field of optics.

4. The list of materials I have considered is set forth in my opening report. In addition, I have reviewed the Board decisions, IV’s Oppositions, the Declarations of Mr. Smith-Gillespie, and all exhibits cited thereto in both the ’545 and ’334 IPRs. I have also reviewed the deposition of Mr. Smith-Gillespie (XLNX-1014 and XLNX-1015) as well as XLNX-1016, which contains excerpts from Spatial Light Modulator Technology (Uzi Efron ed., Marcel Dekker 1995). I have also reviewed the other exhibits cited in this report.

**II.**  
**SUMMARY OF OPINIONS**

5. This declaration addresses a variety of issues that have arisen since I submitted my original declaration. This includes issues raised by (1) the Board’s Decision to institute review; (2) IV’s Opposition; and (3) the testimony of Mr. Smith-Gillespie. For the reasons set forth below and in my other declarations, it is my opinion that the ’545 patent is invalid.

**III.**  
**CLAIM CONSTRUCTION**

6. The Board’s Decision addresses several claim construction issues. Although the Board addressed these terms at IV’s request, it did not adopt IV’s proposed constructions. The following is my response to the constructions proposed by IV and the preliminary constructions adopted by the Board.

A. **“Light-Shutter Matrix System”**

<b>Board Preliminary Construction</b>	<b>IV Proposed Construction</b>
A set of matrices, such as monochrome LCD arrays, where each matrix comprises a rectangular arrangement of elements capable of limiting the passage of light.	A two-dimensional array of elements that selectively admit and block light.

7. I generally agree with the Board’s preliminary construction of “light-shutter matrix system.” In particular, I agree that a light shutter, in the context of the ’545 patent, is an element that is “capable of limiting the passage of light.”

8. IV’s proposed construction is problematic for several reasons. First, in practice, light-shutter elements (e.g., a pixel in an LCD) do not simply “admit” or

“block” light; frequently, the elements allow just some of the light through to create a “grayscale” effect. Thus, “limiting” is a better description of what light shutters do than is “blocking.” Second, IV’s proposed “admit and block” construction attempts to backdoor in a significant limitation on what it means to “block” light.

Specifically, IV’s expert, Mr. Smith Gillespie, opines that a light shutter must block light through absorption only, and not through scattering. [Ex. 2005, ¶ 16] I disagree. The ’545 patent does not contain a limitation on how the light shutters (e.g., LCD elements) limit, or for that matter, block, the passage of light. Some LCD elements (including some of the prior art references at issue here) block light by scattering it rather than absorbing it. Even the Board’s description of LCD technology describes liquid crystal elements as “scattering” light rather than merely absorbing it. Thus, to the extent that IV’s proposed construction is limited to light shutter matrix systems that block light by absorbing it, I disagree.

9. The Board’s preliminary construction limits the phrase “matrix system” to a “rectangular arrangement.” I do not object to this proposed construction, although I note that other reasonable constructions may be broader. A broader interpretation of “matrix system” would not impact my analysis.

# 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.