

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

NICHIA CORPORATION,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	C.A. No. 16-681 (RGA)
)	
TCL MULTIMEDIA TECHNOLOGY)	
HOLDINGS, LTD. and)	
TTE TECHNOLOGY, INC.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

JOINT CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF

MORRIS, NICHOLS, ARSHT & TUNNELL LLP
 Jack B. Blumenfeld (#1014)
 Brian P. Egan (#6227)
 1201 North Market Street
 P.O. Box 1347
 Wilmington, DE 19899
 (302) 658-9200
 jblumenfeld@mnat.com
 began@mnat.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

OF COUNSEL:

Kenneth A. Gallo
 David Cole
 PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON
 & GARRISON LLP
 2001 K Street, NW
 Washington, DC 20006-1047
 (202) 223-7300

Catherine Nyarady
 Daniel J. Klein
 PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON
 & GARRISON LLP
 1285 Avenue of the Americas
 New York, New York 10019-6064
 (212) 373-3000

October 17, 2017

CONNOLLY GALLAGHER LLP
 Arthur G. Connolly III (#2667)
 Ryan P. Newell (#4744)
 Mary Akhimien (#5448)
 The Brandywine Building
 1000 West Street, Suite 1400
 Wilmington, DE 19801
 (302) 757-7300
 aconnolly@connollygallagher.com
 rnewell@connollygallagher.com
 makhimien@connollygallagher.com

Attorneys for Defendants

OF COUNSEL:

Raymond N. Nimrod
 James M. Glass
 Gregory C. Wyckoff
 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART
 & SULLIVAN, LLP
 51 Madison Avenue, 22nd Floor
 New York, NY 10010
 (212) 849-7000

The defendants criticize Nichia for relying on one of two listed dictionary definitions, one which mentions only reflection and one which refers to scattering generally via a translucent material. *Supra* at 40-41; Hansen Decl. ¶¶ 55-56 (JA Ex. 9). The latter, they argue, is “refraction” not “reflection.” This argument, too, misses the point. As Dr. Wetzel has explained (Wetzel Reply Decl. ¶¶ 28-29 (JA Ex. 25)), the meaning of “diffuses” depends on context, and it may well mean one mechanism to the exclusion of others in a given case. The fact that there are multiple definitions in no way contradicts Nichia’s argument that in this case a POSITA would understand the reference in the patent to refer to reflections off of the phosphor particles.²³ In fact, the existence of these dictionary definitions supports Nichia’s position. Either of the definitions cited by the defendants may be appropriate in some contexts and are common usages of the term, but, here, in the context of the specification, “diffusion” means the former and not the latter. Wetzel Reply Decl. ¶ 29 (JA Ex. 25). The dictionary definitions corroborate that the distinction being made by Dr. Wetzel is well supported and recognized.

Although the defendants urge that the specification describes the process of diffusing light in only one sentence, imposes no restriction on possible methods of diffusion, and makes no mention of “reflection,” Dr. Wetzel explains that a *POSITA* would have understood that the claim limitation requiring that the phosphor “diffuses” light from the LED chip refers to the bouncing of light off the phosphor particles. Wetzel Reply Decl. ¶ 30 (JA Ex. 25). The defendants erroneously assert that the intrinsic evidence cited by Nichia is completely irrelevant

²³ The defendants also cite several additional dictionary definitions: “to spread out, pour out, scatter”; “scattering of a beam of light”; “reflection at a rough surface”; “transmission through a translucent . . . medium.” *Supra* at 40-41; Hansen Decl. ¶ 57. Again, as Dr. Wetzel has explained, “diffuses” may mean different things in different contexts. A POSITA would understand that the specific “diffuses” limitation in the relevant claims is not referring to all of them. As noted above, the scattering caused by absorption and reemission of light by the phosphor is wholly insufficient.

dispersive material.” *Supra* at 75. Nichia offers similar structure for the phrase “reflective member.” However, Nichia’s constructions are purely functional and provide no, specific structure, of their own. Hansen R. Decl. ¶¶50-53 (JA Ex. 28). Indeed, Nichia’s non-exhaustive laundry list of “any” structures that perform the claimed functions is precisely why 112, ¶ 6 should apply here. *Williamson v. Citrix*, 792 F.3d 1339, 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2015)

Should the Court decide that these terms are governed by Section 112, ¶6 (as it should), Nichia does not dispute the functions and corresponding structures proposed by TCL. Thus, the Court should adopt TCL’s proposals, which remain uncontested.

MORRIS, NICHOLS, ARSHT & TUNNELL LLP
/s/ Brian P. Egan

CONNOLLY GALLAGHER LLP
/s/ Arthur G. Connolly III

Jack B. Blumenfeld (#1014)
Brian P. Egan (#6227)
1201 North Market Street
P.O. Box 1347
Wilmington, DE 19899
(302) 658-9200
jblumenfeld@mnat.com
began@mnat.com
Attorneys for Plaintiff

Arthur G. Connolly III (#2667)
Ryan P. Newell (#4744)
Mary Akhimien (#5448)
The Brandywine Building
1000 West Street, Suite 1400
Wilmington, DE 19801
(302) 757-7300
aconnolly@connollygallagher.com
rnewell@connollygallagher.com
makhimien@connollygallagher.com
Attorneys for Defendants

OF COUNSEL:

Kenneth A. Gallo
David Cole
PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON
& GARRISON LLP
2001 K Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006-1047
(202) 223-7300

OF COUNSEL:

Raymond N. Nimrod
James M. Glass
Gregory C. Wyckoff
QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART
& SULLIVAN, LLP
51 Madison Avenue, 22nd Floor
New York, NY 10010
(212) 849-7000

Catherine Nyarady
Daniel J. Klein
PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON
& GARRISON LLP
1285 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10019-6064
(212) 373-3000
October 17, 2017