

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 IPR2014-00541
U.S. Patent No. 8,217,902

**PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY 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 Response	5
II.	OVERVIEW OF THE ‘902 PATENT AND CHALLENGED CLAIMS	8
III.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	13
IV.	NONE OF THE PROPOSED GROUNDS SHOW A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF PREVAILING ON THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS	16
A.	Grounds 1 and 2: Combinations Based On <i>Binstead</i> and <i>Miller</i>	16
1.	<i>Binstead</i> Does Not Disclose All of the Limitations of Independent Claims 17 and 25	16
(a)	<i>Binstead</i> Does Not Disclose “Conductor Assemblies,” “Conductor Cells” or “Conduction Lines”	17
(b)	<i>Binstead</i> Does Not Disclose “A Plurality of Second-Axis Conductor Assemblies, Each Second-Axis Conductor Assembly Comprising a Plurality of Second-Axis Conductor Cells Arranged on the Surface of the Substrate...” or “a Plurality of Signal Transmission Lines Formed on the Surface of he Substrate”	18
(c)	<i>Binstead</i> Does Not Disclose Measuring a “Capacitance Between a First Cell of the Plurality of First-Axis Conductor Cells and a Second Cell of the Plurality of Second-Axis Conductor Cells to Detect a Position of Touch”	21

2.	The Combination of <i>Binstead</i> and <i>Miller</i> Does Not Render Obvious the Mutual Capacitance Limitations of Claims 17 and 25.....	24
3.	Petitioner’s Proposed Three-Reference Combinations Based on <i>Seguine</i> and <i>Honeywell</i> Fail to Raise a <i>Prima Facie</i> Case that Claims 23 and 30 are Obvious.....	34
4.	Petitioner’s Proposed Combination in Ground 2 Is Cumulative and Redundant with Respect to Claims 20 and 28.....	39
B.	Grounds 3 and 4: Combinations Based On Fujitsu and Miller.....	39
1.	Petitioner’s Proposed Combination of <i>Fujitsu</i> with <i>Miller</i> Fails to Teach or Suggest All of the Limitations of Independent Claims 17 and 25.....	39
(a)	The Combination of <i>Fujitsu</i> and <i>Miller</i> Does Not Disclose “Conductor Assemblies” or “Conductor Cells”.....	40
(b)	The Combination of <i>Fujitsu</i> and <i>Miller</i> Does Not Disclose “A Plurality of Signal Transmission Lines Formed on the Surface of the Substrate”.....	42
2.	The Combination of <i>Fujitsu</i> and <i>Miller</i> Does Not Render Obvious the Mutual Capacitance Limitations of Claims 17 and 25.....	47
3.	Petitioner’s Proposed Three-Reference Combinations Based on <i>Seguine</i> and <i>Honeywell</i> Fail to Raise a <i>Prima Facie</i> Case that Claims 23 and 30 are Obvious.....	56
V.	CONCLUSION.....	60

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

<i>Becton, Dickinson & Co. v. Tyco Healthcare Group, LP</i> , 616 F.3d 1249 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	41
<i>Berk-Tek, LLC v. Belden, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00057, Paper No. 46 (PTAB Nov. 19, 2012)	27, 50
<i>Cimline, Inc. v. Crafcro, Inc.</i> , 672 F. Supp. 2d 916 (D. Minnesota 2009).....	38, 52, 59
<i>Cont'l Can Co. USA v. Monsanto Co.</i> , 948 F.2d 1264 (Fed. Cir. 1991).....	23
<i>Corning Inc. v. DSM IP Assets B.V.</i> , IPR2013-00045, Paper No. 11 (PTAB May 13, 2013).....	15
<i>Cyanotech Corp. v. The Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois</i> , IPR2013-00401, Paper No. 17 (PTAB Jun. 28, 2013)	28, 50
<i>DePuy Spine, Inc. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc.</i> , 567 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	29, 51
<i>Engel Indus., Inc. v. Lockformer Co.</i> , 96 F.3d 1398 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....	41, 46, 47
<i>Ex Parte Konstant</i> , Appeal No. 2009-001901, Decision on Appeal (BPAI Aug. 20, 2009) ...	42, 46
<i>Ex Parte Koutsky</i> , Appeal No. 2008-0557, Decision on Appeal (BPAI Sep. 23, 2008)	42
<i>Ex Parte Weideman</i> , Appeal No. 2008-3454, Decision on Appeal (BPAI Jan. 27, 2009)...	42, 46, 47
<i>Excelsior Med. Corp. v. Robert Lake</i> , IPR2013-00494, Paper No. 10 (PTAB Aug. 6, 2013)	27, 50
<i>Gaus v. Conair Corp.</i> , 363 F.3d 1284 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	41
<i>In re Fine</i> , 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988).....	32, 38, 54, 60
<i>In re Fitch</i> , 972 F.2d 1260 (Fed. Cir. 1992).....	30, 35, 53, 57

<i>In re Gordon</i> , 733 F.2d 900 USPQ 1125 (Fed. Cir. 1984)	29
<i>In re Gurley</i> , 27 F.3d 551 (Fed. Cir. 1994).....	34, 55
<i>In re Hedges</i> , 783 F.2d 1038 (Fed. Cir. 1986).....	31
<i>In re NTP, Inc.</i> , 654 F.3d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	32, 54
<i>In re Suitco Surface, Inc.</i> , 603 F.3d 1255 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	14
<i>In re Wesslau</i> , 353 F.2d 238, 147 U.S.P.Q. 391 (CCPA 1965).....	31, 53
<i>In re Young</i> , 927 F.2d 588 (Fed. Cir. 1991).....	25, 48
<i>Lantech Inc. v. Keip Machine Co.</i> , 32 F.3d 542 (Fed. Cir. 1994).....	41
<i>Leo Pharmaceutical Products Ltd. v. Rea</i> , 726 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. Aug. 12, 2013).....	38, 52, 59
<i>Medien Patent Verwaltung AG v. Warner Bros. Entm't</i> , 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 12360 (S.D.N.Y. Jan 29, 2014)	30, 52
<i>Monsanto Company v. Pioneer Hi-Bred International, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00022, Paper No. 43 (PTAB April 11, 2013).....	8, 30, 52
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (<i>en banc</i>)	14
<i>Princeton Biochemicals, Inc. v. Beckman Coulter, Inc.</i> , 411 F.3d 1332 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	passim
<i>Synopsys, Inc. v. Mentor Graphics Corp.</i> , IPR2012-00041 (PTAB Feb. 22, 2013)	14
<i>Transclean Corp. v. Bridgewood Servs., Inc.</i> , 290 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	24
<i>Wowza Media Systems v. Adobe Systems Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00054, Paper No. 12 (PTAB Nov. 17, 2012)	8, 30, 52

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.