

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

FINISAR CORP.
Petitioner

v.

THOMAS SWAN & CO. LTD.
Patent Owner

Case IPR2014-00465
Patent 8,335,033

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Overview	1
II. Related Proceedings.....	4
III. The Intrinsic Record of the '033 Patent.....	4
A. Summary of an Exemplary Embodiment from the '033 Patent	4
B. The challenged claims recite optical processors and methods in which multiple holograms are used on an SLM to control directions at which light emerges from the SLM	8
C. The challenged claims further recite optical processors and methods in which light from a common point on a dispersion device is spatially distributed over at least part of an SLM	11
D. Challenged claims 29 and 63 further recite optical processors and methods that expressly recite that the focusing device is the element that focuses dispersed light from the dispersion device onto the SLM.....	12
E. The prosecution histories of the '033 patent and the related '395 patent indicate that Parker does not disclose an optical processor in which light from a common point on a dispersion device is spatially distributed over multiple holograms displayed on an SLM. 13	
IV. Claim Construction	16
V. The Petition Does Not Establish a Reasonable Likelihood that any of the Challenged Claims are Unpatentable as Obvious	21
A. The cited prior art does not disclose optical processors or methods in which light from a common point on a dispersion device is spatially distributed over multiple holograms displayed on an SLM.....	21
1. Parker purposefully uses a single hologram to process light from a dispersion device.....	21
i. Additional portions of Parker confirm the display of a single hologram to process dispersed light incident on the SLM.....	24
ii. Dr. Hall's testimony with respect to Figure 6.1 in Parker is not credible.....	32
2. The Petition fails to explain how or why a PHOSITA would have modified Parker based on Warr and/or Tan to provide the material missing from Parker	35
i. The Petition's reliance on Warr is insufficient	35
ii. The Petition's reliance on Tan is insufficient.....	40

B. The Petition fails to identify where the cited prior art discloses optical processors or methods in which dispersed light from a dispersion device is focused onto an SLM by a focusing device 43

C. The Petition’s Obviousness Analysis is Insufficient to Institute Trial..... 47

D. Even Finisar touts the Non-obviousness of the Claimed Invention..... 52

VI. Petitioner has not Properly Established that any of the Parker, Warr, and Tan Theses are Prior Art..... 56

VII. Conclusion..... 59

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Case Law

<i>Alexsam, Inc. v. IDT Corp.</i> , 715 F.3d 1336, 1347-48 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	50
<i>Apple Inc. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n</i> , 725 F.3d 1356, 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	55
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1, 17 (1966)	48, 55
<i>In re Cronyn</i> , 890 F.2d 1158, 1161 (Fed. Cir. 1989)	58
<i>In re Fine</i> , 837 F.2d 1071, 1076 (Fed. Cir. 1988)	51
<i>In re Lister</i> , 583 F.3d 1307, 1311-12 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	56
<i>In re Robertson</i> , 169 F.3d 743, 745 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	35
<i>Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.</i> , 688 F.3d 1342, 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	50
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398, 418 (2007)	48
<i>Omega Eng’g, Inc. v. Raytek Corp.</i> , 334 F.3d 1314, 1325–26 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	17
<i>Power-One Inc., v. Artesyn Techs., Inc.</i> , 599 F.3d 1343, 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	50
<i>Rohm and Haas Co. v. Brotech Corp.</i> , 127 F.3d 1089, 1092 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	34, 37, 39, 43, 45, 46

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(3)	47
35 U.S.C. § 314(a)	47, 56
37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(4)	47
37 C.F.R. § 42.20(c)	47, 56
37 C.F.R. § 42.204(b)	47, 56

37 C.F.R. § 42.22(a)(2)..... 47, 56
37 CFR § 1.68 57
37 CFR § 42.2 57
37 CFR § 42.53(a)..... 57
37 CFR § 42.62(a)..... 57
37 CFR § 42.65(a)..... 34, 37, 39, 43, 45, 46
Fed. R. Evid. 701 57
Fed. R. Evid. 801(c)..... 57

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.