UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

LG ELECTRONICS, INC.,
LG ELECTRONICS U.S.A., INC., and
LG ELECTRONICS MOBILECOMM U.S.A., INC.,
Petitioner

v.

CYPRESS SEMICONDUCTOR CORPORATION
Patent Owner

Case IPR2014-01343
Patent 8,519,973

PATENT OWNER CYPRESS SEMICONDUCTOR CORP. RESPONSE

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. OVERVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 8,519,973 1

A. Background of the Dispute 1

B. Capacitive Touch Technology 2

C. Prosecution History 7

III. STATEMENT OF RELIEF REQUESTED 8

A. Person Of Ordinary Skill In The Art 8

IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION 8

A. How the claims are to be interpreted 8

V. CLAIMS 1–8, 11, 12, and 14–20 ARE NOT OBVIOUS OVER BOIE AND BISSET 9

A. Overview of Boie 9

B. Overview of Bisset 13

C. Claim 1 Is Not Rendered Obvious By The Combination Of Boie And Bisset 19

1. Petitioner Fails To Show That Boie Teaches A "Touch Screen Device" As In Claim 1 20

2. Petitioner Fails To Show That Bisset Teaches A "Touch Screen Device" As In Claim 1 22

3. Bisset Teaches Away From Use Of A "Touch Screen Device" 23

4. Bisset Does Not Teach Using Capacitance Variations 25

5. Petitioner Failed To Demonstrate Motivation To Combine Bisset with Boie 26

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

a. Dr. Wright's Declaration Testimony Is Conclusory And Devoid Of Any Analysis 27

i. Dr. Wright Did Not Explain How Using Bisset's Alleged Determination Of Capacitance Variations Would Provide Finer Resolution.....31

b. Dr. Wright's Deposition Testimony Confirms That Resolution Is Determined by Factors Other Than Determining "Capacitance Variations" 31

D. Neither Boie Nor Bisset Teach The Subject Matter Of Claim 2 36

1. Dr. Wright's Declaration Testimony Is Conclusory.....44

2. Dr. Wright's Declaration Testimony Is Also Irrelevant 46

E. Petitioner Does Not Even Attempt To Demonstrate Where Bisset Teaches The Limitations Of Claim 2 47

F. Claim 3 Is Not Rendered Obvious By The Combination Of Boie And Bisset.....48

G. Claim 4 Is Not Rendered Obvious By The Combination Of Boie And Bisset.....48

H. Claim 5 Is Not Rendered Obvious By The Combination Of Boie And Bisset.....48

I. Claim 6 Is Not Rendered Obvious By The Combination Of Boie And Bisset.....49

J. Claim 7 Is Not Rendered Obvious By The Combination Of Boie And Bisset.....49

K. Neither Boie Nor Bisset Teach The Limitations Recited In Claim 8 50

L. Neither Boie Nor Bisset Teach The Limitations Recited In Claim 11 50

M. Neither Boie Nor Bisset Teach The Limitations Recited In Claim 12 51

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

N. Neither Boie Nor Bisset Teach The Limitations Recited In Claim 14 51

O. Neither Boie Nor Bisset Teach The Limitations Recited In Claim 15 51

P. Neither Boie Nor Bisset Teach The Limitations Recited In Claim 16 51

Q. Claim 17 Is Not Rendered Obvious By The Combination Of Boie And Bisset.....52

R. Neither Boie Nor Bisset Teach The Limitations Recited In Claim 18 52

S. Neither Boie Nor Bisset Teach The Limitations Recited In Claim 19 52

T. Neither Boie Nor Bisset Teach The Limitations Recited In Claim 20 53

VI. CONCLUSION.....54

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

ActiveVideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Commc'ns, Inc., 694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012)..... 27, 44

BAE Sys. Info. & Elec. Sys. Integration, Inc. v. Cheetah Omni, LLC, Case No. IPR2013-00175, (Paper 45, June 19, 2014).....9

Graham v. John Deere Co., 383 U.S. 1 (1966) 26

Hodosh v. Block Drug Co., Inc., 786 F.2d 1136 (Fed. Cir. 1986).....25

In re Am. Acad. of Sci. Tech. Ctr., 367 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....9

In re Grasselli, 713 F.2d 731 (Fed. Cir. 1983) 25

In re Kahn, 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006) 27

LinkedIn Corp. v. AvMarkets Inc., Case No. CBM2013-00025, (Paper 30, November 10, 2014) 9

Marvell Semiconductor, Inc. v. Intellectual Ventures I LLC, Case No. IPR2014-01562, Paper No. 11 (P.T.A.B., April 16, 2015) 47

Phillips v. AWH Corp., 415 F.3d 1303, 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (*en banc*).....9

Synopsys Inc. v. Mentor Graphics Corp., IPR2012-00041, Paper 16 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 22, 2013) 20, 21, 23

Thorner v. Sony Computer Entm't Am. LLC, 669 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2012) 9

W.L. Gore & Assocs., Inc. v. Garlock, Inc., 721 F.2d 1540 (Fed. Cir. 1983) 25

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKET ALARM

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.