

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

K.J. PRETECH CO., LTD.,)
Petitioner,) Case IPR2015-01866
) (U.S. 8,215,816)
vs.) Case IPR2015-01867
) (U.S. 7,537,370)
INNOVATIVE DISPLAY) Case IPR2015-01868
TECHNOLOGIES LLC,) (U.S. 7,434,974)
Patent Owner.)

The deposition of THOMAS CREDELLE,
called as a witness for examination, taken
before ANDREA L. KIM, a Certified Shorthand
Reporter of said state, CSR No. 84-3722, at, 71
South Wacker Drive, Chicago, Illinois, on the
2nd day of June, A.D. 2016, at 9:03 a.m.

Page 2

1 PRESENT:
2
3 MAYER BROWN LLP
4 (71 South Wacker Drive,
5 Chicago, Illinois 60606-4637,
6 312-701-8641), by:
7 MR. ROBERT G. PLUTA
8 rpluta@mayerbrown
9 MS. AMANDA K. STREFF
10 astreff@mayerbrown.com
11 appeared on behalf of the Petitioner;
12
13 BRAGALONE CONROY, P.C.
14 (Chase Tower,
15 2200 Ross Avenue, Suite 4500 W,
16 Dallas, Texas 75201-7924
17 214.785.6670), by:
18 MR. JUSTIN B. KIMBLE
19 jkimble@bcpc-law.com
20 appeared on behalf the Patent Owner;
21
22
23
24 REPORTED BY: ANDREA L. KIM,
25 Illinois CSR No. 84-3722.

Page 3

1 INDEX
2
3 WITNESS: PAGE:
4 THOMAS CREDELLE
5 EXAM by MR. KIMBLE..... 4
6 EXAM by MR. PLUTA..... 203
7
8 *****
9 INDEX
10 EXHIBIT NUMBER MARKED
11 Exhibit No. 1 Declaration of Thomas L.
12 Credelle Case No. IPR2015-01115..... 44
13 Exhibit No. 2 Declaration of Thomas L.
14 Credelle Case No. IPR2015-01114.....201
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Page 4

1 (WHEREUPON, the witness was duly
2 sworn.)
3 THOMAS CREDELLE,
4 called as a witness herein, having been first
5 duly sworn, was examined and testified as
6 follows:
7 EXAMINATION
8 BY MR. KIMBLE:
9 Q. Do you please state your name.
10 A. Thomas Credelle.
11 Q. And where do you reside?
12 A. Brentwood, California.
13 Q. And have you been deposed
14 before?
15 A. Yes.
16 Q. How many times?
17 A. Twice.
18 Q. Can you tell me generally the
19 circumstances of those depositions?
20 A. One was as a technical
21 witness, and the second was as an IPR.
22 Q. So let's take the first one,
23 the technical witness.
24 Were you an expert in that
25 matter?

Page 5

1 A. I was an inventor in a case, a
2 dispute between my previous company and another
3 company, and so I was deposed as to the details
4 of that invention.
5 Q. Can you recall about what year
6 that took place?
7 A. I probably should know. It's
8 probably in my CV. It's so long ago.
9 Q. Why don't I hand you a copy of
10 your declaration and see if that will help.
11 This has been premarked K.J. Pretech 1004 in
12 IPR 2015-01868 regarding the '974 patent.
13 (WHEREUPON, the document was
14 tendered to the witness.)
15 BY THE WITNESS:
16 A. Let's see if I put that in
17 here. 2008.
18 BY MR. KIMBLE:
19 Q. Can you point me to where you
20 find that in your CV?
21 A. The first line it says case
22 Alien versus Avery, case number 08 --
23 Q. What page is that?
24 A. I am sorry. Page 5 of the CV.
25 I guess it's numbered differently, the

