

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

TCL MULTIMEDIA TECHNOLOGY HOLDINGS, LTD.  
and  
TTE TECHNOLOGY, INC.,  
Petitioners,

v.

NICHIA CORPORATION,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2017-02001  
Patent No. 8,309,375 B2

---

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE  
UNDER 37 C.F.R. §42.107**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
I. Introduction.....	1
II. The Petition Should Be Denied Because It Does Not Identify All Real-Parties-in-Interest.....	2
A. VIZIO is an unidentified real-party-in-interest.....	2
B. TTEC is an unidentified real-party-in-interest.....	5
C. TCLC is an unidentified real-party-in-interest.....	8
III. The Board Should Deny Institution Under §325(d) and §314(a).....	9
A. The Office previously considered the same or substantially the same references and arguments.....	9
B. The <i>General Plastic</i> factors favor denying institution.....	12
IV. Technical Background.....	15
A. Nichia develops the blue LED. ....	16
B. Researchers pursue the white LED using a 3-LED red-green- blue approach. ....	17
C. Nichia discards the 3-LED approach. ....	18
D. Nichia uses phosphors with LEDs. ....	19
E. Nichia develops a sheet-like white-light source using a blue LED and phosphors. ....	20
F. Nichia develops a white LED.....	23
G. Petitioners’ asserted history of YAG confirms that Nichia’s use of it in an LED was a breakthrough. ....	26
V. The Petition Should Be Denied Because Petitioners Fail to Present the Required <i>Graham</i> Analysis. ....	29
VI. Claim Construction.....	32
VII. Ground 1 Should Be Denied Because It Relies on the Non-Analogous Pinnow Reference.....	32
A. <i>Cree</i> is irrelevant to whether Pinnow is analogous art.....	34

B.	Pinnow is not in the same field of endeavor as the '375.....	36
C.	Pinnow is not reasonably pertinent to the problems faced by the '375 inventors.....	44
D.	Nichia's inclusion of Pinnow on an IDS is irrelevant.....	46
VIII.	Ground 1 Should Be Denied Because Petitioners Have Not Demonstrated a Motivation to Combine Baretz with Shimizu. ....	47
IX.	Ground 2 Should Be Denied Because Petitioners Have Not Shown a Reason to Combine Tadatsu and Nakamura with Shimizu.....	54
X.	Ground 2 Should Be Denied Because Petitioners Have Not Shown a Motivation to Combine Tadatsu, Nakamura, and Shimizu with Blasse. ....	55
XI.	Ground 2 Should Be Denied with Respect to Claim 4 Because Petitioners Fail to Show Blasse Teaches the Claimed Range. ....	60
XII.	Petitioners Have Not Demonstrated the Required Nexus for Osram's Supposed "Simultaneous Invention." .....	61
XIII.	Petitioners' Collateral Estoppel Argument Is Baseless.....	62
XIV.	The Pending <i>Oil States</i> Decision .....	63
XV.	Conclusion .....	63

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b><u>Page(s)</u></b>
<b>CASES</b>	
<i>Abbott Labs. v. Baxter Pharm. Prods., Inc.</i> , 334 F.3d 1274 (Fed. Cir. 2003) .....	47
<i>In re Affinity Labs of Tex., LLC</i> , 856 F.3d 883 (Fed. Cir. 2017) .....	62
<i>Alarm.com Inc. v. Vivint, Inc.</i> , IPR2016-01124, Pap. 11 (Dec. 5, 2016).....	13
<i>Amazon.com, Inc. v. Appistry, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00480, Pap. 18 (July 13, 2015) .....	5, 7, 8
<i>Amgen Inc. v. Sanofi</i> , 872 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2017) .....	35
<i>Anascape, Ltd. v. Nintendo of Am., Inc.</i> , 601 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2010) .....	43
<i>Atl. Gas Light Co. v. Bennett Regulator Guards, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00453, Pap. 88 (Jan. 6, 2015).....	6, 7
<i>In re Bigio</i> , 381 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2004) .....	33, 36, 38
<i>Blonder-Tongue Labs., Inc. v. Univ. of Ill. Found.</i> , 402 U.S. 313 (1971).....	63
<i>In re Clay</i> , 966 F.2d 656 (Fed. Cir. 1992) .....	44
<i>Copperweld Corp. v. Independence Tube Corp.</i> , 467 U.S. 752 (1984).....	6
<i>In re Cree, Inc.</i> , 818 F.3d 694 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Ex Parte Cree, Inc.</i> , Appeal 2014-007890 (PTAB Nov. 21, 2014).....	34

Case IPR2017-02001  
Patent No. 8,309,375 B2

<i>In re Deminiski</i> , 796 F.2d 436 (Fed. Cir. 1986) .....	36, 38
<i>Duo Sec. Inc. v. Strikeforce Techs.</i> , IPR2017-01041, Pap. 7 (Oct. 16, 2017) .....	47, 49, 50
<i>Gen. Plastic Indus. Co. v. Canon Kabushiki Kaisha</i> , IPR2016-01357, Pap. 19 (Sept. 6, 2017) .....	13, 14, 15
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	1, 29, 55
<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006) .....	47
<i>Kirk v. Raymark Indus., Inc.</i> , 61 F.3d 147 (3d Cir. 1995) .....	18
<i>In re Klein</i> , 647 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....	33
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	47
<i>Neil Ziegmann, N.P.Z., Inc. v. Stephens</i> , IPR2015-01860, Pap. 13 (Sept. 6, 2017) .....	9, 10
<i>Nora Lighting, Inc. v. Juno Mfg., LLC</i> , IPR2015-00601, Pap. 13 (Aug. 12, 2015) .....	12
<i>R.J. Reynolds Vapor Co. v. Fontem Holdings 1 BV</i> , IPR2017-01318, Pap. 12 (Nov. 8, 2017) .....	13
<i>Ex parte Rinkevich</i> , Appeal No. 2017-1317 (BPAI May 29, 2007) .....	50
<i>Rohm &amp; Haas Co. v. Brotech Corp.</i> , 127 F.3d 1089 (Fed. Cir. 1997) .....	43
<i>Samsung Elecs. Co. v. Elm 3DS Innovations, LLC</i> , IPR2017-01305, Pap. 11 (Oct. 17, 2017) .....	13, 14, 15

# 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.