

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. Summary of Grounds 1

II. The '338 Patent (Ex. 1001) 1

 A. Summary of '338 Patent..... 1

 B. Elements of '338 Patent 5

 1. Multi-transistor OLED Circuit 5

 2. Low Resistance Electrodes 5

 3. Color Display 6

 C. '338 Patent Claims 6

 D. '338 Patent Prosecution History..... 9

III. Person of Ordinary Skill in The Art 11

IV. Claim Construction..... 12

V. Ground I: Obviousness Over Kobayashi and Shirasaki 13

 A. Overview of Kobayashi (Ex. 1003) 13

 B. Overview of Shirasaki (Ex. 1004)..... 15

 C. Failure to Show Why One Skilled in the Art Would Be
Motivated to Combine Kobayashi with Shirasaki as Proposed
by Petitioner 17

 1. Kobayashi and Shirasaki are directed to different problems, and a
 POSITA with Kobayashi would not be motivated to look to
 Shirasaki as Petitioner proposes 17

 2. Petitioner’s arguments that Kobayashi and Shirasaki both disclose
 OLEDs or TFTs are insufficient to show motivation to combine 19

 3. Petitioner’s other arguments fail and mischaracterize what
 Shirasaki actually teaches or suggests. 20

 D. Failure to Show *How* One Skilled in the Art Would Have
Combined Kobayashi with Shirasaki as Proposed by Petitioner
or that One Skilled in the Art Would Have a Reasonable
Expectation of Success..... 23

 E. Failure to Show that the Combination of Kobayashi in View of
Shirasaki Satisfies Limitation 1[b]: “a plurality of

interconnections which are formed to project from a surface of the transistor array substrate, and which are arrayed in parallel to each other” 26

F. Failure to Show that the Combination of Kobayashi in View of Shirasaki Satisfies Limitation 1[c]: “a plurality of pixel electrodes for the plurality of pixels, respectively, the pixel electrodes being arrayed along the interconnections between the interconnections on the surface of the transistor array substrate”..... 31

VI. Ground II: Obviousness Over Childs and Shirasaki..... 33

A. Overview of Childs (Ex. 1005) 33

B. Failure to Show Why One Skilled in the Art Would Be Motivated to Combine Childs with Shirasaki as Proposed by Petitioner 35

1. Childs and Shirasaki are directed to different problems, and POSITA with Childs would not be motivated to look to Shirasaki as Petitioner proposes 35

2. Petitioner’s arguments that Childs and Shirasaki are similar are insufficient to show motivation to combine 36

3. Petitioner’s other arguments fail and mischaracterize what Shirasaki actually teaches or suggests. 37

C. Failure to Show *How* One Skilled in the Art Would Have Combined Kobayashi with Shirasaki as Proposed by Petitioner or that One Skilled in the Art Would Have a Reasonable Expectation of Success..... 40

D. Failure to Show that the Combination of Kobayashi in View of Shirasaki Satisfies Limitation 1[c]: “a plurality of pixel electrodes for the plurality of pixels, respectively, the pixel electrodes being arrayed along the interconnections between the interconnections on the surface of the transistor array substrate”..... 43

VII. Conclusion..... 48

PATENT OWNER'S EXHIBIT LIST

Ex.	Description
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. Summary of Grounds

Petitioner challenges claims 1–3 and 5–13 of U.S. Patent 7,446,338 (“’338 patent,” Exhibit 1001) under two grounds (Pet. at 10–11):

- Ground I: Claims 1–2, 5–6, and 9–11 are obvious over the combination of Kobayashi and Shirasaki.
- Ground II: Claims 1–3 and 5–13 are obvious over the combination of Childs and Shirasaki.

For the reasons below, Petitioner has not shown unpatentability under either ground and the Board should affirm the validity of the challenged claims.

II. The '338 Patent (Ex. 1001)¹

A. Summary of '338 Patent

The '338 patent, titled “Display Panel,” was filed by T. Shirasaki, et al. on Sept. 26, 2005 and issued on Nov. 4, 2008. It claims a priority date of Sept. 29, 2004.

Casio, the original assignee of the '338 patent was a pioneer in the development of practical and high performing displays utilizing organic light emitting diodes (OLEDs). The '338 patent concerns display panels with light-emitting elements, such as organic electroluminescent display panels. (Ex. 1001,

¹ See Ex. 2001, Declaration of Richard A. Flasck (“Flasck Decl.”) ¶¶ 33–63.

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.