

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 PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS AND CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.....	6
A.	Claim Listing.....	6
B.	Petitioner’s Proposed Claim Constructions Are Wrong	8
1.	“major surface”	9
2.	“metallized ... major surface”	11
III.	THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE NOT UNPATENTABLE	13
A.	The Board Should Deny Institution of This IPR—One of Five IPRs Filed Against the ’486 Patent—Based on the <i>General Plastic</i> Factors	15
B.	Grounds 1-3 Fail and Should be Denied Without Institution	19
1.	Nakajima Does Not Disclose the Claimed “Electrically Conductive Mounting Pad,” “First Electrically Conductive Connecting Pad,” and “First Electrically Conductive Interconnecting Element” Recited in Claim 1	19
2.	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	23
3.	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.....	25
4.	Petitioner’s Grounds 2-3 Challenges Fail Because Neither Kish Nor Edmond Teach or Suggest a “Metallized Top Major Surface of the LED” As Recited in Claim 2.....	27

5.	Nakajima Does Not Disclose the Claimed “Electrically Conductive Bonding Pad,” “Second Electrically Conductive Connecting Pad,” and “Second Electrically Conductive Interconnecting Element” Recited in Claim 2.....	29
6.	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.....	32
7.	Petitioner’s Ground 1 Challenge Against Claims 4 and 5 Erroneously Argues that the Claim 4 Feature Reciting “the First Electrically Conductive Interconnecting Element is Selected to Withstand an Operating Temperature When the LED is Mounted on the Electrically Conductive Mounting Pad” is Not Entitled to Patentable Weight	35
C.	Grounds 4-6 Fail and Should be Denied Without Institution	36
1.	Rohm Does Not Disclose the Claimed “Electrically Conductive Mounting Pad,” “First Electrically Conductive Connecting Pad,” and “First Electrically Conductive Interconnecting Element” Recited in Claim 1	36
2.	Petitioner’s Grounds 4-6 Challenges 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.....	40
3.	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	41
4.	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	43
5.	Petitioner’s Grounds 5-6 Challenges Fail Because Neither Kish Nor Edmond Teach or Suggest a “Metallized Top Major Surface of the LED” As Recited in Claim 2.....	45

6.	Rohm Does Not Disclose the Claimed “Electrically Conductive Bonding Pad,” “Second Electrically Conductive Connecting Pad,” and “Second Electrically Conductive Interconnecting Element” Recited in Claim 2.....	47
7.	Petitioner’s Grounds 4-6 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 Rohm’s LED	50
D.	Petitioner’s Grounds 7-9 Challenges Against Claims 4 and 5 Erroneously Argue that the Claim 4 Feature Reciting “the First Electrically Conductive Interconnecting Element is Selected to Withstand an Operating Temperature When the LED is Mounted on the Electrically Conductive Mounting Pad” is Not Entitled to Patentable Weight.....	52
E.	Grounds 10-12 Fail and Should be Denied Without Institution	52
1.	Matsushita Does Not Disclose the Claimed “Electrically Conductive Mounting Pad,” “First Electrically Conductive Connecting Pad,” and “First Electrically Conductive Interconnecting Element” Recited in Claim 1	53
2.	Petitioner’s Grounds 10-12 Challenges 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	56
3.	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	57
4.	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	59
5.	Petitioner’s Grounds 11-12 Challenges Fail Because Neither Kish Nor Edmond Teaches or Suggests a “Metallized Top Major Surface of the LED” As Recited in Claim 2	62

6.	Matsushita Does Not Disclose the Claimed “Electrically Conductive Bonding Pad,” “Second Electrically Conductive Connecting Pad,” and “Second Electrically Conductive Interconnecting Element” Recited in Claim 2	64
7.	Petitioner’s Grounds 10-12 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 Matsushita’s LED	67
F.	Petitioner’s Grounds 13-15 Challenges Against Claims 4 and 5 Erroneously Argue that the Claim 4 Feature Reciting “the First Electrically Conductive Interconnecting Element is Selected to Withstand an Operating Temperature When the LED is Mounted on the Electrically Conductive Mounting Pad” is Not Entitled to Patentable Weight.....	68
G.	Grounds 16-24 Fail and Should be Denied Without Institution	69
IV.	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.