

Filed on behalf of: Nichia Corporation

Paper _____

By: Martin M. Zoltick, Lead Counsel
Michael H. Jones, Back-up Counsel
Mark T. Rawls, Back-up Counsel
ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK, P.C.
607 14th Street, N.W., Suite 800
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-783-6040
Facsimile: 202-783-6031
Emails: mzoltick@rfem.com
mjones@rfem.com
mrawls@rfem.com

Date filed: December 14, 2017

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.,
Petitioner,

v.

NICHIA CORPORATION,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2017-02011
Patent 8,530,250

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS..... ii

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES v

EXHIBIT LIST ix

I. STATEMENT OF THE PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED 1

II. BACKGROUND OF THE TECHNOLOGY 9

III. U.S. PATENT NO. 8,530,250 13

(A) The Claims of the '250 Patent..... 14

(B) Problems Addressed by the '250 Patent..... 15

(C) The Patented Products Have Received Industry Praise, Solved
A Long-Felt, but Unresolved Need in the Industry, and
Achieved Immense Commercial Success. 16

(D) Claim Construction 19

(E) Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art 20

IV. STATEMENT OF SPECIFIC REASONS WHY NO *INTER PARTES*
REVIEW SHOULD BE INSTITUTED FOR SELECTED CLAIMS AND
GROUNDS 21

(A) Standards for Granting *Inter Partes* Review..... 21

(B) *Inter Partes* Review Should Not Be Instituted for Any of the
Grounds Because the Petition Fails To Explain How the
References Can Be Combined While Balancing the Competing
Design Considerations Taught by the References. 27

1) All Grounds Are Defective. 27

2) Petitioners' Expert's Testimony Should be Given Little
or No Weight..... 32

3)	Ground 1 Fails to Demonstrate a Reasonable Likelihood That Any Challenged Claim Would Be Found Unpatentable.	33
a)	The Petition Fails to Explain Why Koung Should Be Modified.	34
b)	Urasaki Addresses a Different Problem than the '250 Patent.	36
c)	The Combination of Koung and Urasaki Fails to Disclose or Suggest Each and Every Element of the Challenged Claims.	40
d)	The Petition Fails to Provide Any Technical Explanation Regarding How the Proposed Modifications Would Actually Work in a Predictable Manner Without Changing the Purpose of Koung.	41
4)	Ground 2 Fails to Demonstrate a Reasonable Likelihood That Any Challenged Claim Would Be Found Unpatentable.	43
5)	Grounds 1-2 Fail to Demonstrate a Reasonable Likelihood That Claim 12 Would Be Found Unpatentable.	46
6)	Grounds 3-4 Fails to Demonstrate a Reasonable Likelihood That Claim 11 Would Be Found Unpatentable.	49
7)	Ground 5 Fails to Demonstrate a Reasonable Likelihood That Any Challenged Claim Would Be Found Unpatentable.	50
8)	Ground 6 Fails to Demonstrate a Reasonable Likelihood That Any Challenged Claim Would Be Found Unpatentable.	52

9)	Grounds 7-8 Fail to Demonstrate a Reasonable Likelihood That Any Challenged Claim Would Be Found Unpatentable.	54
(C)	<i>Inter Partes</i> Review Should Not Be Instituted On Any of the Grounds Because the Petition Failed to Address Objective Indicia of Non-Obviousness.....	55
(D)	<i>Inter Partes</i> Review Should Not Be Instituted Because This Petition Is Cumulative to the Park Petition.	58
(E)	Grounds 1, 3, 5 and 7 Should Be Denied As Redundant, and Ground 6 Should At Least Be Denied With Respect to Claim 19.	60
1)	Ground 1 Should Be Denied As Redundant of Ground 2.	60
2)	Ground 3 Should Be Denied As Redundant of Ground 4.	61
3)	Ground 5 should be Denied As Redundant of Ground 6.....	61
4)	Ground 5-7 Should Be Denied As Redundant of Ground 8 for Claim 19.	61
(F)	The Petition Should Be Denied With Respect to Claims 1, 7, 17, 19 and 21, As Cumulative of VIZIO’s Petitions.....	62
V.	CONCLUSION.....	63

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

ActiveVideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Commc’ns, Inc.,
694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012) 23, 26

Apple Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.,
839 F.3d 1034 (Fed. Cir. 2016)56

Arista Networks, Inc. v. Cisco Sys., Inc.,
IPR2015-01710, Paper 9 (Mar. 29, 2016)59

AVX Corp. v. Greatbatch, Ltd.,
IPR2014-00697, Paper 57 (Oct. 21, 2015)20

Dennison Mfg. Co. v. Panduit Corp.,
475 U.S. 809, 106 S.Ct. 1578, 89 L.Ed.2d 817 (1986)..... 25, 42

Google Inc. v. EveryMD.com LLC,
IPR2014-00347, Paper 9 (May 22, 2014)..... 22, 29

Gracernote, Inc. v. Iceberg Indus. LLC,
IPR2013-00552, Paper 6 (Mar. 7, 2014) 22, 29

Graham v. John Deere Co.,
383 U.S. 1 (1966)..... passim

Harmonic Inc. v. Avid Tech., Inc.,
815 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2016)60

Heart Failure Techs., LLC v. CardioKinetix, Inc.,
IPR2013-00183, Paper 12 (July 31, 2013)23

In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Patent Litig.,
676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012)56

In re Fine,
837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988)25

In re GPAC Inc.,
57 F.3d 1573 (Fed. Cir. 1995)56

In re Hedges,
783 F.2d 1038 (Fed. Cir. 1986)25

In re Rinehart,
531 F.2d 1048 (CCPA 1976)24

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.