

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

APPLE INC.  
Petitioner

v.

MAXELL, LTD.  
Patent Owner

---

Case No. IPR2020-00597  
U.S. Patent No. 8,339,493

---

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW  
OF U.S. PATENT NO. 8,339,493**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>I.</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>II.</b>	<b>THE '493 PATENT .....</b>	<b>1</b>
	A. DESCRIPTION OF THE ALLEGED INVENTION OF THE '493 PATENT .....	1
	B. PRIORITY DATE OF THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS .....	2
	C. SUMMARY OF UNPATENTABILITY OF THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS .....	2
	D. LEVEL OF SKILL OF A POSITA .....	3
	E. OPINIONS OF A POSITA .....	3
<b>III.</b>	<b>REQUIREMENTS FOR IPR UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.104.....</b>	<b>4</b>
	A. GROUNDS FOR STANDING UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(A) .....	4
	B. IDENTIFICATION OF CHALLENGE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(B) AND RELIEF REQUESTED .....	4
	C. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(B)(3) .....	5
	1. Claim 1: “effective scanning lines...of a display screen” .....	5
	2. Claims 1, 3-5, and 10: “mixing...signal charges accumulated in the N number of vertically arranged pixel lines”/“mixed...from the N number of vertically arranged pixel lines” .....	6
	3. Claims 4, 6, and 11: “an image-instability detector” .....	6
	4. Claims 4, 6, and 11: “an image-instability of the electric camera” .....	6
<b>IV.</b>	<b>THE BOARD’S DISCRETION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 314(A).....</b>	<b>7</b>
	A. APPLICATION OF THE <i>GENERAL PLASTIC</i> FACTORS .....	7
	B. APPLE HAS NOT DELAYED IN FILING THIS PETITION .....	10
<b>V.</b>	<b><i>CASIO</i> IS A PRINTED PUBLICATION AVAILABLE AS PRIOR ART TO THE '493 PATENT .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>VI.</b>	<b>SHOWING OF ANALOGOUS PRIOR ART .....</b>	<b>17</b>
	A. <i>CASIO</i> IS ANALOGOUS PRIOR ART .....	17
	B. <i>JUEN</i> IS ANALOGOUS PRIOR ART .....	18
	C. <i>TAKASE</i> IS ANALOGOUS PRIOR ART .....	18
	D. <i>MISAWA</i> IS ANALOGOUS PRIOR ART .....	19
<b>VII.</b>	<b>GROUND 1: THERE IS A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD CLAIMS 1, 3, 5, AND 10 ARE OBVIOUS OVER <i>CASIO</i> IN VIEW OF <i>JUEN</i> .....</b>	<b>20</b>
	A. CLAIM 1 .....	20
	1. Claim 1 [Preamble] .....	20

2.	Claim 1(a).....	22
3.	Claim 1(b).....	28
4.	Claim 1(c).....	32
5.	Claim 1(d).....	34
6.	Claim 1(e).....	44
7.	Claim 1(f).....	48
8.	Mapping for the Same “Signal Processing Unit” of Claim 1(b) Performing the Functionality Recited in Claims 1(d)-1(f).....	52
B.	CLAIM 3 .....	56
C.	CLAIM 5 .....	57
1.	Claim 5 [Preamble].....	57
2.	Claim 5(a).....	57
3.	Claim 5(b).....	57
4.	Claim 5(c).....	57
5.	Claim 5(d).....	57
6.	Claim 5(e).....	58
7.	Claim 5(f).....	58
D.	CLAIM 10 .....	60
1.	Claim 10 [Preamble].....	60
2.	Claim 10(a).....	60
3.	Claim 10(b).....	61
4.	Claim 10(c).....	61
5.	Claim 10(d).....	61
6.	Claim 10(e).....	66
7.	Claim 10(f).....	67
8.	Claim 10(g).....	67

<b>VIII. GROUND 2: THERE IS A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD CLAIM 4 IS OBVIOUS OVER <i>CASIO</i> IN VIEW OF <i>JUEN</i> IN FURTHER VIEW OF <i>TAKASE</i> .....</b>	<b>68</b>
A. CLAIM 4(A).....	68
B. CLAIM 4(B).....	70

<b>IX.</b>	<b>GROUND 3: THERE IS A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD CLAIMS 6 AND 11 ARE OBVIOUS OVER <i>CASIO</i> IN VIEW OF <i>JUEN</i> IN FURTHER VIEW OF <i>MISAWA</i></b> .....	<b>74</b>
A.	CLAIM 6 .....	74
1.	Claim 6(a).....	74
2.	Claim 6(b).....	76
B.	CLAIM 11 .....	79
<b>X.</b>	<b>CONCLUSION</b> .....	<b>80</b>
<b>XI.</b>	<b>MANDATORY NOTICES UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(A)(1)</b> .....	<b>81</b>
A.	REAL PARTY-IN-INTEREST .....	81
B.	RELATED MATTERS .....	81
C.	LEAD AND BACK-UP COUNSEL .....	82

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases:

<i>Cuozzo Speed Techs. v. Lee</i> , 136 S. Ct. 2131 (2016).....	12
<i>Eli Lilly and Co. v. Los Angeles Biomedical Research Inst.</i> , 849 F.3d 1073 (Fed. Cir. 2017) .....	3
<i>General Plastic Indus. Co., Ltd. v. Canon Kabushiki Kaisha</i> , IPR2016- 01357, slip op. (PTAB Sept. 6, 2017) .....	7, 10
<i>Hulu, LLC v. Sound View Innovations, LLC</i> , IPR2018-01039, Paper 29 (PTAB Dec. 20, 2019).....	13
<i>In re Wyer</i> , 655 F.2d 221 (C.C.P.A. 1981).....	13
<i>Olympus Corp., et al. v. Maxell, Ltd.</i> , IPR2018-00904, Paper 9 (PTAB December 26, 2018).....	7
<i>Philips Elec. &amp; Pharm. Indus. Corp. v. Thermal &amp; Elecs. Indus., Inc.</i> , 450 F.2d 1164 (3d Cir. 1971).....	13
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	5
<i>RPX Corp., et al. v. Iridescent Networks, Inc.</i> , IPR2018-00254, Paper 20 (PTAB Dec. 10, 2018) .....	13
<i>Samsung Elecs. Co. v. Infobridge Pte. Ltd.</i> , 929 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	13
<i>Sandoz Inc. v. Abbvie Biotechnology Ltd.</i> , IPR2018-00156, Paper 11 (PTAB Jun. 5, 2018) .....	13
<i>Silicon Labs., Inc. v. Cresta Tech. Corp.</i> , IPR2015-00615, Paper 9 (PTAB Aug. 14, 2015).....	12
<i>Valeo North America, Inc. v. Magna Elec., Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00251, Paper 18 (PTAB May 26, 2016) .....	3
<i>ZTE Corp., et al. v. Maxell, Ltd.</i> , IPR2018-00236, Paper 2 (PTAB November 22, 2017) .....	7

# 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.