

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

United States Patent No.: 7,915,631	§	Attorney Docket No.:
Inventors: Yoshinori Shimizu, et al.	§	112868-0001-658
Formerly Application No.: 12/548,618	§	
Issue Date: March 29, 2011	§	Customer No.: 28120
Filing Date: August 27, 2009	§	
Former Group Art Unit: 2822	§	Petitioner: VIZIO, Inc.
Former Examiner: Michael Trinh	§	
	§	
	§	
	§	
	§	

For: LIGHT EMITTING DEVICE AND DISPLAY

MAIL STOP PATENT BOARD
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Post Office Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,915,631

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	2
II.	OVERVIEW OF THE '631 PATENT	4
III.	OVERVIEW OF THE EVERLIGHT LITIGATION	6
IV.	PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	7
V.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	7
VI.	STATEMENT OF RELIEF REQUESTED FOR EACH CHALLENGED CLAIM	9
A.	Identification of Challenge (37 C.F.R. §§ 42.104(b)).....	9
VII.	GROUNDS OF CHALLENGE (37 C.F.R. § 42.204(b)(2)).....	9
VIII.	TECHNOLOGY BACKGROUND.....	9
A.	Principles of Color Mixing.....	9
B.	Phosphors are Commonly Used to Create White and Different Light Colors.....	11
C.	In 1996, YAG Phosphors Were Well Known for Converting Blue Emissions to Yellow in Lighting Products, Especially Under Harsh Operating Conditions.....	12
D.	Emergence of Commercially Viable Blue LEDs.....	13
E.	The Blue Plus Yellow Approach to Making a White LED was a Natural and Obvious Progression.....	14
IX.	SUMMARY OF THE CITED PRIOR ART.....	16
A.	Baretz.....	16
B.	Shimizu.....	17
C.	Matoba.....	18
D.	Pinnow.....	19
E.	The 1995 Nakamura Reference.....	20
X.	IDENTIFICATION OF HOW THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE UNPATENTABLE.....	21

A.	Ground 1: Baretz, Shimizu, and Matoba Render Claims 1-2, 6, and 10-11 Obvious	21
1.	Independent Claim 1	22
	(a) Baretz Discloses 1.Pre.	22
	(b) Baretz Discloses 1a.....	23
	(c) Baretz Discloses 1b	23
	(d) Baretz and Shimizu Disclose 1c	24
	(i) Baretz.....	25
	(ii) Shimizu.....	27
	(iii) Motivation to Combine Baretz and Shimizu.....	29
	(e) Baretz Discloses 1d	29
	(f) Matoba Discloses 1e.....	29
	(g) Baretz Discloses 1f.....	30
	(h) A POSITA Would Have Been Motivated To Combine Baretz, Shimizu, and Matoba and Had a Reasonable Expectation of Success In So Doing.....	32
2.	Baretz Discloses Claim 2	35
3.	Baretz Discloses Claim 6	35
4.	Baretz Discloses Claim 10	36
5.	Baretz Discloses Claim 11	36
B.	Ground 2: Baretz, Shimizu, Matoba, and Pinnow Render Claims 7-8 Obvious.....	37
	(a) A POSITA Would Have Been Motivated To Combine Baretz, Shimizu, Matoba, and Pinnow And Had A Reasonable Expectation Of Success In So Doing	38
2.	Pinnow Discloses Claim 7	45
3.	Pinnow Discloses Claim 8	46
C.	Ground 3: Baretz, Shimizu, Matoba, and Nakamura Render Claim 9 Obvious.....	46
1.	Nakamura Discloses Claim 9	46

2.	A POSITA Would Have Been Motivated To Combine Baretz, Shimizu, Matoba, and Nakamura And Had a Reasonable Expectation of Success	47
D.	Ground 4: Matoba, Shimizu, and Pinnow Render Claims 1, 6-8, and 10-11 Obvious	49
1.	Independent Claim 1	50
(a)	Matoba Discloses 1.Pre.	50
(b)	Matoba Discloses 1b.....	51
(c)	Matoba, Shimizu, and Pinnow Disclose 1c	52
(i)	<i>Matoba discloses the claimed phosphor, absorbing LED light, and emitting light of a different wavelength</i>	52
(ii)	<i>Shimizu discloses absorbing a “part” of the LED light.</i>	53
(iii)	<i>Pinnow discloses absorbing a “part” of the blue emission from the light source.</i>	54
(iv)	<i>A POSITA would have been motivated to combine Matoba, Shimizu, and Pinnow with a reasonable expectation of success</i>	55
2.	Shimizu Discloses Claim 6	64
3.	Pinnow Discloses Claim 7	64
4.	Pinnow Discloses Claim 8	65
5.	Shimizu Discloses Claim 10	65
6.	Matoba Discloses Claim 11	65
XI.	MANDATORY NOTICES	65
A.	Real Party-in-Interest (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1)).....	66
B.	Related Matters (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2)).....	66
1.	Related Patent Office Proceedings.....	66
2.	Related Litigation.....	67
XII.	Lead and Back-Up Counsel (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3)) and Service Information (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3)-(4))	67

XIII. REQUIREMENTS FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW (37 C.F.R. §§ 42.101, 42.104, and 42.108)68

 A. Grounds for Standing (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a); 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.101(a)-(c))68

XIV. The Board Should Not Exercise Its Discretion to Deny Institution Under Sections 314(A) and 325(d).....68

XV. CONCLUSION.....72

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.