

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 7,202,843

**PATENT OWNER SURPASS TECH INNOVATION LLC'S
PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction.....	1
a. The Serial Nature of This Petition is an Abuse of the Administrative Process 1	
b. The Petition Recycles Arguments and Art Already Considered and Rejected by the Board.....	13
II. Background.....	19
a. About U.S. Patent No. 7,202,843 (the “‘843 patent” or “Shen”).....	19
b. Independent Claim 4.....	23
c. Petitioner’s Grounds of Challenge	24
III. Claim Construction.....	26
a. A Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	27
b. Properly Construed, Claim 4 Requires Overdriving	27
IV. Argument.....	34
a. The Combination of Suzuki and Nitta is Insufficiently Supported.....	34
b. The Grounds of Challenge Based on Jinda Also Remain Deficient	39
c. The Grounds of Challenge Based on Ham Fail to Consider the Proper Construction of Claim 4.....	41
V. Conclusion	43

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Cat Tech LLC v. TubeMaster, Inc.</i> , 528 F.3d 871 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	33
<i>Conopco, Inc. dba Unilever v. The Proctor & Gamble Co.</i> , IPR2014-00628, paper 23 (PTAB 3/20/2015)	8, 10, 11
<i>Heart Failure Technologies, LLC v. Cardiokinetix, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00183, paper 12 (PTAB 7/31/2013)	14, 15
<i>In re Paulsen</i> , 30 F.3d 1475 (Fed. Cir. 1994)	27
<i>In re Translogic Tech., Inc.</i> , 504 F.3d 1249 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	26
<i>Jiawei Technology (HK) Ltd., et al. v. Richmond</i> , IPR2015-00580, paper 22 (PTAB 5/2/2015)	10, 11
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007)	14
<i>Lake Cable, LLC v. Windy City Wire Cable & Tech. Prods., LLC</i> , IPR2013-00528, paper 11 (PTAB 2/19/2014)	15
<i>Unilever, Inc. dba Unilever v. The Proctor & Gamble Co.</i> , IPR2014-00506, paper 17 (PTAB 7/7/2014)	12
<i>ZTE Corp. v. ContentGuard Holdings, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00454, paper 12 (PTAB 9/25/2013)	11

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 314(a)	12, 34, 43
35 U.S.C. § 325(d)	passim

Rules

37 C.F.R. § 42.1(b)	9
37 C.F.R. § 42.22(a)(2)	37, 41
37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b)	26
37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)	41
37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(4)	37
Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48756 (Aug. 14, 2012)	26

...

LIST OF PATENT OWNER'S EXHIBITS

<u>Exhibit</u>	<u>Description</u>
2001	“Petitioner and His Money are Soon Parted: Separate Fee Payments Do Not Reduce Risk of Non-Institution of Redundant Grounds”; Authored by M. Carniaux and M. Sander; interpartesreviewblog.com, dated November 13, 2014 (accessed June 1, 2015)
2002	Joint Stipulation to Stay Cases Pending <i>Inter Partes</i> Review, filed November 20, 2014
2003	Order Granting Joint Stipulation to Stay Cases Pending <i>Inter Partes</i> Review, entered November 21, 2014

I. Introduction

a. The Serial Nature of This Petition is an Abuse of the Administrative Process

Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd., Samsung Display Co., Ltd. (collectively, “Samsung”), and Sony Corporation (“Sony”) (Sony and Samsung are collectively referred to as the “Petitioners”) filed the current Petition¹ for *inter partes* review of claims 4-9 of U.S. Patent No. 7,202,843 (“the ‘843 patent”) on March 16, 2015. But this filing represents only the most recent of many similar requests for Board resources filed by a common group of accused infringers in litigation with Patent Owner Surpass Tech Innovation LLC (“Surpass”).

More than five months previously, on October 3, 2014, three Sharp entities filed two petitions for IPR against Surpass: IPR2015-00021 challenging claims 1, 4, 8, and 9 of the ‘843 patent; and IPR2015-00022 challenging claims 1-5 of U.S. Patent No. 7,420,550 patent (the ‘550 patent) (hereinafter these petitions will be collectively referred to as the “First Round Petitions”).²

¹ Hereinafter, the Corrected Petition (paper 4) will be referred to as “Pet.”

² Because Patent Owner Surpass has already introduced the ‘843 patent and its claims in its preliminary response in IPR2015-00021, this Preliminary Response

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.