

Filed on behalf of: Nichia Corporation

Paper _____

By: Martin M. Zoltick, Lead Counsel
Robert P. Parker, Back-up Counsel (*pro hac vice* admission pending)
Derek F. Dahlgren, Back-up Counsel (*pro hac vice* admission pending)
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
rparker@rfem.com
ddahlgren@rfem.com
mjones@rfem.com
mrawls@rfem.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

VIZIO, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

NICHIA CORPORATION,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2018-00437
Patent 9,537,071

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	i
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iii
EXHIBIT LIST	v
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. BACKGROUND OF THE TECHNOLOGY	2
A. Overview of LED Technology	2
B. The '071 patent.....	4
III. PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	8
A. Field of the Invention/Relevant Art	8
B. Level of Ordinary Skill	9
IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	9
V. ALLEGED PRIOR ART REFERENCES	10
A. Loh.....	10
B. Mori	11
C. Wang.....	11
D. Oshio.....	12
VI. GROUNDS IN THE PETITION.....	13
VII. STATEMENT OF SPECIFIC REASONS WHY NO IPR SHOULD BE INSTITUTED FOR THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS	14
A. Ground 1 Fails to Demonstrate a Reasonable Likelihood that any Challenged Claim Would be Found Unpatentable.....	15
B. Ground 2 Fails to Demonstrate a Reasonable Likelihood that any Challenged Claim Would be Found Unpatentable.....	18

C.	Ground 3 Fails to Demonstrate a Reasonable Likelihood that any Challenged Claim Would be Found Unpatentable.....	21
D.	Ground 4 Fails to Demonstrate a Reasonable Likelihood that any Challenged Claim Would be Found Unpatentable.....	22
E.	Ground 5 Fails to Demonstrate a Reasonable Likelihood that any Challenged Claim Would be Found Unpatentable.....	22
VIII.	PETITIONER FAILED TO DISCLOSE ALL REAL PARTIES IN INTEREST	23
IX.	SHOULD THE SUPREME COURT HOLD THAT PATENTS ARE PRIVATE RIGHTS, THE BOARD SHOULD VACATE AND TERMINATE THIS PROCEEDING.....	25
X.	CONCLUSION.....	25

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

ActiveVideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Commc’ns, Inc.,
694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012)19

Amazon.com, Inc. v. Appistry, Inc.,
IPR2015-00480, Paper 18 (PTAB July 13, 2015)24

AVX Corp. v. Greatbatch, Ltd.,
IPR2014-00697, Paper 57 (PTAB Oct. 21, 2015)9

Cohesive Techs., Inc. v. Waters Corp.,
543 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2008)21

Duro-Last, Inc. v. Custom Seal, Inc.,
321 F.3d 1098 (Fed. Cir. 2003)21

Heart Failure Techs., LLC v. CardioKinetix, Inc.,
IPR2013-00183, Paper 12 (PTAB July 31, 2013)19

In re Cyclobensaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Patent Litig.,
676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012)20

In re Stepan Co.,
868 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2017)20

Innovention Toys, LLC v. MGA Entm’t, Inc.,
637 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2011)9

KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.,
550 U.S. 398 (2007)..... 18, 19, 20

Lake Cable, LLC v. Windy City Wire Cable and Tech. Prods., LLC,
IPR2013-00528, Paper 11 (PTAB Feb. 19, 2014)19

Medtronic, Inc. v. Robert Bosch Healthcare Sys., Inc.,
IPR2014-00488, Paper 61 (PTAB May 22, 2015)24

Naughty Dog, Inc.,
IPR2014-00197, Paper 11 (PTAB May 28, 2014)19

Nestle USA, Inc. v. Steuben Foods, Inc.
686 Fed. Appx. 917 (Fed. Cir. 2017)10

Nichia Corp. v. Everlight Ams., Inc.,
855 F.3d 1328 (Fed. Cir. 2017) 3, 8, 9, 10

Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd. v. Flamm,
IPR2016-01510, Paper 6 (PTAB Feb. 14, 2017)..... 18, 21

SAS Inst., Inc. v. ComplementSoft, LLC,
IPR2013-00581, Paper 15 (PTAB Dec. 30, 2013)18

Toshiba Corp. v. Intellectual Ventures II LLC,
IPR2014-00201, Paper 11 (PTAB May 21, 2014)20

Wright Med. Tech., Inc. v. Orthophoenix, LLC,
IPR2014-00912, Paper 9 (PTAB Dec. 16, 2014)19

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 312(a)23

35 U.S.C. § 314(a) 1, 14

Other Authorities

37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)14

37 C.F.R. § 42.107(a).....1

37 C.F.R. § 42.108(b)14

37 C.F.R. § 42.108(c).....14

37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)23

MPEP 2111.01 § IV10

Rules

77 Fed. Reg. 48,756 (Aug. 14, 2012) 14, 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.