UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

VIZIO, INC., Petitioner,

v.

NICHIA CORP., Patent Owner.

Case IPR2018-00386 (Patent 9,490,411 B2) Case IPR2018-00437 (Patent 9,537,071 B2)

Record of Oral Hearing Held: March 5, 2019

Before SALLY C. MEDLEY, WILLIAM V. SAINDON, and NATHAN A. ENGELS, *Administrative Patent Judges*.



APPEARANCES:

ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER:

GABRIELLE E. HIGGINS
CHRISTOPHER M. BONNY
Ropes & Gray LLP
1900 University Avenue, 6th Floor
East Palo Alto, California 94303-2284
650-617-4000
christopher.bonny@ropesgray.com
gabrielle.higgins@ropesgray.com

ON BEHALF OF THE PATENT OWNER:

MARTIN M. ZOLTICK MICHAEL H. JONES Rothwell, Figg, Ernst & Manbeck, P.C. 607 14th Street, N.W., Suite 800 Washington, DC 20005 202-783-6040

The above-entitled matter came on for hearing on Tuesday, March 5, 2019, commencing at 1:01 p.m. at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, 600 Dulany Street, Alexandria, Virginia.



1	PROCEEDINGS
2	
3	JUDGE SAINDON: We're here for an oral hearing in two cases,
4	IPR 2018-00386 and IPR 2018-00437, involving Petitioner Vizio and Patent
5	Owner Nichia.
6	I am Judge Saindon and with me here is Judge Medley, and Judge
7	Engels is appearing from our Dallas, Texas office. He can only hear you
8	through that microphone right there. So please talk only talk when you are
9	at the podium.
10	All right. We have 75 minutes in total. So each side will have
11	their 75 minutes. That will be between your primary time and rebuttal time
12	When you get up, if you want to let me know, to reserve some time for you,
13	I will be giving you oral warnings and keeping the clock here. We don't
14	have an external clock in this room.
15	So with that, Petitioner you are going to go first and you may reserve
16	time for rebuttal. We'll do introductions for each side when you first step
17	up. So we'll go with Petitioner first. Introduce yourself and your team.
18	And then if you have any rebuttal time you want to reserve, let me know.
19	MS. HIGGINS: Thank you, Your Honor. Gabrielle Higgins.
20	With me today is Christopher Bonny and Allen Cross from Ropes & Gray
21	on behalf of Petitioner. We would like to reserve 25 minutes if we may of
22	rebuttal time.
23	JUDGE SAINDON: Okay. You may begin when ready.



MS. HIGGINS: Thank you. Slide 4, please. So Petitioner has provided our positions and our evidence in our briefing. To assist the board in considering the record, we will address today in our opening discussion four topics along with any questions the Board may have.

I will first address the two claim construction issues, and we'll show how the prior reference Loh meets those two terms.

My colleague, Mr. Bonny, will then address the lack of written description support for Patent Owner's proposed amended claims in the 071 patent as well as the unpatentability of Patent Owner's proposed amended claims under 35 U.S.C. Section 103.

Slide 5, please. So we're going to start with this disputed claim term, which is unique to the 386 proceeding involving the 411 patent.

Slide 6, please. And we see here independent Claim 1 of the 411 patent, which recites in the highlighted language both a part of the metal part and a part of the resin part are disposed in a region below an upper surface of the metal part on four outer lateral surfaces of the resin package.

Now as shown in Figure 1, which is an annotated figure from the Petition, both a part of the metal part, which is colored in blue and a part of the resin part, colored in green, are disposed in a region below an upper surface of the metal part outlined in blue on four outer lateral surfaces of the resin package.

To be clear, it is the region below an upper surface of the metal part that is outlined in blue. The blue line illustrates the upper boundary of the region, which is in the resin package.



Turn to Slide 7, please. Now the term disposed in a region below an upper surface of the metal part on four outer lateral surfaces of the resin package should be given its plain and ordinary meaning consistent with the specification under the broadest reasonable interpretation that's applicable in this proceeding.

First, the claim self-requires that a part of the metal part and a part of the resin part are disposed in a region. And the claim language itself specifies the region. The region must be below an upper surface of the metal part. And the region is outlined in blue in Figure 1. And the region must also be on four outer lateral surfaces of the resin package, which is outlined by the red lines in Figure 1.

Second, consistent with the patent claims and specification, the plain meaning of below is at a lower level than.

Slide 8, please. Now, as the Federal Circuit case law tells us, specification is the single best guide to the meaning of the term. The figures for all embodiments disclose both a part of the metal part and a part of the resin part disposed in a region that is below, i.e. at a lower level than an upper surface of the metal part. All of the figures support the broadest reasonable interpretation.

Slide 9, please. So consistent with the claims and specification, contemporary dictionary definitions confirm the plain meaning of below, that it's at a lower level than. As Dr. Shanfield explained, a person of ordinary skill would have understood that when resin is below an upper surface, it is at a lower level than the upper surface.



DOCKET

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.

