

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

LOWE'S COMPANIES, INC.,
LOWE'S HOME CENTERS, LLC, and L G SOURCING, INC.,
Petitioners,

v.

NICHIA CORPORATION,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2018-00066
Patent No. 7,915,631 B2

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. Introduction.....	1
II. The Board Should Deny Institution Under §325(d) and §314(a).....	2
A. This is the third petition on the '631 the Board has been asked to consider.	2
B. The Office previously considered the same or substantially the same references and arguments.....	4
C. The <i>General Plastic</i> factors favor denying institution.....	7
III. Technical Background.....	11
A. Nichia develops the blue LED.	11
B. Researchers pursue the white LED using a 3-LED red-green-blue approach.	12
C. Nichia discards the 3-LED approach.	14
D. Nichia uses phosphors with LEDs.	14
E. Nichia develops a sheet-like white-light source using a blue LED and phosphors.	16
F. Nichia develops a white LED.....	19
G. Petitioners' asserted history of YAG confirms that Nichia's use of it in an LED was a breakthrough.	23
IV. The Petition Should Be Denied Because Petitioners Fail to Present the Required <i>Graham</i> Analysis.	25
V. Claim Construction.....	29
VI. Grounds 2 and 4 Should Be Denied Because They Rely on the Non-Analogous Pinnow Reference.	30
A. <i>Cree</i> is irrelevant to whether Pinnow is analogous art.....	32
B. Pinnow is not in the same field of endeavor as the '631.....	35
C. Pinnow is not reasonably pertinent to the problems faced by the '631 inventors.....	43
D. Nichia's inclusion of Pinnow on an IDS is irrelevant.....	46

VII.	The Petition Should Be Denied Because All Grounds Erroneously Rely on Matoba as Disclosing the “Concentration of Phosphor” Limitation.	46
A.	Petitioners incorrectly construe “transparent material” in an attempt to satisfy the “concentration of phosphor” limitation.	47
B.	Matoba does not disclose the “concentration of phosphor” limitation.	52
VIII.	The Petition Should Be Denied Because All Grounds Erroneously Rely on Baretz or Matoba as Disclosing the “Phosphor Diffuses” Limitation.	56
A.	Petitioners incorrectly construe “diffuses” in an attempt to satisfy the “phosphor diffuses” limitation.	57
B.	Baretz does not disclose the “phosphor diffuses” limitation (Grounds 1-3).	61
C.	Matoba does not disclose the “phosphor diffuses” limitation (Ground 4).	65
IX.	Petitioners Have Not Demonstrated the Required Nexus for Osram’s Supposed “Simultaneous Invention.”	66
X.	Petitioners’ Collateral Estoppel Argument Is Baseless.	67
XI.	The Supreme Court’s Pending <i>Oil States</i> Decision.	68
XII.	Conclusion.	68

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page(s)</u>
CASES	
<i>Abbott Labs. v. Baxter Pharm. Prod., Inc.</i> , 334 F.3d 1274 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	46
<i>In re Affinity Labs of Tex., LLC</i> , 856 F.3d 883 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	66
<i>Alarm.com Inc. v. Vivint, Inc.</i> , IPR2016-01124, Pap. 11 (Dec. 5, 2016).....	8
<i>Amgen Inc. v. Sanofi</i> , 872 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	33
<i>Anascape, Ltd. v. Nintendo of Am., Inc.</i> , 601 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	43
<i>In re Bigio</i> , 381 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	30, 35
<i>Blonder-Tongue Labs., Inc. v. Univ. of Ill Found.</i> , 402 U.S. 313 (1971).....	68
<i>In re Clay</i> , 966 F.2d 656 (Fed. Cir. 1992)	42, 43
<i>In re Cree, Inc.</i> , 818 F.3d 694 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	6, 32, 33, 34, 35
<i>Ex parte Cree, Inc.</i> , Appeal 2014-007890 (PTAB Nov. 21, 2014).....	32, 35
<i>In re Deminiski</i> , 796 F.2d 436 (Fed. Cir. 1986)	35
<i>Gen. Plastic Indus. Co. v. Canon Kabushiki Kaisha</i> , IPR2016-01357, Pap. 19 (Sept. 6, 2017)	7, 8, 9, 10

Case IPR2018-00066
Patent No. 7,915,631 B2

<i>In re GPAC Inc.</i> , 57 F.3d 1573 (Fed. Cir. 1995)	66
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	25, 26
<i>Kinetic Techs., Inc. v. Skyworks Sols., Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00529, Pap. 8 (Sept. 23, 2014)	27
<i>Kirk v. Raymark Indus., Inc.</i> , 61 F.3d 147 (3d Cir. 1995)	13
<i>In re Klein</i> , 647 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	31
<i>Monarch Knitting Mach. Corp. v. Sulzer Morat GmbH</i> , 139 F.3d 877 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	30
<i>In re Oetiker</i> , 977 F.2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992)	30
<i>R.J. Reynolds Vapor Co. v. Fontem Holdings I BV</i> , IPR2017-01318, Pap. 12 (Nov. 8, 2017)	8
<i>Rohm & Haas Co. v. Brotech Corp.</i> , 127 F.3d 1089 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	42
<i>Samsung Elecs. Co. v. Elm 3DS Innovations, LLC</i> , IPR2017-01305, Pap. 11 (Oct. 17, 2017)	8, 9, 10
<i>SAP Am., Inc. v. Versata Dev. Grp., Inc.</i> , CBM2012-00001, Pap. 36 (Jan. 9, 2013)	67
<i>Schott Gemtron Corp. v. SSW Holding Co.</i> , IPR2014-00367, Pap. 62 (May 26, 2015).....	43
<i>Taiwan Semiconductor Mfg. Co. v. DSS Tech. Mgmt., Inc.</i> , IPR2014-01030, Pap. 28 (Nov. 30, 2015)	50, 60
<i>Unified Patents, Inc. v. Berman</i> , IPR2016-01571, Pap. 10 (Dec. 14, 2016).....	5

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.