

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

**SEOUL SEMICONDUCTOR CO., LTD., and
SEOUL SEMICONDUCTOR, INC.**

Petitioners

v.

DOCUMENT SECURITY SYSTEMS, INC.

Patent Owner

Case No. IPR2017-00333

U.S. Patent No. 7,256,486

PETITIONER'S REPLY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	RELEVANT LEGAL STANDARD	1
A.	Claim Construction	1
B.	Burden of Proof.....	3
III.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	3
A.	Patent Owner’s “major surface” Construction Is Baseless.....	3
B.	Patent Owner’s Importation of “substantially covered” into the Claims is Improper.	5
C.	The Board Should Reject Patent Owner’s “separate elements” Argument.....	10
IV.	THE BOARD SHOULD REJECT PATENT OWNER’S FACTUAL DISPUTES.....	12
A.	Patent Owner’s Response to Ground 1 Lacks Merit.....	12
1.	Patent Owner’s Geometry Analysis of Rohm Is Flawed.....	12
2.	Patent Owner’s “small fraction”/“small portion” Argument Is Legally Irrelevant.....	14
3.	Patent Owner’s Inherency Argument is Irrelevant	16
4.	Patent Owner’s Response to Petitioners’ Reasons Analysis is Misplaced	17
5.	Patent Owner’s “same structure” Argument is Incorrect	18
6.	Patent Owner Fails to Separately Address Claim 3.....	19
B.	Patent Owner’s Response to Ground 2 Lacks Merit.....	19
1.	Patent Owner’s “metallized . . . major surface” Arguments Are Meritless.....	19

2.	Patent Owner’s “same structure” Argument is Incorrect	22
3.	Patent Owner’s Response to Petitioners’ Reasons Analysis is Misplaced	22
4.	Patent Owner Fails to Separately Address Claim 3.....	23
C.	Patent Owner’s Constitutionality Challenge Is Baseless	23
V.	CONCLUSION.....	24
	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	
	CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE WITH 37 C.F.R. § 42.24	

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Amax, Inc. v. ACCO Brands Corp.</i> , 282 F. Supp. 3d 432, 437 (D. Mass. 2017).....	11
<i>Apple, Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , No. 12-CV-00630-LHK, 2014 WL 252045 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 21, 2014)	11
<i>Becton, Dickinson & Co. v. Tyco Healthcare Group, LP</i> , 616 F.3d 1249 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	10
<i>DSW, Inc. v. Shoe Pavilion, Inc.</i> , 537 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	4
<i>Kolcraft Enterprises, Inc. v. Artsana USA, Inc.</i> , No. 13 C 4863, 2017 WL 5418756 (N.D. Ill. Nov. 14, 2017)	11
<i>Lite-on Tech. Corp. v. Darfon Elect. Corp.</i> , IPR2018-01062, 2018 WL 6016843 (P.T.A.B. Nov. 15, 2018).....	12
<i>MBO Labs., Inc. v. Becton, Dickinson & Co.</i> , 474 F.3d 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	<i>passim</i>
<i>In re Mouttet</i> , 686 F.3d 1322 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	14
<i>In re Thorpe</i> , 777 F.2d 695 (Fed. Cir. 1985)	22
<i>Octane Fitness, LLC v. Icon Health & Fitness, Inc.</i> , 572 U.S. 545 (2014).....	3, 16
<i>Oil States Energy Services, LLC v. Greene’s Energy Group, LLC</i> , 138 S. Ct. 1365 (2018).....	24
<i>PPC Broadband, Inc. v. Corning Optical Commc’ns RF, LLC</i> , 815 F.3d 747 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	2

<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (<i>en banc</i>)	5, 7
<i>Powell v. Home Depot U.S.A., Inc.</i> , 663 F.3d 1221 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	11
<i>Retractable Technologies., Inc. v. Becton, Dickinson & Co.</i> , 653 F.3d 1296 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	11
<i>Rothschild Connected Devices Innovations, LLC v. Coca-Cola Co.</i> , No. 1:16-CV-1241-TWT, 2017 WL 5410867 (N.D. Ga. Nov. 13, 2017)	11
<i>SkyHawke Techs., LLC v. Deca Int'l Corp.</i> , 828 F.3d 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	7
<i>Smith & Nephew, Inc. v. Rea</i> , 721 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	5
<i>Springs Window Fashions LP v. Novo Indus., L.P.</i> , 323 F.3d 989 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	7
<i>TI Grp. Auto. Sys. (N. Am.), Inc. v. VDO N. Am., L.L.C.</i> , 375 F.3d 1126 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	1, 3
<i>Trivascular, Inc. v. Samuels</i> , 812 F.3d 1056 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	2
<i>Yeda Research v. Mylan Pharm. Inc.</i> , 906 F.3d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	14
Other Authorities	
37 C.F.R. § 316(e).....	3

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.