

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ZTE CORPORATION, and ZTE (USA), Inc.,

Petitioners

v.

HITACHI MAXELL, LTD.,

Patent Owner

U.S. Patent No. 8,339,493

Issued: December 25, 2012

Inventor(s): Takahiro Nakano; Ryuji Nishimura; Toshiro Kinugasa

Title: ELECTRIC CAMERA

Inter Partes Review No. _____

PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF
U.S. PATENT NO. 8,339,493 PURSUANT TO 35 U.S.C. §§ 311-319 AND 37
C.F.R. § 42

Mail Stop "Patent Board"
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. MANDATORY NOTICES UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(a)(1).....	1
A. Real Party-In-Interest Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1)	1
B. Related Matters Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2)	1
C. Lead and Back-Up Counsel Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3)	1
D. Service Information Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4).....	2
III. PAYMENT OF FEES UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.103	2
IV. REQUIREMENTS FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW UNDER 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.104	2
A. Grounds for Standing Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a).....	3
B. Identification of Challenge Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)	3
C. How the Challenged Claim(s) Are to Be Construed (37 C.F.R. §42.104(b)(3))	4
D. How the Construed Claim(s) Are Unpatentable (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(4))	5
V. STATEMENT OF PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED	5
VI. THRESHOLD REQUIREMENT FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW	7
VII. OVERVIEW OF THE ‘493 PATENT	7
VIII. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	10
IX. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(3)).....	11
A. “an image sensing device with a light receiving sensor having an array of pixels arranged vertically and horizontally in a grid pattern”	11
B. “an image instability detector”	12
C. “an image-instability of the electric camera”	12
D. “changing the pixel lines used, and a portion of the pixel lines used according to an amount of image-instability”	12

E.	“a display unit with a display screen, that displays an image corresponding to the image signals”	13
X.	BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF PRIOR ART RELIED UPON.....	14
A.	U.S. Patent No. 5,493,335 (“Parulski ‘335”) (EX. 1003).....	14
B.	U.S. Patent No. 5,440,343 (“Parulski ‘343”) (EX. 1004).....	15
C.	U.S. Patent No. 5,497,192 (“Ishizuka ‘192”) (EX. 1005).....	16
D.	U.S. Patent No. 5,828,406 (“Parulski ‘406”) (EX. 1006).....	16
E.	U.S. Patent No. 6,512,541 (“Dunton ‘541”) (EX. 1007).....	17
XI.	CLAIM-BY-CLAIM EXPLANATION OF GROUNDS OF UNPATENTABILITY	18
A.	Ground A: Under 35 U.S.C. § 103, Parulski ‘335 (Ex. 1003) in view of Parulski ‘343 (Ex. 1004), renders independent claim 5.....	18
B.	Ground B: Under 35 U.S.C. § 103, Parulski ‘335 (Ex. 1003) in view of Parulski ‘343 (Ex. 1004) and Ishizuka ‘192 (Ex. 1005), renders dependent claim 6 obvious.	30
C.	Ground C: Under 35 U.S.C. § 103, Parulski ‘406 (Ex. 1006) in view of Dunton ‘541 (Ex. 1007), renders independent claim 5 obvious.	33
D.	Ground D: Under 35 U.S.C. § 103, Parulski ‘335 (Ex. 1003) in view of Parulski ‘343 (Ex. 1004) and Ishizuka ‘192 (Ex. 1005), renders dependent claim 6 obvious.	45
XII.	CONCLUSION.....	48

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

Cases

<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966)	6
<i>In re ICON Health and Fitness, Inc.</i> , 496 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	5
<i>KSR Int’l C. v. Teleflex, Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007)	6

Statutes and Codes

United States Code,	
Title 35, Section 101	13
Title 35, Section 102(b)	3, 4
Title 35, Section 102(e)	4
Title 35, Section 103	passim
Title 35, Section 103(a)	7
Title 35, Section 112	13
Title 35, Section 311(b)	5
Title 35, Section 314(a)	7

Rules and Regulations

Code of Federal Regulations,	
Title 37, Section 42.8(a)	1
Title 37, Section 42.8(b)	1, 2
Title 37, Section 42.15(a)	2
Title 37, Section 42.100(b)	4, 11
Title 37, Section 42.103	2
Title 37, Section 42.104	2
Title 37, Section 42.104(a)	3
Title 37, Section 42.104(b)	3, 4, 5

LIST OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit No.	Exhibit
Ex.1001	U.S. Patent No. 8,339,493 (“the ‘493 Patent”)
Ex.1002	Declaration of Dr. Barmak Mansoorian
Ex.1003	U.S. Patent No. 5,493,335 (“Parulski ‘335”)
Ex.1004	U.S. Patent No. 5,440,343 (“Parulski ‘343”)
Ex.1005	U.S. Patent No. 5,497,192 (“Ishizuka ‘192”)
Ex.1006	U.S. Patent No. 5,828,406 (“Parulski ‘406”)
Ex.1007	U.S. Patent No. 6,512,541 (“Dunton ‘541”)
Ex.1008	Prosecution History of U.S. Patent No. 8,339,493 (“the ‘493 file history”)

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.