

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

SAMSUNG DISPLAY CO., LTD.,  
Petitioner

v.

SOLAS OLED, LTD.,  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2020-00320  
Patent No. 7.446,338

---

**PATENT OWNER RESPONSE**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I.	<u>Introduction</u> .....	1
II.	<u>Samsung’s Theories and Assertions Under Ground I-- Obviousness Over Kobayashi in View of Shirasaki—Fail as a Matter of Law</u> .....	3
A.	Merely Showing Supposed Interconnections <i>Formed Anywhere Above a Surface</i> of A Substrate—as Samsung Admittedly Did—Does Not Show “Interconnections <i>Formed to Project From</i> ” That Surface .....	3
B.	Samsung Also Fails to Show the Supposed Pixel Electrodes “Arrayed Along” Any Interconnections—and Samsung’s Theories Render That Separate Claim Requirement Meaningless .....	12
III.	<u>Samsung’s Theories and Assertions Under Ground II-- Obviousness Over Childs in View of Shirasaki—Fail For Similar Reasons</u> .....	21
A.	Samsung Plainly Does Not and Cannot Show “a plurality of pixel electrodes “on the surface of the transistor array substrate” ....	21
B.	Samsung Again Also Fails to Show the Supposed Pixel Electrodes “Arrayed Along” Any Interconnections—and Petitioner’s Theories Render That Separate Claim Requirement Meaningless .....	25
IV.	Conclusion.....	28

**PATENT OWNER'S EXHIBIT LIST**

<b>Ex.</b>	<b>Description</b>
2001	United States Patent Application Publication 2004/0256617 A1
2002	Defendants' Responsive Claim Construction Brief
2003	Defendants' Claim Construction Presentation
2004	Solas's Notice of Agreement on Previously Disputed Claim Construction Terms
2005	Declaration of Richard A. Flasck
2006	<i>Curriculum Vitae</i> of Richard A. Flasck
2007	Transcript of Deposition of Dr. Adam Fontecchio on September 11, 2020
2008	The New Oxford American Dictionary (2d ed. 2005)

## I. Introduction

On Ground 1, Samsung's Reply only further exposes the fact that Samsung has failed to show a plurality of interconnections "formed to *project from*" a surface of the transistor array substrate." In its first ground, Samsung relies solely on Kobayashi to satisfy this express claim requirement and all of 1[b], for that matter. But even a cursory glance at Kobayashi shows that Samsung's theories must fail. That is because, whatever spatial relationships Kobayashi's supposed interconnections have with the surface of the transistor array substrate, they demonstrably do not "*project from*" that surface. This claim requirement—"project from" has a meaning -Each word must means something. The element is not "formed to project upward, from a surface" or formed away from a surface" or "formed to project with respect to a surface" or something as broad as (d) above...". Instead, it is formed "to project from a surface."

This is where Samsung's problems become insurmountable, because its theories rest on an interpretation that is several steps broader and more dissimilar to the actual claim requirement than either (a) – (c) above. As Samsung's expert admitted during deposition, to make Kobayashi satisfy the claim requirements, Samsung misinterpreted the actually claimed phrase, formed to "*project from a surface*" to merely require that the interconnections are (d) formed anywhere "*above*" a surface:

That is not the only fatal problem under Ground 1. Applying the parties' *agreed* construction, Samsung's Reply makes at least Samsung's failure to show the (i) "***arrayed along***" claim requirement abundantly clear. Samsung admits that 117 is not coplanar with 118. Indeed, 117 and 118 ***do not share any overlapping layers*** in the formation of the entire package. Reply at 20

Samsung's Ground 2 fares no better. Childs does not satisfy the "Lower" electrodes (green) are not "on the surface" of the transistor array substrate (orange). (*Id.*) Instead, large portions of the pixel electrodes are buried ***under and in the alleged substrate***. (*Id.*) One look at the patent specification proves this beyond reasonable debate. While Samsung expressly relies in Figure 2, the reference makes clear that the lower electrode 21 is not on any surface of the substrate. Just the opposite is true. Childs clearly explains that The "Figures 2 and 3 illustrate a LED construction in which the lower electrode 21 is formed as a thin film ***in the circuit substrate 100***. Indeed, it then states that "the subsequently-deposited organic semiconductor material 22 contacts this thin-film electrode layer 21 at a window 12a in a planar insulating layer 12 (for example

And again, as with Ground 1, even if not in the same plane or layer, the separate "arrayed along" requirement must imply being adjacent to one another and some overlap in at least one of the interconnections. And in sharp contrast to the

# 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.