

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

FINISAR CORP.
Petitioner

v.

THOMAS SWAN & CO. LTD.
Patent Owner

Case IPR2014-00461
Patent 7,664,395

PRELIMINARY RESPONSE BY PATENT OWNER UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.107

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Overview	1
II. Related Proceedings.....	3
III. The Intrinsic Record of the '395 Patent.....	4
A. Summary of an exemplary embodiment from the '395 Patent.....	4
B. Independent claims 1, 24, and 27 each recites an SLM and a dispersion device arranged so that the SLM can display multiple holograms to independently route different frequency channels as part of an optical routing module or device.....	7
C. The Prosecution History of the '395 patent confirms that the independent claims each requires an SLM and a dispersion device arranged so that the SLM can display multiple holograms to independently route different frequency channels as part of an optical routing module or device	11
IV. Claim Construction	15
V. The Petition does not establish a reasonable likelihood that any claim is unpatentable as obvious.....	22
A. Parker does not disclose a dispersion device arranged so that beams corresponding to different channels can be incident on the different holograms formed at respective groups of pixels on the SLM to achieve independent control of the routing of the different channels, as required by the independent claims.....	22
i. Parker teaches using a fixed grating to compensate for the limited pitch of the SLM, with all channels being incident on the same hologram on the SLM	23
ii. Dr. Hall's testimony with respect the Parker grating is not credible.....	32
B. Parker does not "display holograms on the SLM to determine the channels at respective outputs," as recited in claim 1, nor does Parker describe a routing device that	

is “operable to select the frequencies from the input signals to appear in the output,” as recited in claim 24, or that is “operable to combine the frequencies from the input signals to appear in the output,” as recited in claim 27 37

C. Warr and Tan do not provide the material missing from Parker 39

 i. The Petition’s reliance on Warr is insufficient..... 40

 ii. The Petition’s reliance on Tan is insufficient..... 45

D. The Petition’s obviousness analysis is insufficient to institute trial 48

E. Even Finisar touts the non-obviousness of the claimed invention 53

F. Dependent claims..... 56

VI. Finisar has not properly established that any of the Parker, Warr, and Tan Theses are prior art 57

VII. Conclusion..... 60

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Case Law

<i>Alexsam, Inc. v. IDT Corp.</i> , 715 F.3d 1336, 1347-48 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	51
<i>Apple Inc. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n</i> , 725 F.3d 1356, 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	56
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1, 17 (1966)	48, 56
<i>In re Cronyn</i> , 890 F.2d 1158, 1161 (Fed. Cir. 1989)	59
<i>In re Fine</i> , 837 F.2d 1071, 1076 (Fed. Cir. 1988).....	52
<i>In re Lister</i> , 583 F.3d 1307, 1311-12 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	58
<i>In re Robertson</i> , 169 F.3d 743, 745 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	47
<i>Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.</i> , 688 F.3d 1342, 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	51
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398, 418 (2007)	49
<i>Omega Eng’g, Inc. v. Raytek Corp.</i> , 334 F.3d 1314, 1325–26 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	20
<i>Power-One Inc., v. Artesyn Techs., Inc.</i> , 599 F.3d 1343, 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	51
<i>Rohm and Haas Co. v. Brotech Corp.</i> , 127 F.3d 1089, 1092 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	33, 42, 47
<i>Thorner v. Sony Computer Entertainment Am. LLC</i> , 669 F.3d 1362, 1365-7 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	17, 22

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(3)	48
35 U.S.C. § 314(a).....	48, 57
37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(4).....	48
37 C.F.R. § 42.20(c)	48, 57

...

37 C.F.R. § 42.204(b) 48, 57
37 C.F.R. § 42.22(a)(2)..... 48, 57
37 CFR § 1.68 58
37 CFR § 42.2 58
37 CFR § 42.53(a)..... 58
37 CFR § 42.62(a)..... 58
37 CFR § 42.65(a)..... 33, 42, 47
Fed. R. Evid. 701 58
Fed. R. Evid. 801(c)..... 58

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.