

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	vi
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	4
A. Overview	4
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	14
E. Prosecution History	16
VI. PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	17
VII. CLAIMS 38-54 OF THE '106 PATENT ARE UNPATENTABLE	18
A. The '106 Patent Presents an Obvious Variation of Conventional Optical Pickups.....	19

B.	Ground 1 – Claims 38-54 of the '106 Patent Are Obvious Over Admitted Prior Art and Katayama	22
1.	One of Ordinary Skill in the Art Would Have Combined Katayama and the Admitted Prior Art	22
2.	Claim 38	25
3.	Claim 39	35
4.	Claim 40	36
5.	Claim 41	37
6.	Claim 42	37
7.	Claim 43	43
8.	Claim 44	44
9.	Claim 45	45
10.	Claim 46	46
11.	Claim 47	47
12.	Claim 48	58
13.	Claim 49	58
14.	Claim 50	59
15.	Claim 51	66
16.	Claim 52	67
17.	Claim 53	67
18.	Claim 54	68
19.	Secondary Considerations.....	69
VIII.	CONCLUSION.....	72

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Agrizap, Inc. v. Woodstream Corp.</i> , 520 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	23
<i>Brinkmann Corporation v. A&J Manufacturing, LLC</i> , (IPR2015-00056), Paper 10 (PTAB 2015)	2
<i>Concrete Appliances Co. v. Gomery</i> , 269 U.S. 177 (1925).....	70
<i>Constant v. Advanced Micro-Devices, Inc.</i> , 848 F.2d 1560 (Fed. Cir. 1988).....	18
<i>Ecolochem, Inc. v. Southern Cal. Edison Co.</i> , 227 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	73
<i>Geo M. Martin Co. v. Alliance Mach. Sys. Int'l LLC</i> , 618 F.3d 1294 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	69
<i>In re Am. Acad. of Sci. Tech. Ctr.</i> , 367 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	14
<i>In re Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC</i> , 793 F.3d 1268, 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2015), <i>aff'd</i> , 136 S. Ct. 2131 (2016).....	14
<i>In re Nomiya</i> , 509 F.2d 566 (CCPA 1975)	18
<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).....	18
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	22, 23
<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).....	22

<i>The Int'l Glass Co. v. United States</i> , 408 F.2d 395 (Ct. Cl. 1969)	73
<i>Tokyo Keiso Co., LTD v. SMC Corp.</i> , 307 Fed. Appx. 446 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	18
<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.)	2

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 102(a)	18
35 U.S.C. § 102(b)	18
35 U.S.C. § 102(e)	18
35 U.S.C. § 103(a)	1, 3
35 U.S.C. § 311	1

Regulations

37 C.F.R. § 42.100	1
37 C.F.R. § 42.101	1
37 C.F.R. § 42.101(a)	1
37 C.F.R. § 42.101(b)	1, 2
37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1)	2
37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2)	2
37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3)	2
37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4)	3

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.