

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SONY CORPORATION, SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.,
SAMSUNG DISPLAY CO., LTD.

Petitioners,

v.

SURPASS TECH INNOVATION LLC

Patent Owner.

Case IPR2015-00863
Patent No. 7,202,843 B2

PETITIONERS' REPLY TO PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

Table of Contents

I. Introduction.....	1
II. Claim 4 is Obvious over Suzuki in view of Nitta.....	3
A. Patent Owner Has Not Rebutted the Evidence of Motivation to Combine Suzuki and Nitta	3
B. Suzuki’s Disclosure Is, At Minimum, Consistent with an AMLCD	8
1. “Source” and “Gate” Drivers	8
2. “Moving Images”	10
3. “Hold Drive”	11
4. Overdriving	13
III. Claim 5 is Obvious over Suzuki in view of Nitta.....	13
IV. Claim 7 is Obvious over Suzuki in view of Nitta.....	15
V. Claim 9 is Obvious over Suzuki in view of Nitta.....	17
VI. Claims 6 and 8 are Obvious over Suzuki in view of Nitta	18
VII. Claim 4 Does Not Require Overdriven Data Impulses.....	18
VIII. The IPR Review Process Is Not Unconstitutional.....	21
IX. Conclusion.....	22

Exhibit List (Updated)

Ex. Sony-1001	U.S. Patent No. 7,202,843
Ex. Sony-1002	Publicly Available File History of U.S. Patent No. 7,202,843
Ex. Sony-1003	U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0156092 (August 21, 2003)
Ex. Sony-1004	Japanese Laid Open Patent Application No. 2002-132224 (May 9, 2002)
Ex. Sony-1005	Certified Translation of Japanese Laid Open Patent Application No. 2002-132224
Ex. Sony-1006	U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0044115 (April 18, 2002)
Ex. Sony-1007	U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0048247 (March 13, 2003)
Ex. Sony-1008	U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0196229 (October 7, 2004)
Ex. Sony-1009	Ernst Lueder, LIQUID CRYSTAL DISPLAYS (2001)
Ex. Sony-1010	William C. O'Mara, LIQUID CRYSTAL FLAT PANEL DISPLAYS (1993)
Ex. Sony-1011	IEEE 100: THE AUTHORITATIVE DICTIONARY OF IEEE STANDARDS TERMS (7th ed., 2000)
Ex. Sony-1012	MCGRAW-HILL DICTIONARY OF SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL TERMS (6th ed., 2003)
Ex. Sony-1013	MICROSOFT COMPUTER DICTIONARY (5th ed., 2002)
Ex. Sony-1014	Declaration of Thomas Credelle
Ex. Sony-1015	<i>Curriculum Vitae</i> of Thomas Credelle
Ex. Sony-1016	Supplemental Declaration of Thomas Credelle (served, not filed)
Ex. Sony-1017	Certification of Translation (for Japanese Laid Open Patent Application No. 2002-132224) (served, not filed)
Ex. Sony-1018	Transcript of September 29, 2015 Telephonic Hearing (<i>see</i> PTAB Order, Paper No. 16)
Ex. Sony-1019	Transcript of January 27, 2016 Deposition of William K. Bohannon
Ex. Sony-1020	Supplemental Declaration of Thomas L. Credelle

I. Introduction

Petitioners respectfully submit this Reply to Patent Owner's Response. To frame the issues, we begin by reviewing what is and what is not in dispute.

In the Petition, Petitioners showed that the subject matters of claims 4-9 of the '843 patent would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art as of 2003 over Suzuki in view of Nitta. Petition at 8-30. In particular, Petitioners showed that Suzuki discloses all steps of the "method for driving a liquid crystal display (LCD) panel" recited in claims 4-9 of the '843 patent, but does not expressly disclose all details of the LCD panel recited in the preamble of claim 4. *Id.* at 9-21. Petitioners further showed that Nitta discloses an active matrix LCD ("AMLCD") panel, and therefore, discloses the recited LCD panel details. *Id.* Petitioners then showed that a person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the driving method of Suzuki with the AMLCD panel of Nitta. *Id.* at 9-15.

In the Decision on Institution ("DI"), the Board agreed with Petitioners that, on the record before the Board, Suzuki discloses all of the claimed method steps. DI 9-12. In response to the argument in Patent Owner's Preliminary Response that the claimed method requires the application of two or more overdriven data impulses, the Board found that, assuming Patent Owner's narrow construction, "Petitioner has accounted for this limitation in the prior art." DI 5. In its

Response, Patent Owner does not rebut Petitioners' showing, and the Board's preliminary conclusion, that Suzuki discloses all method steps recited in claims 4, 6 and 8, and specifically does not contest the Board's finding that Suzuki discloses the application of two or more overdriven data impulses. Therefore, there is no dispute on those points.

Patent Owner does challenge the sufficiency of Petitioners' showing that Suzuki discloses the limitations of claims 5 and 9, but does not provide evidence, through expert testimony or otherwise, that those limitations are in fact absent from Suzuki. Patent Owner's insufficiency argument ignores Suzuki's explicit disclosures, and should be rejected. Patent Owner also argues that Suzuki fails to disclose the limitation of claim 7, but that argument is based on narrow construction of claim 7 that is belied by the words of the claim, and, likewise, should be rejected.

In the DI, the Board also agreed with Petitioners that, on the record before the Board, Nitta discloses the details of the LCD panel recited in the preamble of claim 4. DI at 5. Patent Owner does not contest the Board's finding regarding Nitta. Therefore, there is no dispute on that point.

Aside from Patent Owner's meritless arguments about dependent claims 5, 7 and 9, the only material dispute before the Board is whether a person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine Suzuki's driving method

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.