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

K.J. PRETECH CO., LTD., Petitioner

V.

### INNOVATIVE DISPLAY TECHNOLOGIES LLC, Patent Owner

Case IPR2015-01868
Patent 7,434,974 B1
October 3, 2016

### PETITIONER'S REPLY TO PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

Mail Stop: Patent Board
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450



### **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

|       |  |  | Page |
|-------|--|--|------|
| I.    | INTRODUCTION   |  |      |
| II.   | GROUND 1: CLAIMS 1, 5, 7, 8, 10, and 11 ARE ANTICIPATED BY KISOU             |  |      |
|       | A.   | Kisou discloses a pattern of light extracting deformities to cause light to be emitted from the light emitting surface in accordance with claim elements [1.d] and [7.d]                       | 2    |
|       | B.   | Kisou discloses the end and side reflectors to reflect light that would otherwise exit the panel member through an end edge and/OR side edge in accordance with claim elements [1.e] and [7.e] | 6    |
|       | C.   | Kisou discloses a tray or housing with posts, tabs or other structural features that provide a mount or structural support in accordance with [1.f]-[1.g] and [7.f]-[7.g]                      | 7    |
|       | D.   | Kisou discloses a film positioned near the light emitting surface of the panel in accordance with dependent claims 5, 10, 11   | 10   |
| III.  | GROUND 2: CLAIMS 5, 10, and 11 ARE OBVIOUS OVER KISOU                        |  | 11   |
|       | A.   | Kisou renders obvious positioning a film near the light emitting surface of the panel in accordance with dependent claims 5, 10, 11  | 11   |
| IV.   | GROUND 3: CLAIMS 3 AND 4 ARE OBVIOUS OVER KISOU AND YAGI                     |  | 12   |
|       | A.   | Yagi renders obvious positioning a film near the light emitting surface of the panel in accordance with dependent claims 3 and 4   | 12   |
| V.    | GROUND 4: CLAIMS 1, 3–5, 7, 8, 10, and 11ARE OBVIOUS OVER FURUYA AND NIIZUMA |  |      |
|       | A.   | The proposed combination is explicitly disclosed by Niizuma  | 14   |
|       | B.   | The light conductor and the reflector of Furuya are combinable   | 18   |
| VI.   |  | WERNER'S TESTIMONY IS ENTITLED TO LITTLE OR NO WEIGHT ER 37 CFR § 42.65(A)   | 20   |
| VII.  | PETITIONER IS NOT TIME BARRED UNDER 35 U.S.C                                 |  |      |
| VIII. | CONO   | CLUSION  | 23   |



### **TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

|  | Page(s)   |
|--|-----------|
| Cases  |           |
| GEA Process Eng'g, Inc. v. Steuben Foods, Inc.,<br>IPR2014-00041 | 22        |
| Statutes   |           |
| 35 U.S.C. § 315(b)   | 1, 21, 23 |
| Other Authorities  |           |
| 37 C.F.R § 42.12   | 14        |
| 37 CFR § 42.65(A)  | 20        |
| U.S. Patent No. 7.434.974 B2                                     | passim    |



### I. INTRODUCTION

In its March 17, 2016 Institution Decision on U.S. Patent No. 7,434,974 B2 (the "'974 Patent"), the Board found that Petitioner K.J. Pretech Co., Ltd. demonstrated a reasonable likelihood of prevailing on all four Grounds based on all challenged claims and that the Petition is not time-barred under 35 U.S.C. § 315(b). *See* Institution Decision ("Dec."), Paper 15, at 10, 13, 17, 23, 24-25. Patent Owner filed a response on July 1, 2016 ("Resp."). The Response is just a rehash of arguments that the Board addressed while making the above-referenced findings in the Institution Decision. Nothing in the Response should disturb these findings. Thus, for the reasons set forth in the Petition ("Pet.") and further explained below, the challenged claims of the '974 Patent are unpatentable.

### II. GROUND 1: CLAIMS 1, 5, 7, 8, 10, and 11 ARE ANTICIPATED BY KISOU

Patent Owner argues that Kisou does not anticipate claims 1, 5, 7, 8, 10, and 11 because Kisou does not disclose claim elements [1.d]/[7.d], [1.e]/[7.e], [1.f]-[1.g]/[7.f]-[7.g], and a separate film as required by dependent claims 5, 10, and 11. *See* Resp. at 2. As explained below, however, these arguments are based on improper characterizations or misunderstanding of Kisou.



### A. Kisou discloses a pattern of light extracting deformities to cause light to be emitted from the light emitting surface in accordance with claim elements [1.d] and [7.d]

Patent Owner's arguments regarding Kisou's disclosure of claim elements [1.d] and [7.d] ignore the Board's construction of the term "deformities" and rest on the false premise that "**the light paths 31 are** only the spaces between the light conductor 30 and the reflector 40, **not the surface of the light conductor 30**." Resp. at 5 (emphasis added).

In its Institution Decision, the Board agreed that "deformities" should be construed to mean "any change in the shape or geometry of a surface and/or coating or surface treatment that causes a portion of light to be emitted." Dec. at 5 (citing Pet. at 7 (citing '974 patent, Ex. 1001, 4:36–40)). Patent Owner has not disputed this. Indeed, the paragraphs of Kisou cited by Patent Owner explicitly disclose how Kisou's recessed light paths 31 meet this construction.

First, as demonstrated by the paragraphs in Kisou cited by Patent Owner, the recessed light paths 31 are changes in shape of the surface of light conductor 30. Kisou places "the light paths 31 on the rear side of conductor 30." Kisou at [0027]; Resp. at 5 (emphasis added); Ex. 1026, 53:9-12; 58:9-12. Kisou discloses that the "recessed light paths 31 [] are formed on a rear surface of the light conductor 30." Kisou at [0026] (emphasis added); *see* Pet. at 20. Moreover, Kisou emphasizes that "the recessed light paths 31 impart the light conductor 30 with a



# DOCKET

## 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.

