

Filed on behalf of TPK Touch Solutions Inc.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

WINTEK CORPORATION
Petitioner,

v.

TPK TOUCH SOLUTIONS INC.
Patent Owner

Case IPR 2013-00568
U.S. Patent No. 8,217,902

**PATENT OWNER FINAL RESPONSE TO PETITION
PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.107**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
A.	Procedural Background	1
B.	Summary of Patent Owner’s Arguments	3
II.	OVERVIEW OF THE ’902 PATENT AND CHALLENGED CLAIMS	6
A.	Background of the Technology at the Time of the ’902 Patent	6
B.	The Invention Described and Claimed in the ’902 Patent	7
III.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	12
A.	“wherein a capacitance between a first cell of the plurality of first-axis conductor cells and a second cell of the plurality of second-axis cells is measured.”	12
B.	“conductor assemblies,” “conductor cells,” and “conduction lines.”	13
IV.	GROUND 1: <i>FUJITSU</i> DOES NOT ANTICIPATE THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS	18
A.	<i>Fujitsu</i> Does Not Disclose the “Conductor Assemblies,” “Conductor Cells” or “Conduction Lines” of the Independent Claims.....	18
B.	<i>Fujitsu</i> Does Not Disclose Conductor Cells Having a “Contour of a Hexagonal Shape.”	22
C.	<i>Fujitsu</i> Does Not Disclose a Structure Wherein “Each Second-Axis Conduction Line Terminates on the Edge of Each Second-Axis Conductor Cell to the Adjacent Second-Axis Conductor Cells.”	23
D.	<i>Fujitsu</i> Does Not Disclose Signal Transmission Lines on the Surface of the Substrate.....	24
E.	<i>Fujitsu</i> Does Not Disclose Electrically Connecting Between	

Conductor Cells Using a Plurality of Conduction Lines.....	28
V. GROUND 2: THE COMBINATION OF <i>FUJITSU</i> AND <i>BINSTEAD</i> DOES NOT RENDER OBVIOUS THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS.....	31
VI. GROUND 3: THE COMBINATION OF <i>FUJITSU</i> AND <i>MILLER</i> DOES NOT RENDER OBVIOUS THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS.....	34
A. The Proposed Combination of <i>Fujitsu</i> and <i>Miller</i> Does Not Disclose the “Conductor Assemblies,” “Conductor Cells” or “Conduction Lines” of the Independent Claims.	34
B. The Proposed Combination of <i>Fujitsu</i> and <i>Miller</i> Does Not Disclose “Signal Transmission Lines Formed on the Surface of the Substrate.”	35
C. A Person of Ordinary Skill Would Not Be Motivated to Combine <i>Fujitsu</i> with <i>Miller</i> in the Manner Proposed.	35
1. <i>Miller</i> Contains No Teaching, Suggestion or Motivation of Implementing Mutual Capacitance in a Single-Layer Solution.	36
2. <i>Fujitsu</i> Contains No Teaching, Suggestion or Motivation of Detecting a Position of Touch by Measuring a Change in Capacitance Between Conductor Elements.....	40
3. Combining the Electrode Structure of <i>Fujitsu</i> with the Measurement of Mutual Capacitance in <i>Miller</i> Would Result in an Unworkable System.....	41
VII. GROUND 4: THE COMBINATION OF <i>FUJITSU</i> AND <i>SEGUINE</i> DOES NOT RENDER OBVIOUS THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS.....	50
VIII. GROUND 5: THE COMBINATION OF <i>FUJITSU</i> AND <i>BOLENDER</i> DOES NOT RENDER OBVIOUS THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS.	53
IX. OBJECTIVE INDICIA OF NONOBVIOUSNESS SUPPORT THE CONCLUSION THAT THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS OF THE '902 PATENT ARE NOT OBVIOUS.	54

A. Commercial Success and Industry Praise56

B. Long-Felt Need and Failure of Others57

X. CONCLUSION.....60

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

<i>Advanced Display Sys. v. Kent State Univ.</i> , 212 F.3d 1272 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	29, 56
<i>Alco Standard Corp. v. Tennessee Valley Authority</i> , 808 F.2d 1490 (Fed. Cir. 1986)	57
<i>Apple Inc. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n</i> , 725 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	55
<i>Becton, Dickinson & Co. v. Tyco Healthcare Group, LP</i> , 616 F.3d 1249 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	21
<i>Callaway Golf Co. v. Acushnet Co.</i> , 576 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	29
<i>Connell v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.</i> , 722 F.2d 1542 (Fed. Cir. 1983)	passim
<i>Engel Indus., Inc. v. Lockformer Co.</i> , 96 F.3d 1398 (Fed. Cir. 1996)	21, 27
<i>Gaus v. Conair Corp.</i> , 363 F.3d 1284 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	21
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966)	54, 56
<i>In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Patent Litig.</i> , 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	55
<i>In re Fine</i> , 837 F.2d 1071	43
<i>In re Fitch</i> , 972 F.2d 1260 (Fed. Cir. 1992)	43

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.