

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

LG ELECTRONICS, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

INNOVATIVE DISPLAY TECHNOLOGIES LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2015-00496
Patent 8,215,816 B2

Before THOMAS L. GIANNETTI, BEVERLY M. BUNTING, AND
MICHELLE N. WORMEESTER *Administrative Patent Judges*.

BUNTING, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION

Denying Institution of *Inter Partes* Review

37 C.F.R. § 42.108

Dismissal of Motion for Joinder

37 C.F.R. § 42.122

LG Electronics, Inc. (“Petitioner”) filed a petition (“Petition”) pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §§ 311–319 to institute an *inter partes* review of claims 1–4 (“the challenged claims”) of U.S. Patent No. 8,215,816 B2 (Ex. 1001, “the ’816 patent”). Paper 2 (“Pet.”). With the Petition, Petitioner filed a motion for joinder (Paper 3 (“Joinder Motion”)), seeking to join with *LG Display Co., Ltd. v. Innovative Display Technologies LLC*, Case IPR2014-01095 (PTAB) (“the 1095 IPR”).¹ Joinder Motion 1. Innovative Display Technologies LLC (“Patent Owner”) filed an opposition to the Joinder Motion (Paper 7) and a Preliminary Response (Paper 8).

Applying the standard set forth in 35 U.S.C. § 314(a), and for the reasons that follow, we deny this Petition and dismiss the Joinder Motion.

I. BACKGROUND

A. *Related Proceedings*

The parties state that Patent Owner has asserted infringement of the ’816 patent in *Delaware Display Group LLC v. LG Electronics Inc.*, No. 1:13-cv-02109 (D. Del., filed Dec. 31, 2013). Pet. 1; Paper 5, 2. Patent Owner identifies other proceedings in which it has alleged infringement of the ’816 patent. Paper 5, 2–6. In addition to the 1095 IPR, Patent Owner identifies another petition challenging the patentability of the ’816 patent, *Mercedes-Benz, LLC v. Innovative Display Technologies LLC*, IPR2015-00366 (PTAB) (terminated). *Id.* at 6. Further, Patent Owner cites additional

¹ At the time Petitioner filed its motion for joinder with the 1095 IPR, the Board had not yet decided whether to institute an *inter partes* review. We subsequently denied *inter partes* review of claims 1–4 on all asserted grounds. *See* 1095 IPR, Paper 9.

petitions challenging the patentability of patents related to the '816 patent.
Id. at 6–7.

B. References

Petitioner relies on the following references (Pet. 8–11), the Admitted Prior Art (“APA”) discussed in the '816 patent (*id.* at 8) and the Declaration of Dr. Michael J. Escuti (Ex. 1004):

References	Patents/Printed Publications	Date	Exhibit
Pristash	US 5,005,108	April 2, 1991	1006
Funamoto	US 5,619,351	April 8, 1997 ¹	1007
Gyoko	JP H6-273756	Sept. 30, 1994 ²	1008
Murase	US 5,178,447	Jan. 12, 1993	1011
Tsunoda	JP H6-051130	Feb. 25, 1994 ³	1012
Imai	US 5,253,089	Oct. 12, 1993	1015

C. Grounds Asserted

Petitioner challenges claims 1–4 of the '816 patent on the following grounds. Pet. 11.

¹ Petitioner relies on Funamoto’s 35 U.S.C. § 371 date of May 10, 1994. Pet. 9.

² Gyoko is a Japanese unexamined patent application, and Petitioner relies on the September 30, 1994 application publication date. *Id.* at 10.

³ Tsunoda is a Japanese unexamined patent application, and Petitioner relies on the February 25, 1994 publication date. *Id.*

References	Basis	Claims Challenged
Pristash, Tsunoda, or in the alternative Imai	§ 103(a)	1–4
Funamoto, Tsunoda, or in the alternative Imai	§ 103(a)	1–4
Gyoko, Tsunoda, or in the alternative Imai	§ 103(a)	1–4
Murase, Tsunoda, or in the alternative Imai	§ 103(a)	1–4

II. ANALYSIS

In the 1095 IPR, applying the standard set forth in 35 U.S.C. § 314(a), we denied the Petition and declined to institute an *inter partes* review of claims 1–4 of the ’816 patent based on any of the asserted grounds. 1095 IPR, Paper 9, 2. Now, in the instant Petition, Petitioner challenges these same claims, and Petitioner relies on the same arguments we found unavailing in the 1095 IPR. Pet. 11–50. Indeed, Petitioner acknowledges that “the invalidity grounds raised in this IPR are identical to the invalidity grounds raised in the LGD IPR.” Mot. 1.

In view of the identity of the challenges to the ’816 patent, and reliance on essentially the same arguments and evidence presented in both this Petition and the 1095 IPR, we deny institution of *inter partes* review in this proceeding of claims 1–4 for the same reasons we denied institution of *inter partes* review in the 1095 IPR. *See* 1095 IPR, Paper 9.

III. SUMMARY

For the foregoing reasons, we conclude Petitioner has not demonstrated a reasonable likelihood that at least one challenged claim is unpatentable based on the asserted grounds. We, therefore, do not institute

an *inter partes* review on any of the asserted grounds as to any of the challenged claims. Because the petition in IPR2014-01095 was denied and *inter partes* review was not instituted, Petitioner's Joinder Motion is dismissed as moot. *See* 35 U.S.C. § 315(c) (permitting joinder if Director institutes *inter partes* review).

IV. ORDER

In consideration of the foregoing, it is hereby:

ORDERED that the Petition is denied as to all challenged claims and no trial is instituted;

FURTHER ORDERED that the Motion for Joinder is dismissed.

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.