

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
WACO DIVISION**

SOLAS OLED LTD.,

*Plaintiff,*

v.

LG DISPLAY CO., LTD.,  
LG ELECTRONICS, INC., and  
SONY CORPORATION,

*Defendants.*

Case No. 6:19-cv-00236-ADA

**SOLAS'S OPENING CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b><i>I. INTRODUCTION</i></b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b><i>II. BACKGROUND OF ASSERTED PATENTS</i></b> .....	<b>2</b>
A. U.S. Patent No. 7,907,137 (“137 Patent”).....	2
B. U.S. Patent No. 7,432,891 (“891 patent”).....	2
C. U.S. Patent No. 7,573,068 (“068 Patent”).....	3
<b><i>III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION PRINCIPLES</i></b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b><i>IV. DISPUTED TERMS FOR ‘137 PATENT</i></b> .....	<b>5</b>
A. “a gradation current having a current value” (‘137 patent claims 10, 36) .....	5
B. “gradation signal” (‘137 patent claims 10, 15, 36, 37, 39 ) .....	8
C. “generates, as the gradation signal, a non-light emitting display voltage having a predetermined voltage value” (‘137 patent claim 15) “a non-light emitting display voltage having a predetermined voltage value for allowing the optical element to perform a non-light emitting operation is generated as the gradation signal (‘137 patent claim 39) .....	10
D. “. . . through a data line . . . through the data line . . . through the data line” (‘137 patent claims 10, 16) .....	13
E. “before” (‘137 patent claim 10) / “after” (‘137 patent claim 36).....	15
<b><i>V. DISPUTED TERMS FOR ‘891 PATENT</i></b> .....	<b>15</b>
A. “a third thin film transistor which during driving its gate through a driving conductor taps a diode driving current at an output of said first current-driving transistor and supplies a current measuring- and voltage regulating circuit, said current measuring- and voltage regulating circuit providing to the data conductor a voltage signal which is dependent on a current measuring result and a voltage comparison” (‘891 patent claims 10, 15, 36, 37, 39).....	15
B. “current measuring” (‘891 patent claims 1, 3) .....	17
C. “wherein all above mentioned elements of the driving circuit are located at a same side of said light emitting diode” (‘891 patent claim 3).....	19
<b><i>VI. DISPUTED TERMS FOR ‘068 PATENT</i></b> .....	<b>22</b>
A. “formed on said plurality of supply lines along said plurality of supply lines” (‘068 patent claim 1) “connected to said plurality of supply lines along said plurality of supply lines” (‘068 patent claim 13) .....	22
B. “patterned” (‘068 patent claims 1, 13) .....	24
C. “patterned together” (‘068 patent claims 1, 13).....	26
D. “signal lines” (‘068 patent claims 1, 13).....	28
E. “feed interconnections” (‘068 patent claims 1, 10, 12, 13, 17) .....	29

## TABLE OF EXHIBITS AND ABBREVIATIONS

Ex <sup>1</sup>	Document Description	Abbreviation
1	Declaration of Richard A. Flasck in support of Solas's opening claim construction brief	Flasck. Decl.
2	U.S. Patent No. 7,907,137	'137 patent
3	U.S. Patent No. 7,432,891	'891 patent
4	U.S. Patent No. 7,573,068	'068 patent
5	Parties' joint revised list of terms/constructions dated March 6, 2020	Joint Chart
6	Microsoft Computer Dictionary (3rd ed., 1997), definition of "signal"	MS Dict.
7	McGraw-Hill Dictionary of Scientific and Technical Terms (4th ed., 1989), definition of "data transmission line"	McGraw-Hill
8	Merriam-Webster Dictionary (avail. at <a href="http://www.merriam-webster.com">www.merriam-webster.com</a> , accessed Feb 2020), definitions of "along" and "together"	Merriam-Webster
9	Dictionary.com (avail. at <a href="http://www.dictionary.com">www.dictionary.com</a> , accessed Feb. 2020), definitions of "along" and "together"	Dictionary.com
10	Defendant LG Display's petition for <i>inter partes</i> review in IPR2020-00177 on the '891 patent	'891 IPR Pet.
11	Defendant LG Display's expert declaration by Dr. Hatalis in <i>inter partes review</i> in IPR2020-00177 on the '891 patent	'891 IPR Decl.
12	U.S. Patent No. 5,106,652	'652 patent
13	U.S. Patent No. 5,981,317	'317 patent
14	U.S. Patent Appl. Pub. No. 2002/0101172	'173 app. pub.
15	U.S. Patent No. 7,250,722	'722 patent

