

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 RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.120

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.....	14
C. Baker.....	18
IV. PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	20
V. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	20
VI. PETITIONER FAILED TO DEMONSTRATE BY A PREPONDERANCE OF EVIDENCE THAT CLAIM 21 OF THE ‘990 PATENT IS UNPATENTABLE.....	21
A. Legal Standards	21
B. Use of Zemax Optical Design Program	23
C. Obviousness Over Tada Alone.....	24
1. Petitioner Relied Exclusively on One Tada Embodiment Containing a Readily Apparent Error Which Cannot Form the Basis of Any Obviousness Ground.....	24
2. Even Ignoring Embodiment 3’s Clear Error, Dr. Chipman’s Approach is Flawed in Concept and Execution, Leading Away from Obviousness	40
a. A POSA Does Not Routinely or Ordinarily Perform the Analysis Dr. Chipman Suggests.....	41
b. Dr. Chipman’s Data is Exaggerated by Relying on Chief Rays when More Precision is Required	44

- c. Dr. Chipman’s Data is Exaggerated by Inexplicably and Incompletely Analyzing the 380 nm Wavelength.....47
- d. A Proper Analysis of Tada’s Image Point Distribution Function Shows its Maximum Divergence is NOT as Close to 10% as Dr. Chipman’s Flawed Data Suggests.....51
- 3. A POSA Would Not, as a Matter of Routine Experimentation, Increase Distortion to Enhance Tada’s Alleged “Intermediate Zone”56
- D. Petitioner Failed to Show by a Preponderance of Evidence that Claim 21 is Obvious Over Tada and Nagaoka62
 - 1. Because Petitioner Relied on Tada’s Readily Apparent Error, Its Asserted Ground 2 is Deficient.....62
 - 2. Nagaoka *Teaches Away* from Image Point Distribution Functions Having Compressed Image Heights at the Periphery63
- E. Petitioner Failed to Show by a Preponderance of Evidence that Claim 21 is Obvious Over Tada and Baker.....66
 - 1. Because Petitioner Relied on Tada’s Readily Apparent Error, Its Asserted Ground 3 is Deficient.....67
 - 2. Petitioner Grossly Mischaracterized Baker’s Teachings to Detract from Baker’s Clear Focus on Peripheral Content Enhancement.....68

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Ex parte Burger</i> , No. 2009-004196 (B.P.A.I. Oct. 27, 2009)	39
<i>Custom Accessories, Inc. v. Jeffrey-Allan Indus.</i> , 807 F.2d 955 (Fed. Cir. 1986)	30
<i>Ex parte Darr</i> , Appeal 2011-011436 (P.T.A.B. October 21, 2013).....	39
<i>Depuy Spine, Inc. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc.</i> , 567 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	23
<i>Dynamic Drinkware, LLC v. Nat’l Graphics, Inc.</i> , 800 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	21
<i>In re Fulton</i> , 391 F.3d 1195 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	23, 65, 69
<i>Galderma Labs., L.P. v. Tolmar, Inc.</i> , 737 F.3d 731 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	23, 65, 69
<i>Harmonic Inc. v. Avid Tech., Inc.</i> , 815 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	21
<i>In re Hedges</i> , 783 F.2d 1038 (Fed. Cir. 1986)	60
<i>Intelligent Bio-Sys., Inc. v Illumina Cambridge Ltd.</i> , 821 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	22
<i>InTouch Techs., Inc. v. VGO Commc’ns, Inc.</i> , 751 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	22
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>In re Magnum Oil Tools Int’l, Ltd.</i> , 829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	22

<i>Ex parte Nutalapati</i> , Appeal 2018-004192 (P.T.A.B. July 29, 2019).....	39
<i>Ex parte Okuda</i> , Appeal 2009-015032 (B.P.A.I. May 27, 2010)	39
<i>Panduit Corp. v. Corning Optical Commc 'ns LLC</i> , IPR2017-00528, Paper 7 (May 30, 2017).....	21
<i>Panduit Corp. v. Dennison Mfg. Co.</i> , 810 F.2d 1561 (Fed. Cir. 1987)	61, 63, 68
<i>Polaris Indus. v. Arctic Cat, Inc.</i> , 882 F.3d 1056 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	22
<i>In re Royka</i> , 490 F.2d 981 (CCPA 1974)	21
<i>U.S. Surgical Corp. v. Ethicon, Inc.</i> , 103 F.3d 1554 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	43
<i>In re Wesslau</i> , 353 F.2d 238 (CCPA 1965)	61
<i>In re Yale</i> , 434 F.2d 666 (CCPA 1970)	38, 63, 67
Statutes	
35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(3).....	21
35 U.S.C. § 316(e)	21

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.