

IPR2013-00112  
U.S. Patent No. 5,779,334

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

XILINX, INC.  
Petitioner

v.

INTELLECTUAL VENTURES I LLC  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2013-00112  
Patent 5,779,334

---

INTELLECTUAL VENTURES' PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY  
RESPONSE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.107(a)

## Table of Contents

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Overview of U.S. Patent No. 5,779,334.....	6
III.	Claim Construction.....	8
	A. Claims 1-6 and 11-14 require a “light-shutter matrix system”.....	10
	B. Claims 1-6 and 11-14 require a “video controller” and Claims 7-10 require “a video signal through an LCD controller”.....	13
	C. Claims 1-6 and 11-14 require “equivalent switching matrices”.....	16
	D. Claims 7-10 require “a dynamic color image”.....	17
IV.	The Trial Should Not Be Instituted Because Xilinx Failed To Show A Reasonable Likelihood The Petitioner Would Prevail.....	19
	A. Challenge #1: Alleged obviousness of Claims 1 and 4-14 over Takanashi.....	20
	1.     Claims 1, 4-6, and 11-14: It would not have been obvious to add a “video controller” to the system of Takanashi in the way the petition argues.....	21
	2.     Claims 1, 4-6, and 11-14: Takanashi does not disclose a “light-shutter matrix system” .....	23
	3.     Claims 1, 4-6, and 11-14: Takanashi does not disclose “equivalent switching matrices”.....	27
	4.     Claim 7-10: Takanashi does not disclose “directing the separate ... beams” or “switching the ... matrix”... <td>30</td>	30
	5.     Claims 7-10: Takanashi does not disclose a “dynamic color image”.....	32
	B. Challenge #2: Alleged obviousness of Claims 1-14 over Takanashi and Lee .....	33

1.	Claims 1-6 and 11-14: Takanashi and Lee do not disclose a “video controller adapted for controlling the light-shutter matrix system” .....	34
2.	Claims 1-6 and 11-14: Takanashi and Lee do not disclose a “light-shutter matrix system” .....	37
3.	Claims 1-6 and 11-14: Takanashi and Lee do not disclose “equivalent switching matrices”.....	37
4.	Claim 7-10: Takanashi and Lee do not disclose “directing the separate ... beams” or “switching the ... matrix”.....	38
5.	Claims 7-10: Takanashi and Lee do not disclose a “dynamic color image”.....	40
C.	Challenge #3: Alleged obviousness of Claims 1 and 4 -14 over Takanashi and Burstyn.....	41
1.	Claims 1, 4-6, and 11-14: Takanashi and Burstyn do not disclose a “video controller adapted for controlling the light-shutter matrix system”.....	41
2.	Claims 1, 4-6, and 11-14: Takanashi and Burstyn do not disclose a “light-shutter matrix system” .....	43
3.	Claims 1, 4-6, and 11-14: Takanashi and Burstyn do not disclose “equivalent switching matrices” .....	44
4.	Claim 7-10: Takanashi and Burstyn do not disclose “directing the separate ... beams” or “switching the ... matrix”.....	44
5.	Claims 7-10: Takanashi and Burstyn do not disclose a “dynamic color image”.....	46
V.	Conclusion and Relief Requested.....	48

## Table of Authorities

### **FEDERAL CASES**

<i>DeSilva v. DiLeonardi,</i> 181 F.3d 865 (7th Cir. 1999) .....	5
<i>In re Trans Texas Holdings Corp.,</i> 498 F.3d 1290 (Fed. Cir. 2007) .....	8
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.,</i> 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc) .....	8, 10
<i>Vitronics Corp. v. Conceptronic, Inc.,</i> 90 F.3d 1576 (Fed. Cir. 1996) .....	10

### **REGULATORY CASES**

<i>Rohm and Haas Co. v. Brotech Corp.,</i> 127 F.3d 1089, 44 USPQ2d 1459 (Fed. Cir. 1997) .....	4
<i>Scripps Research Institute v. Nemerson,</i> 72 USPQ2d 1122 (BPAI 2004) .....	9
<i>Stampa v. Jackson,</i> 78 USPQ2d 1567 (BPAI 2005) .....	5

### **FEDERAL STATUTES**

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) .....	5, 31
35 U.S.C. § 314(a) .....	1, 21

### **REGULATIONS**

37 C.F.R. § 42.20(c).....	9
37 C.F.R. § 42.65(a).....	4
37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b) .....	10
37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(3).....	9

37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(4)..... 1-2, 24

77 Fed. Reg. 48756, 48763-64 (Aug. 14, 2012) ..... 9

**NON-PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS**

Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, 10th ed. 1993 ("Merriam-Webster" Exhibit 2001 at 1084) ..... 8

Oxford English Dictionary..... 20

**OTHER AUTHORITIES**

U.S. Patent No. 6,002,207..... 8, 11

U.S. Patent No. 6,985,253 (filed Dec. 28, 2000, Exhibit 2004) ..... 26

# 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.