<sup>1</sup> All exhibits attached to the concurrently filed declaration of Neil A. Rubin.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Plaintiff Solas OLED Ltd. (“Solas”) and Defendants LG Display Co., LTD., LG Electronics, Inc., and Sony Corporation (collectively, “Defendants”) offer not just competing claim-construction proposals but completely different approaches to claim construction.

In each case, Solas’s claim term proposals stay faithful to the plain meaning and narrow from that plain meaning only when necessary under controlling Federal Circuit law or when helpful to narrow the disputes for the Court. Solas’s proposals are also the only ones that are faithful to the full scope of the intrinsic record—and the only ones that are supported by expert opinion on what a person of skill in the art would understand the terms to mean in light of the intrinsic and extrinsic record.

Defendants’ proposals, on the other hand, ask this Court to recharacterize and burden clear terms by importing artificial and extraneous baggage, but Defendants cannot point to any clear or unmistakable disclaimer or lexicography to support those importations, which invites reversible error. *E.g., JVV Enters. v. Interact Accessories, Inc.*, 424 F.3d 1324, 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2005). Indeed, in many cases, Defendants actually import negative limitations, but those are only appropriate where the limitation is expressly disclaimed or where independent lexicography in the written description” justifies adding it. *Omega Eng’g, Inc. v. Raytek Corp.*, 334 F.3d 1314, 1322-23 (Fed. Cir. 2003). And that is not the case here. To the contrary, many of Defendants’ proposals are inconsistent with—and even exclude—embodiments taught in the specification. Such constructions are “rarely, if ever, correct.” *SanDisk Corp. v. Memorex Prods.*, 415 F.3d 1278, 1285-86 (Fed. Cir. 2005). For other proposals, Defendants’ proposed constructions are inconsistent with the claim language itself. These are also improper under controlling law—and do nothing to help any fact-finder, but rather only make that job more difficult. They should be rejected.

## II. BACKGROUND OF ASSERTED PATENTS<sup>2</sup>

### A. U.S. Patent No. 7,907,137 (“’137 Patent”)

The ’137 patent concerns driving circuitry for self-luminous displays that emit light due to the current flowing through pixel elements, such as displays utilizing organic electroluminescent or LED elements. ’137 patent at 1:17–26, 36–43. The current flowing through such devices is commonly controlled by a gate voltage on a drive transistor. *Id.* at 3:15–30. But the relationship between the gate voltage and the current may change “depending on the usage time, the drive history and the like,” and in particular the minimum “threshold voltage” on the gate necessary to permit current flow may shift. *Id.* The ’137 patent provides structures and methods for driving the pixel circuits that solve problems in the prior art, including by detecting the threshold voltage for each pixel and applying a “compensation voltage” that compensates for such differences in such threshold voltages. *Id.* at 3:59–65, Fig. 1.

### B. U.S. Patent No. 7,432,891 (“’891 patent”)

The ’891 patent concerns an active matrix drive circuit with current feedback for an organic light-emitting diode (OLED) image seen. ’891 patent at Abstract, 1:5–61. The patent addresses a well-known problem with such circuits: “manufacturing-dependent fluctuations of the parameters of the thin film transistors” affect the amount of current provided to each OLED. *Id.* These differences may cause OLEDs to emit different amounts of light. *Id.*

Prior-art solutions used feedback to compensate for differences in drive transistors but used at least four transistors in the drive circuit, and/or drive circuit elements on both sides of the diode, making manufacturing difficult. *Id.* at 2:22–31, 2:45–53. The ’891 patent solves the problem by disclosing a novel drive circuit that requires “only three thin film transistors” and a “current

---

<sup>2</sup> For further technology background *see* Flasck Decl. ¶¶ 21–47.

# 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.