

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

LG DISPLAY CO., LTD.  
Petitioner

v.

INNOVATIVE DISPLAY TECHNOLOGIES LLC  
Patent Owner

---

**Case: IPR2014-01096**

**Patent 7,537,370**

---

**PETITIONER'S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF ITS PETITION  
FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,537,370**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**I. MR. WERNER’S DECLARATION SHOULD BE GIVEN LITTLE TO NO WEIGHT .....1**

**II. CLAIMS 15 AND 27 ARE OBVIOUS OVER PRISTASH.....3**

    A. Pristash Discloses the “Panel Member Ha[ving] a Transition Region Between the at Least One Input Edge and the Patterns of Light Extracting Deformities to Allow the Light From the at Least One Light Source to Mix and Spread.” .....4

    B. Pristash Discloses “At Least One Side of the Transition Region Contains Optical Elements for Reflecting or Refracting Light From the at Least One Light Source.” .....6

    C. Pristash Discloses “Deformities on or in the at Least One Side Ha[ving] at Least Two Different Types.” .....7

**III. CLAIMS 15 AND 27 ARE OBVIOUS OVER KOBAYASHI IN VIEW OF PRISTASH.....12**

**IV. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST.....13**

**V. STATEMENT OF MATERIAL FACTS IN DISPUTE .....14**

**VI. CONCLUSION .....14**

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Kinetic Techs., Inc. v. Skyworks Solutions, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00529 .....	2
<i>Numatics, Inc. v. Balluff, Inc.</i> , 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 176759 (E.D. Mich. Dec. 16, 2014) .....	3
<i>Viterbo v. Dow Chemical Co.</i> , 826 F.2d 420 (5th Cir. 1987) .....	2
<i>Wowza Media Sys., LLC v. Adobe Sys. Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00054 .....	1

**PETITIONER'S EXHIBIT LIST**

<b>Description</b>	<b>Exhibit #</b>
U.S. Patent No. 7,537,370	1001
Prosecution History of U.S. Patent No. 7,537,370	1002
Complaints filed in Related District Court Cases	1003
Declaration of Michael J. Escuti, Ph.D. ("Escuti Decl.")	1004
U.S. Patent No. 5,461,547 ("Ciupke")	1005
U.S. Patent No. 5,005,108 ("Pristash")	1006
EP500960 ("Ohe")	1007
U.S. Patent No. 5,408,388 ("Kobayashi")	1008
U.S. Patent No. 5,160,195 ("Miller")	1009
J. A. Castellano, <i>Handbook of Display Technology</i> , Academic Press Inc., San Diego, 1992, at pp. 9-13 and Ch. 8	1010
U.S. Patent No. 5,598,280 ("Nishio")	1011
U.S. Patent No. 5,384,658 ("Ohtake")	1012
U.S. Patent No. 5,303,322 ("Winston")	1013
U.S. Patent No. 5,050,946 ("Hathaway")	1014
U.S. Patent No. 5,828,488 ("Ouderkirk")	1015
3M product brochure 75-0500-0403-7, "Brightness Enhancement Film (BEF)," 2 pages (1993)	1016
U.S. Patent No. 5,706,134 ("Konno")	1017
U.S. Patent No. 5,944,405 ("Takeuchi")	1018
Declaration of Jamie Beaber	1019
6/16/2015 Deposition of Mr. Kenneth Werner	1020
3/26/2015 Deposition of Dr. Michael J. Escuti, Ph.D. ("Escuti Dep.")	1021

In its January 13, 2015 Institution Decision on the '370 Patent, the Board correctly found that Petitioner LG Display is likely to prevail in showing that (a) claims 15 and 27 are obvious over Pristash; and (b) claims 15 and 27 are obvious over Kobayashi in view of Pristash. *See* Decision, Paper 11, at 17. Patent Owner Innovative Display Technologies, LLC's Response does not rebut the Petition, Dr. Escuti's opinions, or the Board's institution decision. *See* Response, Paper 24. Additionally, Patent Owner's Response is nearly identical to the declaration of its expert, Mr. Werner, who offers no technical opinions but rather challenges the sufficiency of the disclosure in the Petition. Thus, as explained below, it should be given no weight.

**I. MR. WERNER'S DECLARATION SHOULD BE GIVEN LITTLE TO NO WEIGHT**

Mr. Werner's declaration should be given little to no weight for at least two reasons. First, the patent and prior art analysis sections of Mr. Werner's declaration are nearly identical to those sections of the Patent Owner Response. *Compare* Paper No. 24, at 8-15 *with* Ex. 2005, at ¶¶38-49. Indeed, Mr. Werner admitted during his deposition that he would not be surprised to learn that the Patent Owner Response was nearly identical to his declaration. *See* Ex.1020, at 104:2-5. Because Mr. Werner's declaration simply tracks the arguments in the Response and is nearly identical, his declaration is not helpful and should be given no probative weight. *See, e.g., Wowza Media Sys., LLC v. Adobe Sys. Inc.*, IPR2013-00054,

# 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.