UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

LG ELECTRONICS INC.
Petitioner

v.

IMMERVISION, INC.
Patent Owner

Case IPR2020-00195

Patent No. 6,844,990

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.107

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

page

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. THE INVENTION OF CLAIM 21 OF THE '990 PATENT 4

III. THE ASSERTED PRIOR ART 8

A. Tada 8

B. Nagaoka 11

C. Baker 14

IV. PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART 16

V. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION 16

VI. PETITIONER FAILED TO DEMONSTRATE THAT THERE IS A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD IT WILL PREVAIL WITH RESPECT TO THE CHALLENGED CLAIM OF THE '990 PATENT 17

A. Legal Standards 17

B. Petitioner Failed to Establish that the Code V Analysis Essential to All Grounds Was Possible at the Time of the Invention 19

C. Petitioner's Use of Tada in All Grounds is Based on Impermissible Hindsight 22

D. None of Petitioner's Grounds Addressed Whether Tada, As Modified, Would Satisfy its Express Operational Conditions 28

E. Petitioner Failed to Meet its Burden to Show Claim 21 Would Have Been Obvious Over Tada Alone (Ground 1) 30

1. Petitioner's Theory of Obviousness for Ranges Simply Being "Close Enough" is Legally Incorrect 30

2. Petitioner's Alleged Reason to Modify Tada is Conclusory and Based on Hindsight Rather than Actual Evidence 32

DOCKET ALARM Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

F. Petitioner Failed to Meet Its Burden on Grounds 2 and 3 By Glossing Over the Clear *Teaching Away* from the Claimed Invention by Nagaoka and Baker 36

1. Petitioner Ignored Nagaoka's Overall *Teaching Away* from Image Point Distribution Functions Having Unsatisfactory Image Heights at the Periphery 37

2. Petitioner Grossly Mischaracterized Baker's Teachings to Detract from Baker's Clear Focus on Peripheral Content Enhancement 40

VII. CONCLUSION 44

DOCKET ALARM Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Federal Cases

Belden Inc. v. Berk-Tek LLC,
805 F.3d 1064 (Fed. Cir. 2015) 35

Cheese Sys., Inc. v. Tetra Pak Cheese and Powder Sys., Inc.,
725 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2013) 22

In re Fulton,
391 F.3d 1195 (Fed. Cir. 2004) 39, 41

Galderma Labs., L.P. v. Tolmar, Inc.,
737 F.3d 731 (Fed. Cir. 2013) 38, 41

In re Gordon,
733 F.2d 900 (Fed. Cir. 1984) 28

In re Hedges,
783 F.2d 1038 (Fed. Cir. 1986) 27

Intelligent Bio-Sys., Inc. v Illumina Cambridge Ltd.,
821 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016) 18

InTouch Techs., Inc. v. VGO Commc'ns, Inc.,
751 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2014) 18

KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.,
550 U.S. 398 (2007).....*passim*

In re Magnum Oil Tools Int'l, Ltd.,
829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016) 18

Metalcraft of Mayville, Inc. v. The Toro Co.,
848 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2017) 22

Panduit Corp. v. Dennison Mfg. Co.,
810 F.2d 1561 (Fed. Cir. 1987) 37

PersonalWeb Techs., LLC v. Apple, Inc.,
848 F.3d 987 (Fed. Cir. 2017) 24

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

In re Peterson,
315, F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2003) 30, 31

Polaris Indus. v. Arctic Cat, Inc.,
882 F.3d 1056 (Fed. Cir. 2018) 18

In re Royka,
490 F.2d 981 (CCPA 1974) 17

Titanium Metals Corp. of Am. v. Banner,
778 F.2d 775 (Fed. Cir. 1985) 30, 31

WBIP, LLC v. Kohler Co.,
829 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2016) 24

In re Wesslau,
353 F.2d 238 (CCPA 1965) 27

Yeda Research & Dev. Co. v. Mylan Pharm., Inc.,
906 F.3d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 2018) 24

Patent Trial and Appeal Board Cases

Air Liquide Large Indus. U.S. LP v. Praxair Tech., Inc.,
IPR2016-01079, Paper 14 (Nov. 21, 2016) 21

Gen. Plastic Indus. Co., Ltd. v. Canon Inc.,
IPR2015-01954, Paper 9 (Mar. 9, 2016) 28

Johns Manville Corp. v. Knauf Insulation, Inc.,
IPR2018-00827, Paper 9 (Oct. 16, 2018)(informative).....36

Kinetic Techs., Inc. v. Skyworks Solutions, Inc.,
IPR2014-00529, Paper 8 (Sep. 23, 2014) 36

Panduit Corp. v. Corning Optical Commc'ns LLC,
IPR2017-00528, Paper 7 (May 30, 2017).....17

Federal Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 103 20

35 U.S.C. § 314 17

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKET ALARM

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.