SEL EXHIBIT NO. 2003

CMI CORP. v. PATENT OF YOSHIHARU HIRAKATA and SHUNPEI YAMAZAKI

IPR 2013-00068



1	JEFFER MANGELS BUTLER & MITCHELL LLP
2	CTANILEVA CIDCON (D. N. 160000)
3	sgibson@jmbm.com GREGORY S. CORDREY (Bar No. 190144) gcordrey@jmbm.com 3 Park Plaza, Suite 1100 Irvine, California 92614-2592 Telephone: (949) 623-7200 Facsimile: (949) 623-7202
4	3 Park Plaza, Suite 1100 Irvine, California 92614-2592
5	Telephone: (949) 623-7200 Facsimile: (949) 623-7202
6	Attorneys for Defendants
7	CHIMEI INNOLUX CORPORATION, CHIMEI OPTOELECTRONICS USA, INC., ACER AMERICA CORPORATION,
8	ACER AMERICA CORPORATION, VIEWSONIC CORPORATION, VIZIO, INC.
9	VIZIO, INC.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SEMICONDUCTOR ENERGY LABORATORY CO., LTD.,

Plaintiff,

v.

CHIMEI INNOLUX CORPORATION, CHI MEI OPTOELECTRONICS USA, INC., ACER AMERICA CORPORATION, VIEWSONIC CORPORATION, VIZIO, INC., and WESTINGHOUSE DIGITAL, LLC,

Defendants.

CASE NO. SACV12-0021-JST (JPRx)

SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATION OF GREGORY S. CORDREY IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR STAY PENDING OUTCOME OF INTER PARTES REVIEW

Date: Time: December 21, 2012

ne: 2:30 p.m.

Place: Hon. Josephine Staton Tucker Courtroom 10A

411 W. 4th St. # 1-053 Santa Ana, California

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

PRINTED ON

DECLARATION OF GREGORY S. CORDREY

I, Gregory S. Cordrey, declare and state:

- I am an attorney with Jeffer Mangels Butler & Mitchell LLP, counsel for 1. Chimei Innolux Corporation, Chi Mei Optoelectronics USA, Inc., Acer America Corporation, ViewSonic Corporation, and VIZIO, Inc. (collectively, "Defendants"). I submit this supplemental declaration in support of Defendants' Motion to Stay Pending Outcome of Inter Partes Review ("Motion to Stay"). The matters stated below are of my personal knowledge. If called as a witness, I could and would testify competently thereto:
- 2. This declaration supplements my earlier declaration to provide details regarding the filing of the petitions for inter partes review ("IPR") of the patents-insuit that have occurred subsequent to the filing of CMI's motion on October 22, 2012 (Dkt. No. 100).
- As stated in Defendants' Motion to Stay, Defendants filed with the U.S. 3. Patent and Trademark Office ("PTO") on October 19, 2012, the first of its petitions for inter partes review for U.S. Patent No. 6,404,480 ("'480 Patent"). Attached hereto as Exhibits 1 and 2 are true and correct copies of Defendants' petition for IPR, and supporting expert declaration, respectively. On October 25, 2012 the PTO issued a Notice of Filing Date Accorded to Petition and Notice For Setting the Time Period for Filing Patent Owner Preliminary Response ("Notice"). The Notice accorded the petition a filing date of October 19, 2012 as Case IPR2013-00028 and designated Administrative Patent Judge Sally C. Medley to manage the proceeding. Attached hereto as Exhibit 3 is a true and correct copy of the Notice issued by the PTO on October 25, 2012.
- On November 7, 2012, Defendants filed with the U.S. Patent and 4. Trademark Office ("PTO") its petition for IPR for U.S. Patent No. 7,956,978 ("'978 Patent"). Attached hereto as Exhibits 4 and 5 are true and correct copies of



Defendants' petition for IPR, and supporting expert declaration, respectively. On
November 9, 2012 the PTO issued a Notice of Filing Date Accorded to Petition and
Notice For Setting the Time Period for Filing Patent Owner Preliminary Response
("Notice"). The Notice accorded the petition a filing date of November 7, 2012 as
Case IPR2013-00038 and designated Administrative Patent Judge Sally C. Medley to
manage the proceeding. Attached hereto as Exhibit 6 is a true and correct copy of
the Notice issued by the PTO on November 9, 2012.

- 5. On November 19, 2012, Defendants filed with the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office ("PTO") its petition for IPR for U.S. Patent No. 7,697,102 ("102 Patent"). Attached hereto as **Exhibits 7 and 8** are true and correct copies of Defendants' petition for IPR, and supporting expert declaration, respectively. On November 23, 2012 the PTO issued a Notice of Filing Date Accorded to Petition and Notice For Setting the Time Period for Filing Patent Owner Preliminary Response ("Notice"). The Notice accorded the petition a filing date of November 19, 2012 as Case IPR2013-00060 and designated Administrative Patent Judge Sally C. Medley to manage the proceeding. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 9** is a true and correct copy of the Notice issued by the PTO on November 23, 2012.
- 6. On November 26, 2012, Defendants filed with the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office ("PTO") two petitions for IPR for U.S. Patent No. 7,923,311 ("311 Patent"). Attached hereto as **Exhibits 10 and 11** are true and correct copies of Defendants' first petition for IPR for the '311 Patent and supporting expert declaration, respectively. Attached hereto as **Exhibits 12 and 13** are true and correct copies of Defendants' second petition for IPR for the '311 Patent and supporting expert declaration, respectively. On November 29, 2012 the PTO issued a Notice of Filing Date Accorded to Petition and Notice For Setting the Time Period for Filing Patent Owner Preliminary Response ("Notice") for both of the '311 Patent petitions. The Notices accorded both of the petitions a filing date of November 26, 2012 as

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

Cases IPR2013-00064 and IPR2013-00065, and designated Administrative Patent
Judge Sally C. Medley to manage the proceedings. Attached hereto as Exhibits 14
and 15 are a true and correct copy of the Notices issued by the PTO on November 29
2012.

- 7. On November 28, 2012, Defendants filed with the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office ("PTO") its petition for IPR for U.S. Patent No. 7,876,413 ("'413 Patent"). Attached hereto as Exhibits 16 and 17 are true and correct copies of Defendants' petition for IPR, and supporting expert declaration, respectively. As of today (November 29, 2012), the PTO has not issued a Notice of Filing Date Accorded to Petition and Notice For Setting the Time Period for Filing Patent Owner Preliminary Response ("Notice"). At the time the petition was filed, it was given a provisional a filing date of November 28, 2012 as Case IPR2013-00066.
- 8. On November 30, 2012, Defendants filed with the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office ("PTO") its petition for IPR for U.S. Patent No. 8,068,204 ("'204 Patent"). Attached hereto as Exhibits 18 and 19 are true and correct copies of Defendants' petition for IPR, and supporting expert declaration, respectively. At the time the petition was filed, it was given a provisional a filing date of November 30, 2012 as Case IPR2013-00068.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America, that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed this 29th day of November, 2012, in Irvine, California.

/s/ Gregory S. Cordrey Gregory S. Cordrey

28

PRINTED ON