

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

U.S. Patent No. 8,309,375

“Light Emitting Device and Display”

Inter Partes Review No. 2017-02001

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 8,309,375
UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 311-319 AND 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.100 *et seq.***

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THE '375 PATENT	4
III. OVERVIEW OF THE <i>EVERLIGHT</i> LITIGATION.....	7
IV. PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	8
V. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	8
VI. STATEMENT OF RELIEF REQUESTED FOR EACH CHALLENGED CLAIM	9
A. Identification of Challenge (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)).....	9
B. Grounds of Challenge (37 C.F.R. § 42.204(b)(2)).....	9
VII. TECHNOLOGY BACKGROUND.....	10
A. Principles of Color Mixing.....	10
B. Measuring Color.....	11
C. Phosphors Are Commonly Used to Create White And Different Light Colors.....	13
D. In 1996, YAG Phosphors Were Well Known For Converting Blue Emissions To Yellow In Lighting Products	13
E. Emergence of Commercially Viable Blue LEDs.....	15
F. The Blue Plus Yellow Approach to Making A White LED was a Natural And Obvious Progression.....	16
VIII. SUMMARY OF THE PRIOR ART	17
A. Baretz.....	17
B. Shimizu.....	18
C. Tadatsu	20
D. 1995 Nakamura Reference	21
E. Pinnow	23
F. Blasse.....	23
G. Rosotti	24

IX.	IDENTIFICATION OF HOW THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE UNPATENTABLE.....	25
A.	Ground 1 – Claims 1 and 4 are Obvious Over Baretz, Shimizu, Pinnow and Rosotti	25
1.	Baretz Discloses 1.Pre	28
2.	Baretz Discloses 1a	30
3.	Baretz Shimizu and Pinnow Disclose 1b.....	31
	(a) Baretz and Shimizu disclose a phosphor that absorbs part of the blue LED light, emits yellow and “selecting” the phosphor.....	31
	(i) Baretz.....	32
	(ii) Shimizu.....	34
	(b) Pinnow discloses a phosphor with the claimed “peak” wavelength and “tail.”	38
4.	Shimizu Discloses 1c	39
5.	Rossotti Discloses 1d	40
6.	Shimizu Discloses 1e	43
7.	Baretz Shimizu and Pinnow Disclose claim 4	43
8.	A POSITA Would have been Motivated to Combine Baretz, Shimizu and Pinnow And Rossotti, With a Reasonable Expectation Of Success	43
B.	Ground 2 – Claims 1 and 4 are Obvious Over Tadatsu, Nakamura, Shimizu, Blasse, and Rossotti	55
1.	Tadatsu Discloses 1.Pre	56
2.	Tadatsu and Nakamura Disclose Limitation 1a.....	57
	(a) Tadatsu and Nakamura Disclose 1a	57
	(b) A POSITA Would Have Been Motivated To Combine Combined Tadatsu Nakamura, With a Reasonable Expectation Of Success.....	59
3.	Tadatsu, Shimizu and Blasse Disclose 1b	61

(a)	Shimizu discloses a phosphor that absorbs part of the blue LED light, emits yellow and “selecting” the phosphor.....	61
(b)	Blasse discloses a phosphor with the claimed “peak” wavelength and “tail.”	62
(c)	A POSITA Would Have Been Motivated To Combine Combine Tadatsu, Shimizu and Blasse, With a Reasonable Expectation Of Success.....	63
4.	Shimizu Discloses 1c	68
5.	Rossotti Discloses 1d	69
6.	Shimizu Discloses 1e	71
7.	Tadatsu, Nakamura, Shimizu, and Blasse Disclose Claim 4.....	71
C.	Secondary Considerations Do Not Support A Finding Of Non-Obviousness.....	71
X.	MANDATORY NOTICES	72
A.	Real Party-in-Interest (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1)).....	72
B.	Related Matters (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2)).....	72
1.	Related Patent Office Proceedings.....	72
2.	Related Litigation.....	72
C.	Lead and Back-Up Counsel (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3)) and Service Information (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3)-(4))	73
D.	Payment of Fees (37 C.F.R. § 42.15(a))	73
XI.	REQUIREMENTS FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW (37 C.F.R. §§ 42.101, 42.104, AND 42.108)	73
A.	Grounds for Standing (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a); 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.101(a)-(c))	73
XII.	CONCLUSION.....	74

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

Cases

<i>Circuit Check Inc. v. QXQ Inc.</i> , 795 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	47, 48, 55, 66
<i>In re Cree</i> , 828 F.3d 694 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	50
<i>In re Cree</i> , 828 F.3d 694 (Fed. Cir. 2016) ... 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 25, 50, 51, 52, 53, 55, 56, 57, 60, 67, 70	
<i>Dana v. E.S. Originals, Inc.</i> , 342 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	9
<i>Free Motion Fitness, Inc. v. Cybex Intern., Inc.</i> , 423 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	38
<i>Geo. M. Martin v. Alliance Machine Systems</i> , 618 F.3d 1294 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	29, 55
<i>Interval Licensing LLC v. AOL, Inc.</i> , 766 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	11
<i>KSR v. Teleflex</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	28, 49, 50
<i>Panel Claw, Inc. v. Sunpower Corp., IPR2014-00386, Paper</i> , No. 7 at 7 (P.T.A.B. June 30, 2014)	10
<i>Petroleum Geo-Services Inc. v. WesternGeco LLC</i> , IPR2015-01478, (Mar. 17, 2015)	73
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	10
<i>PO. Pharmastem Therapeutics, Inc. v. ViaCell, Inc.</i> , 491 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	22, 36, 61, 65

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.