

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

NICHIA CORPORATION,
Petitioner,

v.

DOCUMENT SECURITY SYSTEMS, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2018-01166
Patent 7,256,486

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

 A. Claims 1-6 Are Not Rendered Obvious by the Challenges Based on Primary References Nakajima, Rohm, and Matsushita 3

 B. Claim 6 Further Distinguishes from the Nine (9) Challenges Based on the Primary References 5

II. THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS AND CLAIM CONSTRUCTION..... 7

 C. Claim Listing..... 7

 D. Petitioner’s Proposed Claim Constructions Are Wrong 9

 1. “major surface” 10

 2. “metallized ... major surface”..... 12

III. THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE NOT UNPATENTABLE 14

 A. Grounds 16-24 Fail to Render Claim 6 Obvious 14

 1. Petitioner Failed to Prove Unpatentability of Claim 6 Based on Jochym 16

 2. Petitioner Fails to Reconcile Technical Differences Between Nakajima and Jochym, Which Are Non-Analogous..... 19

 3. Petitioner Cannot Remedy Its Deficient Challenges in Its Reply.. 23

 B. Grounds 1-3 Fail..... 24

 1. Petitioner’s Ground 1 Challenge Against Claim 1 Fails Because Secondary Reference Weeks Does Not Disclose or Suggest a Light Emitting Diode Having a Metallized Bottom Major Surface 24

 2. Petitioner’s Grounds 1-3 Challenges Against Claim 1 Fail Because Petitioner Has Not Provided Evidence Supporting Why a POSITA Would Have Substituted the LEDs From Any of The Secondary References in Place of Nakajima’s LED..... 26

3.	Petitioner’s Grounds 2-3 Challenges Fail Because Neither Kish Nor Edmond Teaches or Suggests a “Metallized Top Major Surface of the LED” As Recited in Claim 2	28
4.	Petitioner’s Grounds 1-3 Challenges Against Claim 2 Fail Because Petitioner Has Not Provided Evidence Supporting Why a POSITA Would Have Substituted the LEDs From Any of The Secondary References in Place of Nakajima’s LED.....	30
5.	Petitioner’s Characterization of Nakajima Lacks Support	33
6.	Petitioner’s Ground 1 Challenge Against Claim 4 Erroneously Argues that Claim 4’s Features are Not Entitled to Patentable Weight	37
C.	Grounds 4-6 Fail.....	38
1.	Petitioner’s Grounds 4-6 Against Claim 1 Fail Because Petitioner Did Not Identify Which Embodiments in Weeks, Kish, and Edmond Allegedly Disclose a Light Emitting Diode Having a Metallized Bottom Major Surface.....	38
2.	Petitioner’s Ground 4 Challenge Against Claim 1 Fails Because Secondary Reference Weeks Does Not Disclose or Suggest a Light Emitting Diode Having a Metallized Bottom Major Surface	39
3.	Petitioner’s Grounds 4-6 Challenges Against Claim 1 Fail Because Petitioner Has Not Provided Evidence Supporting Why a POSITA Would Have Substituted the LEDs From Any of The Secondary References in Place of Rohm’s LED	41
4.	Petitioner’s Grounds 5-6 Challenges Fail Because Neither Kish Nor Edmond Teaches or Suggests a “Metallized Top Major Surface of the LED” As Recited in Claim 2	43
5.	Petitioner’s Grounds 4-6 Against Claim 2 Fail Because Petitioner Has Not Provided Evidence Supporting Why a POSITA Would Have Substituted the LEDs From Any of The Secondary References in Place of Rohm’s LED	45
6.	Petitioner’s Characterization of Rohm Lacks Support	46

D.	Petitioner’s Grounds 7-9 Against Claim 4 Erroneously Argue that Claim 4’s Features are Not Entitled to Patentable Weight	48
E.	Grounds 10-12 Fail and Should be Denied Without Institution	49
1.	Petitioner’s Grounds 10-12 Against Claim 1 Fail Because Petitioner Did Not Identify Which Embodiments in Weeks, Kish, and Edmond Allegedly Disclose a Light Emitting Diode Having a Metallized Bottom Major Surface.....	49
2.	Petitioner’s Ground 10 Challenge Against Claim 1 Fails Because Secondary Reference Weeks Does Not Disclose or Suggest a Light Emitting Diode Having a Metallized Bottom Major Surface	50
3.	Petitioner’s Grounds 10-12 Challenges Against Claim 1 Fail Because Petitioner Has Not Provided Evidence Supporting Why a POSITA Would Have Substituted the LEDs From Any of The Secondary References in Place of Rohm’s LED	52
4.	Petitioner’s Grounds 11-12 Challenges Fail Because Neither Kish Nor Edmond Teach or Suggest a “Metallized Top Major Surface of the LED” As Recited in Claim 2.....	55
5.	Petitioner’s Grounds 10-12 Against Claim 2 Fail Because Petitioner Has Not Provided Evidence Supporting Why a POSITA Would Have Substituted the LEDs From Any of The Secondary References in Place of Matsushita’s LED	57
6.	Petitioner’s Characterization of Matsushita Lacks Support	58
F.	Petitioner’s Grounds 13-15 Against Claim 4 Erroneously Argue that Claim 4’s Features are Not Entitled to Patentable Weight	60
IV.	RETROACTIVE APPLICATION OF <i>INTER PARTES</i> REVIEW ON PRE-AIA PATENTS IS CONSTITUTIONALLY IMPERMISSIBLE	61
V.	CONCLUSION.....	62

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Bausch & Lomb Inc. v. Barnes-Hind Inc.</i> , 796 F.2d 443 (Fed. Cir. 1986)	21
<i>In re Schreiber</i> , 128 F.3d 1473 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	37
<i>Innova/Pure Water, Inc. v. Safari Water Filtration Systems, Inc.</i> , 381 F.3d 1111 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	10, 12
<i>Oil States Energy Services, LLC v. Greene’s Energy Group, LLC</i> , 138 S. Ct. 1365 (2018).....	61
<i>SAS Institute, Inc. v. Iancu</i> , 138 S. Ct. 1348 (2018).....	24, 36, 48, 60

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 154(a)(2).....	9
35 U.S.C. § 282(a)	61
35 U.S.C. § 314(a)	23

Rules

37 C.F.R. § 42.22(a).....	55
37 C.F.R. § 42.22(a)(2).....	39, 50
37 C.F.R. § 42.23(b)	17, 24
37 C.F.R. § 42.65(a).....	27, 42, 53
37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b)	9
37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(3).....	9
37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(4).....	9, 12
37 C.F.R. § 42.120.....	1

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.