

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

VIZIO, Inc.,
Petitioner

v.

INNOVATIVE DISPLAY TECHNOLOGIES LLC,
Patent Owner

Case: IPR2016-_____

Patent 7,434,974

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW
OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,434,974**

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. MANDATORY NOTICES | 1 |
| A. Real Parties-In-Interest..... | 1 |
| B. Related Matters..... | 1 |
| C. Lead and Back-up Counsel | 3 |
| II. PAYMENT OF FEES | 3 |
| III. STANDING..... | 3 |
| IV. REQUEST FOR <i>INTER PARTES</i> REVIEW OF CLAIMS 1, 3-5, 7-8, AND 10-11 OF THE '974 PATENT | 4 |
| A. Technology Background | 4 |
| B. The Alleged Invention Of The '974 Patent | 6 |
| V. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION | 7 |
| A. Standards For Claim Construction | 7 |
| B. “deformities” (claims 1 and 7) | 8 |
| VI. SUMMARY OF PRIOR ART TO THE '974 PATENT FORMING THE BASIS FOR THIS PETITION..... | 8 |
| A. JP H7-64078A (“Kisou”) (Ex. 1006) | 9 |
| B. JP H5-45651 (“Niizuma”) (Ex. 1007) | 9 |
| C. U.S. Patent No. 4,017,155 (“Yagi”) (Ex. 1008) | 9 |
| D. JP 6-214230 (“Furuya”) (Ex. 1009) | 10 |
| VII. GROUNDS FOR UNPATENTABILITY OF EACH CLAIM..... | 10 |
| A. Ground 1: Claims 1, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11 Are Unpatentable Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) As Being Anticipated By Kisou | 10 |
| 1. Kisou anticipates claim 1..... | 11 |
| 2. Kisou anticipates claim 7..... | 17 |
| 3. Kisou anticipates claim 8..... | 18 |
| 4. Kisou anticipates claims 5, 10, and 11 | 18 |

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont'd.)

| | Page |
|---|-------------|
| B. Ground 2: Claims 5, 10 and 11 Are Unpatentable Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) As Being Obvious Over Kisou | 26 |
| C. Ground 3: Claims 3-4 Are Unpatentable Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) As Being Obvious Over Kisou In View of Yagi | 27 |
| 1. Claim 3 is obvious over Kisou in view of Yagi | 27 |
| 2. Claim 4 is obvious over Kisou in view of Yagi | 29 |
| D. Ground 4: Claims 1, 3-5, 7-8, and 10-11 Are Unpatentable Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) As Obvious Over Furuya In View Of Niizuma | 31 |
| 1. Furuya in view of Niizuma renders obvious independent claim 1 | 32 |
| 2. Motivation to combine Furuya and Niizuma | 38 |
| 3. Furuya in view of Niizuma renders obvious dependent claim 3 | 42 |
| 4. Furuya in view of Niizuma renders obvious dependent claim 4 | 43 |
| 5. Furuya in view of Niizuma renders obvious dependent claim 5 | 43 |
| 6. Furuya in view of Niizuma renders obvious independent claim 7 | 44 |
| 7. Furuya in view of Niizuma renders obvious dependent claim 8 | 44 |
| 8. Furuya in view of Niizuma renders obvious dependent claims 10 and 11 | 45 |
| VIII. CONCLUSION | 55 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

| | Page(s) |
|--|----------------|
| Cases | |
| <i>Arris Group, Inc. v. C-Cation Techs., LLC</i> , IPR2014-00747, Paper 22 (P.T.A.B. Nov. 24, 2014) | 7 |
| <i>K.J. Pretech Co., Ltd. v. Innovative Display Techs., Ltd.</i> , IPR2015-01868, Paper 2 (Sept. 11, 2015)..... | 1 |
| <i>In re Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC</i> , 778 F.3d 1271 (Fed. Cir. 2015) | 7 |
| <i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) | 7 |
| Statutes | |
| 35 U.S.C. § 102..... | 1 |
| 35 U.S.C. § 103..... | 1, 26, 27, 31 |
| 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) | 9, 10 |
| 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)..... | 9 |
| 35 U.S.C. § 112..... | 8 |
| 35 U.S.C. § 301(a)(2)..... | 7 |
| 35 U.S.C. § 311..... | 1 |
| 35 U.S.C. § 315(b)..... | 4 |
| Regulations | |
| 37 C.F.R. § 42.8 | 1 |
| 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(b) | 3 |
| 37 C.F.R. § 42.103 | 3 |
| 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a)..... | 4 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
(continued)

| | Page(s) |
|-----------------------------|----------------|
| 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b) | 4 |
| 37 C.F.R. § 42.122(b) | 4 |

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.