

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD,  
Petitioners,

v.

DSS TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT, INC.,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case: IPR2014-01493  
U.S. Patent No. 5,652,084

---

**PATENT OWNER DSS TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT, INC.'S  
PRELIMINARY RESPONSE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. §42.107**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I.	INTRODUCTION .....	1
II.	STATEMENT OF RELIEF REQUESTED.....	2
III.	RELATED IPR PETITION .....	2
IV.	OVERVIEW OF THE INVENTION CLAIMED IN THE ‘084 PATENT .....	3
V.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.....	8
	A. The Board Should Construe Claims of the ‘084 Patent According to the Legal Principles Used by the District Courts.....	8
	B. Petitioner Failed to Provide its Construction of Several Key Claim Terms.....	9
	1. <i>Patterning</i> .....	10
	2. <i>First pattern</i> .....	10
	3. <i>First patterned layer</i> .....	11
	4. <i>Over</i> .....	11
	5. <i>Second pattern</i> .....	12
	6. <i>Second patterned layer</i> .....	15
	C. Patent Owner’s Proposed Construction in Response to the Construction Proposed by Petitioner .....	16
	1. <i>Imaging layer, single patterned layer, disposable post, PRIST</i> .....	16
	2. <i>Stabilizing</i> .....	16
	3. <i>A second feature distinct from the first feature</i> .....	17
VI.	PETITIONER HAS FAILED TO PROVE THAT THERE IS A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT AT LEAST ONE CLAIM OF THE ‘084 PATENT IS UNPATENTABLE .....	22
	A. Challenge #1: there is no reasonable likelihood that Jinbo could anticipate claims 1-8, 12, 15, and 16 of the ‘084 Patent .....	22

1.	According to Jinbo, both imaging layers are patterned using the same mask, whereas claims 1 and 15 require that each imaging layer is patterned in accordance with its own pattern.....	23
2.	Jinbo does not disclose the second patterned layer having a second feature distinct from the first feature of the first patterned layer .....	25
3.	Jinbo cannot anticipate dependent claims 2-8, 12, and 16 at least because Jinbo does not anticipate independent claims 1 and 15 .....	27
B.	Challenge #2: Claim 9 cannot be found obvious based on Jinbo in view of McColgin because Jinbo does not disclose several material limitations of claim 1 from which claim 9 depends.....	28
C.	Challenge #3: Claims 10 and 11 cannot be found obvious based on Jinbo in view of Matthews because Jinbo does not disclose several material limitations of claim 1 from which claims 10 and 11 depend .....	28
D.	Challenge #4: Claims 13 and 14 cannot be found obvious based on Jinbo in view of Cooper because Jinbo does not disclose several material limitations of claim 1 from which claims 13 and 14 depend .....	28
E.	Challenge #5: There is no reasonable likelihood that Hsue could anticipate claims 1-7, 10, 12, 15, and 16 of the '084 Patent .....	29
1.	Hsue does not disclose “forming a second imaging layer <i>over</i> the first patterned layer” .....	31
2.	Hsue does not disclose that the first and the second patterned layers are formed in accordance with (2) two separate patterns .....	33
3.	Hsue does not disclose the second patterned layer having a second feature distinct from the first feature of the first patterned layer .....	37
4.	Hsue cannot anticipate dependent claims 2-7, 10, 12, and 16 at least because Hsue does not anticipate independent claims 1 and 15.....	37
F.	Challenge #6: Claim 8 cannot be found obvious based on Hsue in view of Jinbo because Hsue does not disclose all limitations of claim 1 .....	37
G.	Challenge #7: Claim 9 cannot be found obvious based on Hsue in view of McColgin because Hsue does not disclose all limitations of claim 1 .....	38

..

H.	Challenge #8: Claims 10 and 11 cannot be found obvious based on Hsue in view of Matthews because Hsue does not disclose all limitations of claim 1 .....	38
I.	Challenge #9: Claims 13 and 14 cannot be found obvious based on Hsue in view of Cooper because Hsue does not disclose all limitations of claim 1 .....	38
VII.	CONCLUSION.....	39

...

## **TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

### **Federal Cases**

<i>Becton, Dickenson and Co. v. Tyco Healthcare Group, LP</i> , 616 F.3d 1249, 1254 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	12
<i>Breville Pty Ltd. v. Storebound LLC</i> , 2013 WL 3153383 (N.D. Cal. 2013) .....	37
<i>CAE Screenplates, Inc. v. Heinrich Fiedler GmbH &amp; Co.</i> , 224 F.3d 1308, 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	12
<i>Engel Indus., Inc. v. Lockformer Co.</i> , 96 F.3d 1398, 1404–05 (Fed. Cir. 1996) 96 F.3d 1398, 1404–05 (Fed. Cir. 1996) .....	12
<i>Gaus v. Conair Corp.</i> , 363 F.3d 1284, 1288 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	12
<i>In re Rambus, Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 42, 46 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	8
<i>In re Robertson</i> , 7169 F.3d 743, 745 (Fed. Cir. 1999).....	32
<i>Liebel–Flarsheim Co. v. Medrad, Inc.</i> , 358 F.3d 898, 910 (Fed.Cir. 2004).....	9
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	9, 18, 20, 26
<i>Subotincic v. 1274274 Ontario Inc.</i> , 2012 WL 3112005 (C.D. Cal. 2012).....	36

### **Decisions of the Patent Trial and Appeal Board**

<i>Innolux Corp. v. Semiconductor Energy Laboratory Co., LTD.</i> , IPR2013-00065, Decision at pg. 10 (Apr. 30, 2013).....	8
<i>Toyota Motor Corp. v. Leroy G. Hagenbuch</i> , IPR2013-00483, Order at pg. 2 (Apr. 16, 2014).....	9

# 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.