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 6</p> <p>1 appendix. 2 Q. So it's the -- it was the 3 Alien versus Avery case? 4 A. That's right. It didn't have 5 anything to do with intellectual ventures, but 6 that was the deposition. 7 Q. And you were an inventor in 8 that case? 9 A. Yes. 10 Q. Not an expert, not a retained 11 expert? 12 A. Not a retained expert. 13 Q. And generally what was the 14 technology at issue there? 15 A. RFID tag packaging. 16 Q. Can you tell me basically what 17 that means? 18 A. Radio frequency ID tag is a 19 device that was being developed by Alien 20 Technology to replace bar codes. It's widely 21 used in many products these days. The patent 22 at dispute was a packaging method of how to 23 package the antenna and the integrated circuit 24 together. 25 Q. And you said you were deposed</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 8</p> <p>1 A. I don't recall if it was 2 anticipatory or obviousness at this point. 3 Q. What did you do to prepare to 4 be deposed today? 5 A. I reread my declarations and 6 the prior art patents and the patents at issue. 7 Q. And when did you reread those 8 documents? 9 A. Over the past two weeks. 10 Q. And do you know approximately 11 how much time you spent rereading those 12 documents? 13 A. Probably a few hours, five to 14 ten hours perhaps, and then I had a meeting 15 with attorneys here to prepare for the 16 deposition. 17 Q. When did you have that 18 meeting? 19 A. Yesterday and the day before. 20 Q. Approximately how long did you 21 spend preparing for the deposition with the 22 attorneys here? 23 A. About 12 to 13 hours. 24 Q. What attorneys were present 25 during those --</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 7</p> <p>1 in another instance in IPR; is that right? 2 A. Yes, that was probably not on 3 here. It was just two months ago. It was 4 Surpass versus Sony. 5 Q. And who did you work for in 6 that case? 7 A. Kenyon & Kenyon. 8 Q. Were they representing the 9 petitioner or the patent owner? 10 A. Representing Sony, the 11 petitioner. 12 Q. And what technology was at 13 issue in that case? 14 A. LCD, LCD driving circuits. 15 Q. And did you author a 16 declaration in that case? 17 A. Yes, I did. 18 Q. In general did you render 19 opinions that the patent at issue was not 20 patentable in that matter in which you were 21 deposed? 22 A. Yes, I did. 23 Q. And do you remember if you 24 opined that the patent was anticipated by any 25 prior art?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 9</p> <p>1 A. Saqib Siddiqu and I met 2 briefly with Rob. That was only a few minutes 3 last night. 4 Q. Did you speak with anybody 5 else other than attorneys with Mayer Brown to 6 prepare for the deposition? 7 A. No. 8 Q. If you would pull back out 9 your report, and let's focus on the CV. 10 A. Okay. 11 Q. Talk to you about some of the 12 things. Let's turn to page 4, and the entry 13 your job with RCA Sarnoff Labs. It says you 14 were a key contributor to novel methods of 15 large screen flat panel TFT, right? 16 A. Correct. 17 Q. And that's thin film 18 transistor? 19 A. Yes. 20 Q. Can you tell me generally what 21 types of products you worked on at RCA? 22 A. I wouldn't call them products 23 but concepts. 24 Q. Okay. What kind of concepts? 25 A. We worked on a variety of flat</p>

Page 10	<p>1 panel technologies that could be used by RCA in 2 the future to build a hang on the wall 3 television. We looked at flat CRTs, cathode 4 ray tubes, that were thin but used a lot of the 5 technology that RCA had at hand, and we looked 6 at thin film transistor driven active matrix 7 LCDs. 8 We did examine plasma briefly 9 but rejected that concept. So my own 10 involvement with flat panel displays at RCA was 11 to be an inventor and developer of various 12 techniques in the flat CRT area as well as in 13 the thin film transistor area. 14 Q. With respect to the flat CRTs, 15 were you ever involved in building prototypes? 16 A. Yes, small prototypes. 17 Q. Approximately what size? 18 A. Five by ten inches. 19 Q. Were those edge-lit CRTs or 20 direct backlit CRTs? 21 MR. PLUTA: Object to form. 22 BY THE WITNESS: 23 A. These devices were neither. 24 They were a beam guided technique where 25 electrons would be injected from the edge of a</p>	Page 12
Page 11	<p>1 tube and be transmitted to the screen. So it 2 could be considered an edge-lit CRT as opposed 3 to an electron source behind the phosphorus 4 screen. 5 BY MR. KIMBLE: 6 Q. You talked about TFT active 7 matrix LCDs. 8 What does active matrix mean? 9 A. To me an active matrix is an 10 array of transistors that drive the pixels. 11 Q. Were you involved in building 12 any prototypes of those display products? 13 A. My research and my team's 14 research was involved in developing the CRT 15 technology, and we did build small on the order 16 by two inch by two inch sized prototypes. 17 Q. Were you -- did those products 18 use backlighting units? 19 A. There was no effort on 20 backlighting. We just used light sources 21 because these were R&D prototypes. 22 Q. What type of light sources did 23 you use? 24 A. I don't recall. Whatever was 25 available.</p>	Page 13
	<p>1 Q. Do you recall if you used 2 LEDs? 3 A. We did not use LEDs. 4 Q. During your time with RCA, 5 were you ever involved in developing 6 backlighting units? 7 A. No. 8 Q. Okay. Let's talk then about 9 your experience after that with GE -- well, 10 take a step back. 11 It says in your CV that you 12 were with RCA from 1970 to 1986; is that 13 correct? 14 A. That's correct. 15 Q. From there you did go to GE; 16 is that right? 17 A. That's right. 18 Q. And you were there from 19 approximately 1986 to 1991? 20 A. Yes. 21 Q. So there you were a manager of 22 TFT LCD R&D; is that right? 23 A. Correct. 24 Q. During your time with GE, did 25 GE build TFT LCD products?</p>	

