

Paper No. _____

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

COREPHOTONICS, LTD.,
Patent Owner

IPR2020-00896
Patent No. 10,317,647

PETITIONER'S REPLY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction.....1

II. Claims 1-3 and 5 are unpatentable over Iwasaki’s Example 4.1

III. Claims 1 and 4 are obvious over Ogino’s Example 5 in view of
Bareau.1

A. A POSITA would have been motivated to modify the L2
lens of Ogino’s Example 5 based on Chen II.....1

B. Dr. Sasián used the same techniques that a POSITA would
have used to generate the modified Ogino Example 5.....5

C. Manufacturing considerations are not required by claims 1
and 4 nor can they be imported to avoid unpatentability.6

1. Patent Owner seeks to import manufacturing
requirements into claims where there are none.6

2. Patent Owner’s arguments contradict statements
made in a related case, and supported by a different
expert, that lens design is separate from
manufacturing.8

3. Dr. Milster admits that a POSITA would have
designed lenses for purposes other than mass
production manufacturing.....10

4. Manufacturing considerations are preferences, and
do not show that lenses cannot be physically
produced.....11

5. Whether a prior art lens design is finished is not
relevant to the claims.12

D. Patent Owner’s arguments about differences in relative
illumination plots for the Example 5 lens are irrelevant.....13

IV. Claims 2, 3, 5, and 8-11 are obvious over Ogino’s Example 5 in
view of Chen II and Bareau.....15

A.	A POSITA would have been motivated to modify Ogino's Example 5 as discussed in the Petition.	15
B.	Dr. Sasián used the same techniques that a POSITA would have used to generate the first and second modified Example 5.....	16
C.	The modified Example 5 designs do not include overlapping lenses.	18
D.	Manufacturing considerations are not required by claims 2, 3, 5, and 8-11, nor can they be imported to avoid unpatentability.	20
V.	Claim 6 is obvious over Ogino's Example 5 in view of Chen II, Bateau, and Kingslake.	21
A.	A POSITA would have been motivated to generate the third modified Ogino's Example 5, as discussed in the Petition.....	21
B.	The third modified Example 5 does not include overlapping lenses.	23
C.	Manufacturing considerations are not required by claim 6, nor can they be imported to avoid unpatentability.....	25
D.	The claims do not include relative illumination requirements.	26
VI.	Claim 7 is obvious over Hsieh and Beich.	27
A.	Manufacturing considerations such as tolerances and desensitization are not required by claim 7.....	27
B.	The combination of Hsieh and Beich does not require modifications to meet the limitations of claim 7.....	27
VII.	Claim 12 is obvious over Chen, Iwasaki, and Beich.....	28
A.	The combination of Chen, Iwasaki, and Beich teaches all of the limitations of claim 12 as well as claim 8, from which claim 12 depends.	28

VIII. Conclusion33
IX. Certificate of Word Count34

PETITIONER'S EXHIBIT LIST

Updated: June 21, 2021

APPL-1001	U.S. Patent No. 10,317,647
APPL-1002	Prosecution History of U.S. Patent No. 10,317,647
APPL-1003	Declaration of José Sasián, Ph.D., under 37 C.F.R. § 1.68
APPL-1004	Curriculum Vitae of José Sasián, Ph.D.
APPL-1005	U.S. Patent No. 9,128,267 to Ogino et al. ("Ogino")
APPL-1006	Warren J. Smith, MODERN LENS DESIGN (1992) ("Smith")
APPL-1007	William S. Beich et al., "Polymer Optics: A manufacturer's perspective on the factors that contribute to successful programs," SPIE Proceedings Volume 7788, Polymer Optics Design, Fabrication, and Materials (August 12, 2010), https://doi.org/10.1117/12.861364 ("Beich")
APPL-1008	U.S. Patent No. 7,777,972 to Chen et al. ("Chen")
APPL-1009	U.S. Patent No. 9,678,310 to Iwasaki et al. ("Iwasaki")
APPL-1010	Max Born et al., PRINCIPLES OF OPTICS, 6 th Ed. (1980) ("Born")
APPL-1011	Prosecution history of U.S. Patent No. 9,128,267 to Ogino
APPL-1012	Jane Bateau et al., "The optics of miniature digital camera modules," SPIE Proceedings Volume 6342, <i>International Optical Design Conference 2006</i> ; 63421F (2006) https://doi.org/10.1117/12.692291 ("Bateau")
APPL-1013	Rudolf Kingslake, OPTICS IN PHOTOGRAPHY (1992) ("Kingslake")
APPL-1014	U.S. Patent No. 7,859,588 to Parulski et al. ("Parulski")
APPL-1015	Japanese Patent Pub. No. JP2013106289 to Konno et al. and certified English translation
APPL-1016	Bruce J. Walker, OPTICAL ENGINEERING FUNDAMENTALS (1995) ("Walker")

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.