

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

INNOLUX CORPORATION
Petitioner

v.

SEMICONDUCTOR ENERGY LABORATORY CO., LTD.
Patent Owner

Case IPR2013-00068 (SCM)
Patent 8,068,204 B2

**PATENT OWNER'S REQUEST FOR REHEARING OF DECISION TO
INSTITUTE INTER PARTES REVIEW PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.71**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PATENT OWNER’S REQUEST FOR REHEARING OF DECISION TO
INSTITUTE INTER PARTES REVIEW PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.71.....1

I. THE CLAIM CONSTRUCTION OF “CONTACT THROUGH AN
OPENING” IS UNREASONABLE.....1

 A. The Board Followed Incorrect Claim Construction Procedure.....2

 B. The Board Definition is Broad Beyond Reasonable Bounds.....6

 1. The Claims Use “Through” in Different Contexts.....6

 2. The Claims Also Distinguish Between “Contact” and “Contact
Through an Opening”7

 3. None of the Specification Uses of “Through” Support the
Board’s Alternate Construction.....8

 4. The Board’s Construction of “Through” Is Divorced From the
Correct Context.....10

 C. Conclusion re the Board’s Alternate Construction.....14

II. INDEPENDENT CLAIMS 54, 61, 68 AND 76 DEFINE OVER
SUKEGAWA.....14

CONCLUSION.....15

**PATENT OWNER'S REQUEST FOR REHEARING OF DECISION TO
INSTITUTE INTER PARTES REVIEW PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.71**

The Decision to Institute *inter partes* review, mailed April 24, 2013, has been carefully considered. This Request for Rehearing on behalf of the Patent Owner (“SEL”) is filed within 14 days of the Decision (Paper 7) and is timely under 37 C.F.R. § 42.71. SEL respectfully requests rehearing because the Board incorrectly construed the claim language and improperly interpreted what the asserted prior art U.S. Patent 5,636,329 to Sukegawa disclosed.

I. THE CLAIM CONSTRUCTION OF “CONTACT THROUGH AN OPENING” IS UNREASONABLE

In Paper 7, pp. 10-12, the Board construed the phrase “... contact through an opening,” which the Board noted appears in claims 54, 61, 68, and 76. The same or substantially the same phrase also appears in claims 14 (“contact through openings”), 24 (same), 36, 43, 51, 59, 66, 73, and 81. The Board cited an English language dictionary and reproduced “several ordinary definitions” from it for the word “*through*.” *Id.*, p. 11. SEL had proposed a definition that in the context of this phrase and patent specification, “contact through an opening” means contact made possible by the opening or by virtue of the opening. The Board agreed that SEL’s definition is consistent with the specification of U.S. Patent 8,068,204 (“the ‘204 patent”) and three of the dictionary definitions which the Board cited.

In its “alternatively” paragraph, however, the Board made further comments

on the ordinary meaning of “through” according to these dictionary definitions, “tempered by its use in the ‘204 patent specification and claim 54 phrase at issue ...” *Id.* p. 12. It concluded that these dictionary definitions do not preclude electrical contact from occurring “between” the vertical limits of the claimed contact opening or through-hole defined by the surrounding insulation film, even if the opening does not cause or permit the contact to be made. The Board referenced Figure 4A of the ‘204 patent which shows that the electrical contact between ITO film 114 and external connection lies 403 occurs at the bottom boundary of the opening in the resin inter-layer insulating film 113 such that “between” includes that bottom boundary at the opening in insulating film 113. *Id.*, p. 12. It ruled, “Accordingly, ‘contact through an opening’ means contact which occurs because of or by virtue of the opening, *or which occurs between the vertical limits of the opening.*” *Id.* [emphasis added]. SEL respectfully submits that the ruling wrongly includes the alternate definition, reproduced here in italics. Everything beginning with “or” should be stricken.

A. The Board Followed Incorrect Claim Construction Procedure

The Board cited *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language* (1975), *id.* p. 11, and then developed a construction of “contact through an opening” based on some of the general definitions it found there “tempered by the meaning in light of the ‘204 patent specification and claim phrase at issue.”

The Board followed a procedure similar to one overruled en banc in *Phillips v. AWH Corp.*, 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005). That Court specifically addressed the use of dictionaries at 415 F.3d 1303, 1319-1324. It cited (and abrogated) the panel decision in *Texas Digital Systems, Inc. v. Telegenix, Inc.*, 308 F.3d 1193 (Fed. Cir. 2002). *Texas Digital* had ruled that words often have multiple dictionary meanings so the intrinsic record must be consulted to determine which of the different possible meanings is most consistent with the use of the term in question by the inventor. The *Texas Digital* court had added that the patent specification and file history must be consulted to determine whether the patentee has used the words of the claim in a manner clearly inconsistent with the ordinary meaning reflected, for example, in a dictionary definition. *Phillips* at 1319 [internal quotation marks omitted]. *Texas Digital* stated that the presumption in favor of a dictionary definition is overcome where the patentee acts as a lexicographer or has made a disavowal or disclaimer of claim scope. *Id.*

The reason given by the *Texas Digital* panel for this *modus operandi* was to avoid importing limitations into the claims. The Federal Circuit agreed in *Phillips* that the *goal* expressed in *Texas Digital* was valid but the methodology adopted to achieve that goal “placed too much reliance on extrinsic sources such as dictionaries, treatises, and encyclopedias and too little on intrinsic sources, in particular the specification and prosecution history.” *Phillips*, at 1320. It explained,

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.