Page 14

1 efforts were aimed at that as an initial
 2 product, but in the future other applications
 3 such as monitors and TVs was in our scope.
 4 Q. During your time with GE, were
 5 you involved in building prototypes of these
 6 display products?
 7 A. Prototypes for avionics, yes.
 8 Q. Do you recall approximately
 9 the size of those prototypes?
 10 A. 5.25 inches by 5.25 inches.
 11 Q. Was there conceptual work done
 12 on larger display products?
 13 A. Not really.
 14 Q. You said that monitors and TVs
 15 were -- I don't want to put words in your
 16 mouth.
 17 A. A future product.
 18 Q. Was there thought given to the
 19 size of those products or what they would be?
 20 A. Not specifically.
 21 Q. Did the avionic prototypes
 22 utilize backlighting units?
 23 A. Yes.
 24 Q. What type of backlighting
 25 units?

Page 15

1 A. Either CCFL or hot cathode
 2 fluorescent.
 3 Q. So CCFL utilizes one or more
 4 bulbs, right?
 5 A. Correct.
 6 Q. Were these either direct
 7 back-lit or edged lit?
 8 A. They would be considered a
 9 direct backlight.
 10 Q. Do they use multiple bulbs?
 11 A. Yes.
 12 Q. For the hot cathode
 13 fluorescent products, were those direct
 14 back-lit?
 15 A. Yes.
 16 Q. And did they use multiple
 17 bulbs?
 18 A. Yes.
 19 Q. During your time with GE, did
 20 you do any work with LEDs as a light source?
 21 A. No.
 22 Q. Was there any conceptual work
 23 done or thought given to using LEDs?
 24 A. The technology didn't really
 25 exist to be practical for this application. So

Page 16

1 no consideration was given to LEDs.
 2 Q. Why do you say the technology
 3 didn't exist?
 4 A. The avionic display has to be
 5 a very bright display to be visible in sunlight
 6 to a pilot in an open canopy. So the amount of
 7 lumens or light output that is required by a
 8 backlight could not be achieved by any known
 9 LEDs at the time.
 10 Q. What level of brightness in
 11 terms of lumens would have been required?
 12 MR. PLUTA: Object to form.
 13 BY THE WITNESS:
 14 A. Let me put it in terms of the
 15 output brightness. The output brightness of
 16 the screen would need to be on the order of
 17 1,000 candelas per square meter.
 18 BY MR. KIMBLE:
 19 Q. Okay. Now, I want to move to
 20 the position you held after that which is -- as
 21 I understand from your CV, was with Apple
 22 Computer; is that right?
 23 A. That's correct.
 24 Q. That was from approximately
 25 1991 to 1994?

Page 17

1 A. Yes.
 2 Q. And you were responsible for
 3 LCD engineering for the first Powerbook; is
 4 that right?
 5 A. That's correct.
 6 Q. Did Apple sell that Powerbook
 7 during your time with Apple?
 8 A. Yes.
 9 Q. And did that Powerbook utilize
 10 a backlighting unit?
 11 A. Yes.
 12 Q. Okay. Was it just one type of
 13 backlighting unit or multiple types?
 14 MR. PLUTA: Object to form.
 15 BY THE WITNESS:
 16 A. The products during the time I
 17 was at Apple used a CCFL backlight.
 18 BY MR. KIMBLE:
 19 Q. Were they direct back-lit or
 20 edge-lit?
 21 A. Edge-lit.
 22 Q. Did those edge-lit CCFL
 23 backlighting units utilize light guides?
 24 A. Yes.
 25 Q. And did they utilize one or

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.