

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

LG ELECTRONICS, INC., and  
LG ELECTRONICS U.S.A., INC.  
Petitioners

v.

TOSHIBA SAMSUNG STORAGE TECHNOLOGY KOREA CORPORATION  
Patent Owner

---

Patent No. RE43,106

---

**PETITION**  
**to Institute an *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. RE43,106**  
***under 37 C.F.R. § 42.100 et seq.***

Mail Stop PATENT BOARD  
Patent Trial and Appeal Board  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
PO Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
*Submitted Electronically via the Patent Review Processing System*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	ii
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	iv
EXHIBIT LIST .....	vii
I. STATEMENT OF THE PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED .....	1
II. GROUNDS FOR STANDING.....	1
III. MANDATORY NOTICES .....	2
IV. IDENTIFICATION OF CHALLENGES.....	4
V. SUMMARY OF THE '106 PATENT .....	5
A. Overview .....	5
B. The '106 Patent .....	5
1. Conventional Optical Pickups Were Compatible With Both CDs and DVDs.....	5
2. The Purported Invention of the '106 Patent is the Use of a Diffractive Element Rather than the Thin Film Element of Conventional Optical Pickups.....	9
C. The Challenged Claims of the '106 Patent .....	12
D. Claim Construction .....	15
E. Prosecution History.....	17
1. Prosecution of the '611 Application .....	18
2. Prosecution of the Reissue Application .....	20
VI. PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART .....	20
VII. CLAIMS 4-6, 20-27, 36, and 37 OF THE '106 PATENT ARE UNPATENTABLE.....	21

A.	The '106 Patent Presents an Obvious Variation of Conventional Optical Pickups .....	22
B.	Ground 1 – Claims 4-6, 20-27, 36, and 37 of the '106 Patent Are Obvious Over Admitted Prior Art and Katayama .....	25
1.	One of Ordinary Skill in the Art Would Have Combined Katayama and the Admitted Prior Art .....	26
2.	Claim 4 .....	29
3.	Claim 5 .....	37
4.	Claim 6 .....	39
5.	Claim 20 .....	39
6.	Claim 21 .....	46
7.	Claim 22 .....	48
8.	Claim 23 .....	50
9.	Claim 24 .....	51
10.	Claim 25 .....	52
11.	Claim 26 .....	54
12.	Claim 27 .....	55
13.	Claim 36 .....	57
14.	Claim 37 .....	64
15.	Secondary Conditions .....	65
VIII.	CONCLUSION.....	69

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>Agrizap, Inc. v. Woodstream Corp.</i> , 520 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	27
<i>Brinkmann Corporation v. A&amp;J Manufacturing, LLC</i> , (IPR2015-00056), Paper 10 (PTAB 2015) .....	2
<i>Concrete Appliances Co. v. Gomery</i> , 269 U.S. 177 (1925).....	66
<i>Constant v. Advanced Micro-Devices, Inc.</i> , 848 F.2d 1560 (Fed. Cir. 1988).....	21
<i>Ecolochem, Inc. v. Southern Cal. Edison Co.</i> , 227 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	69
<i>Geo M. Martin Co. v. Alliance Mach. Sys. Int'l LLC</i> , 618 F.3d 1294 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	66
<i>In re Am. Acad. Of Sci. Tech Ctr.</i> , 367 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	16
<i>In re Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC</i> , 793 F.3d 1268, 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2015), aff'd, 136 S. Ct. 2131 (2016).....	15
<i>In re Nomiya</i> , 509 F.2d 566 (CCPA 1975) .....	21
<i>Intri-Plex Technologies Inc. v. Saint-Gobain Perf. Plastics Rencol Ltd.</i> , Case No. IPR 2014-00309, 2014 WL 2623456 (P.T.A.B. June 10, 2014).....	21
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398, (2007).....	26
<i>Motorola, LLC v. Arnouse</i> , IPR2013-0010, Paper 20 (PTAB 2013).....	2
<i>Sundance, Inc. v. DeMonte Fabricating Ltd.</i> , 550 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	26

<i>The Int'l Glass Co. v. United States</i> , 408 F.2d 395 (Ct. Cl. 1969) .....	69
<i>Tokyo Keiso Co., LTD v. SMC Corp.</i> , 307 Fed. Appx. 446 (Fed. Cir. 2009) .....	21
<i>Toshiba Samsung Storage Technology Korea Corporation v. LG Electronics, Inc.</i> <i>et al.</i> , Case No. 15-cv-00691-LPS-CJB (D. Del.) .....	3

## Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 102(a) .....	21
35 U.S.C. § 102(e) .....	21
35 U.S.C. § 103(a) .....	1, 3
35 U.S.C. § 311 .....	1
35 U.S.C. § 312 .....	1
35 U.S.C. § 313 .....	1
35 U.S.C. § 314 .....	1
35 U.S.C. § 315 .....	1
35 U.S.C. § 316 .....	1
35 U.S.C. § 317 .....	1
35 U.S.C. § 318 .....	1
35 U.S.C. § 319 .....	1

## Regulations

37 C.F.R. § 42.100 .....	1
37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b) .....	14
37 C.F.R. § 42.101 .....	1

# 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.