

Case IPR2015-00575

Pat. 6,886,956

Filed on behalf of Innovative Display Technologies LLC

By: David E. Warden (dwarden@azalaw.com)

AHMAD, ZAVITSANOS, ANAIPAKOS, ALAVI & MENSING P.C.

1221 McKinney, Suite 3460

Houston, TX 77010

Tel: (713) 655-1101

Facsimile: (713) 655-0062

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

KOITO MANUFACTURING CO. LTD. and STANLEY ELECTRIC CO. LTD.  
Petitioners,

v.

INNOVATIVE DISPLAY TECHNOLOGIES LLC,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2015-00575  
Patent 6,886,956

---

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

Mail Stop PATENT BOARD  
Patent Trial and Appeal Board  
U.S. Patent & Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION .....	1
II.	THE PETITION FAILS TO IDENTIFY A REAL PARTY-IN-INTEREST ..	2
III.	THE PETITION FAILS TO MAKE A <i>PRIMA FACIE</i> CASE OF INVALIDITY .....	5
A.	Overview of the '956 Patent.....	5
B.	Overview of the Petition.....	6
C.	Claim Construction.....	8
D.	Brief Overview of Petitioners' References .....	10
1.	JP '602 .....	10
2.	Pristash .....	11
3.	JP '004.....	11
IV.	GROUND 2: JP '602 IN VIEW OF PRISTASH.....	12
A.	Claim 4 .....	12
B.	Claim 16 .....	14
C.	Claim 21 .....	17
V.	GROUND 3: JP '004 IN VIEW OF JP '602.....	19
A.	Claim 1 .....	19
B.	Claims 5, 6, 9, 16, 21 and 31 .....	21
VI.	CONCLUSION .....	21

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>Askeladden LLC v. McGhie et al.</i> , Case IPR2015-00122 (PTAB Feb. 17, 2015) .....	2
<i>Atlanta Gas Light Co. v. Bennett Regulator Guards Inc.</i> , Case IPR2013-00453 (PTAB Jan. 6, 2015) .....	2
<i>Innovative Display Technologies LLC v. Hyundai Motor Co. et al.</i> , No. 2:14-cv-201 (E.D. Tex.) .....	9
<i>Zoll Lifecor Corp. v. Phillips Elec. N. America Corp.</i> , Case IPR2013-00609, Paper 15 at p.11 (PTAB -----) .....	4

### Other Authorities

Office Trial Practice Guide .....	2
-----------------------------------	---

### Regulations

77 Fed. Reg. 48756 .....	2
77 Fed. Reg. 48759 .....	2

**PATENT OWNER'S EXHIBITS**

<b>Exhibit No.</b>	<b>Description</b>
2001	Nissan Motor Co., Ltd and Nissan North America, Inc.'s Third Party Complaint, <i>Innovative Display Technologies LLC v. Hyundai Motor Co. et al.</i> , No. 2:14-cv-201 (E.D. Tex.)
2002	Stanley Electric U.S. Co. Inc.'s Corporate Disclosure Statement, <i>Innovative Display Technologies LLC v. Hyundai Motor Co. et al.</i> , No. 2:14-cv-201 (E.D. Tex.)
2003	Stanley Electric Sales of America Inc.'s Corporate Disclosure Statement, <i>Innovative Display Technologies LLC v. Hyundai Motor Co. et al.</i> , No. 2:14-cv-201 (E.D. Tex.)
2004	Stanley Electric Co. Ltd.'s Corporate Disclosure Statement, <i>Innovative Display Technologies LLC v. Hyundai Motor Co. et al.</i> , No. 2:14-cv-201 (E.D. Tex.)
2005	Claim Construction Order, <i>Innovative Display Technologies LLC v. Hyundai Motor Co. et al.</i> , No. 2:14-cv-201 (E.D. Tex.) (Dkt. 244)
2006	Certified Translation of French Patent No. 1,474.,359 – Erwin Hitzelberger

## I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 313 and 37 C.F.R. § 42.107, Patent Owner Innovative Display Technologies LLC (“Patent Owner” or “IDT”) hereby files this preliminary response to the petition for Inter Partes Review of U.S. Patent No. 6,886,956 (“the Petition”) in IPR2015-00575 filed by Koito Manufacturing Co. Ltd. and Stanley Electric Co. Ltd. (“Petitioners”).

The PTAB should deny the Petition’s request to institute an *inter partes* review (“IPR”) of U.S. Patent No. 6,886,956 (“the ’956 patent”) because it fails to identify all real parties-in-interest. In addition, while Patent Owner believes that the Petition does not demonstrate a reasonable likelihood of the challenged claims being invalid, Patent Owner raises specific arguments with respect to at least with respect to Claims 4, 16 and 21 of the patent to address issues that may not be readily apparent from the Petition itself.

This Response is timely under 35 U.S.C. § 313 and 37 C.F.R. § 42.107, as it is filed within three months of the February 6, 2015 date of the Notice of Filing Date Accorded to Petition and Time for Filing Patent Owner Preliminary Response (Paper No. 5). In this Preliminary Response, Patent Owner has limited its identification of the deficiencies in Petitioners’ arguments. Patent Owner does not intend to waive any arguments by not addressing them in this Preliminary

# 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.