

PUBLIC VERSION

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

Washington, D.C.

In the Matter of

**CERTAIN MAGNETIC DATA STORAGE AND
TAPES AND CARTRIDGES CONTAINING
THE SAME (II)**

INV. NO. 337-TA-1076

**INITIAL DETERMINATION ON VIOLATION OF SECTION 337 AND
RECOMMENDED DETERMINATION ON REMEDY AND BOND**

Administrative Law Judge Clark S. Cheney

(October 25, 2018)

Appearances:

For the Complainants Fujifilm Corporation and Fujifilm Recording Media U.S.A., Inc.:

Robert C. Scheinfeld, Esq., Robert L. Maier, Esq., Jennifer C. Tempesta, Esq., and Joseph Akalski, Esq. of Baker Botts L.L.P. of New York, NY.

Lisa M. Kattan, Esq., Katherine Burke, Esq., and Thomas C. Martin, Esq. of Baker Botts L.L.P. of Washington, DC.

Syed Fareed, Esq. of Baker Botts L.L.P. of Austin, TX.

For the Respondents Sony Corporation, Sony Storage Media Solutions Corporation, Sony Storage Media Manufacturing Corporation, Sony DADC US Inc., Sony Latin America Inc.:

Gregory F. Corbett, Esq., Michael N. Rader, Esq., Randy J. Pritzker, Esq., Charles T. Steenburg, Esq., Hunter D. Keeton, Esq., John L. Strand, Esq., Nathan R. Speed, Esq., Bryan S. Conley, Esq., Jason W. Balich, Esq., Elizabeth A. DiMarco, Esq., Giorgos Stamatopoulos, Esq., Michelle K. Nyein, Esq., Brandon S. Blackwell, Esq., and Claire E. Schuster, Esq., Elizabeth Hudson, Esq. of Wolf Greenfield & Sacks, P.C. of Boston, MA.

James B. Altman, Esq., F. David Foster, Esq., Barbara A. Murphy, Esq., David F. Nickel, Esq., Susan Koegel, Esq., Kandis C. Gibson, Esq., Matthew N. Duescher, Esq. of Foster, Murphy, Altman & Nickel, PC of Washington, DC.

For the Commission Investigative Staff:

Margaret D. Macdonald, Esq., Director; David O. Lloyd, Esq., Supervisory Attorney; Todd P. Taylor, Esq., Investigative Attorney of the Office of Unfair Import Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission

PUBLIC VERSION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction	2
A.	Procedural History	2
B.	The Private Parties	3
1.	Complainants.....	3
a)	Fujifilm Corporation	3
b)	Fujifilm Recording Media U.S.A., Inc.:	4
2.	Respondents	4
a)	Sony Corporation	4
b)	Sony Storage Media Solutions Corporation.....	4
c)	Sony Storage Media Manufacturing Corporation	4
d)	Sony DADC US Inc.	4
e)	Sony Latin America Inc.	5
C.	The Technology at Issue	5
D.	The Accused Products.....	5
E.	The Domestic Industry Products	6
II.	Jursidiction and Importation.....	6
A.	Subject Matter Jurisdiction.....	6
B.	Personal Jurisdiction	7
C.	<i>In Rem</i> Jurisdiction.....	7
D.	Importation	7
E.	Ownership and Standing	7
III.	Relevant Law.....	8
A.	Claim Construction	8
B.	Infringement	10
1.	Literal Infringement	10
2.	Doctrine of Equivalents.....	10
C.	Validity.....	11

PUBLIC VERSION

1.	Anticipation.....	11
2.	Obviousness	12
3.	Written Description and Enablement	13
4.	Indefiniteness	14
D.	Domestic Industry	15
1.	Economic Prong	15
2.	Technical Prong.....	16
IV.	U.S. Patent Number 6,630,256.....	16
A.	The Claims-at-Issue.....	17
B.	A Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art	18
C.	Claim Construction	19
D.	Infringement	19
E.	Domestic Industry – Technical Prong	32
F.	Invalidity	34
1.	The alleged obviousness combinations involving Inaba do not render the asserted claims invalid.....	35
a)	Sony has not met its burden to prove that Inaba in combination with Nagasawa renders the asserted claims invalid as obvious.....	37
b)	Sony has not met its burden to prove that Inaba in combination with the prior art allegedly admitted in the '256 patent renders the asserted claims invalid as obvious.	40
c)	Sony has not met its burden to prove that the substrate the inventors allegedly derived from Asahi qualifies as prior art.....	43
2.	The claim term “nonmagnetic support” is adequately described in the specification.....	47
V.	U.S. Patent Number 6,835,451.....	48
A.	The Claims-at-Issue.....	50
B.	A Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art	51
C.	Claim Construction and Indefiniteness	51
D.	Infringement	55

PUBLIC VERSION

1.	Fujifilm’s flawed measurements fail to show that the accused products have ratio (Sdc/Sac) values within the claimed range.....	56
2.	Fujifilm failed to prove that the tapes in the accused Sony product lines have the same or similar properties as the individual tape it measured for each respective product line.....	63
E.	Domestic Industry – Technical Prong.....	64
F.	Invalidity	66
1.	The LTO-1 products in combination with Ejiri and Speliotis render claim 5, but not claims 12-14, invalid as obvious	66
a)	Claim 5	67
b)	Claims 12, 13, and 14.....	70
2.	Sony did not prove that the asserted claims that depend on claim 1 are not enabled.....	74
VI.	U.S. Patent Number 7,011,899.....	78
A.	The Claims-at-Issue.....	79
B.	A Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art	80
C.	Claim Construction and Indefiniteness	81
D.	Infringement	84
1.	Independent Claim 1	84
2.	Dependent Claim 2.....	91
3.	Dependent Claims 7, 11, 12	92
E.	Domestic Industry – Technical Prong.....	93
1.	Independent Claim 1	93
2.	Dependent Claim 2.....	97
3.	Dependent Claims 7 and 9-12	97
F.	Invalidity	98
1.	The Claims Are Not Obvious over Sueoka.....	98
2.	The Claims Are Not Obvious in View of Sueoka Combined with Aonuma.....	110
3.	The Claims Are Not Indefinite.....	111

PUBLIC VERSION

VII. U.S. Patent Number 6,462,905.....	111
A. The Claims-at-Issue.....	112
B. A Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art	113
C. Claim Construction	114
D. Infringement	115
1. Claim 1 – Literal Infringement.....	115
a) Centering after Impact.....	116
b) Centering During Assembly.....	122
c) Centering During Tape Drive Use	123
2. Claim 1 – Infringement under Doctrine of Equivalents	125
3. Claim 2	127
4. Claim 3	128
E. Domestic Industry – Technical Prong	130
1. Claim 1	130
2. Claim 2	131
3. Claim 3	132
F. Invalidity	132
1. Claim 1 – Not Obvious Over McAllister-I in View of Laverriere.....	132
2. Claim 2 – Not Obvious Over McAllister-I and Laverriere	136
3. Claim 1 – Not Obvious Over Morita-I in View of Morita-II	136
4. Claim 2 – Not Obvious Over Morita-I in View of Morita-II and Laverriere.....	139
5. Claim 3 – Not Anticipated by McAllister-I	140
6. Claim 3 – Not Obvious Over McAllister-I.....	142
7. Claim 3 – Anticipated by Fujifilm Cartridge Sales.....	145
8. Secondary Considerations of Obviousness	149
9. Conclusions	149
VIII. Domestic Industry – Economic Prong	150
A. Plant and Equipment	152

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.