

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

SOLAS OLED LTD.,

*Plaintiff,*

v.

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

LG DISPLAY CO., LTD., a Korean  
corporation  
LG ELECTRONICS, INC., a Korean  
corporation  
and SONY CORPORATION, a  
Japanese corporation,

*Defendants.*

**PLAINTIFF SOLAS OLED LTD.’S SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL  
RESPONSES AND OBJECTIONS TO DEFENDANTS’  
FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES (NOS. 1-17)**

Pursuant to Rules 26 and 33 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiff Solas OLED Ltd. (“Solas”) hereby objects and responds to Defendants LG Display Co., Ltd, LG Electronics, Inc and Sony Corporation’s (collectively “Defendants”) First Set of Interrogatories as follows:

**I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

Discovery in this matter is still ongoing. Solas is presently pursuing its investigation and analysis of the facts and law relating to this case and has not completed such investigation or preparation for trial. Therefore, these responses and objections, while based on diligent factual exploration by Solas and its counsel, reflect only Solas’s current state of knowledge, understanding and belief with regard to the matters about which inquiry has been made. Solas anticipates that,

interrogatory may be determined, including at least the following: SOLAS\_LG\_0013269; SOLAS\_LG\_0013371; SOLAS\_LG\_0019653-686; SOLAS\_LG\_0003213-3234; SOLAS\_LG\_0003149-3153; SOLAS\_LG\_0019644-19650; SOLAS\_LG\_0003146-48.

Solas's investigation is ongoing; Solas reserves the right to modify or supplement this response should additional information become available.

**SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 9 (OCT. 15, 2020):**

Solas further responds as follows. Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 33(d), Solas identifies the following documents from which information responsive to this interrogatory may be determined: SOLAS\_LG\_0021883-SOLAS\_LG\_0021892.

Solas's investigation is ongoing; Solas reserves the right to modify or supplement this response should additional information become available.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 10:**

For each Asserted Claim of the Asserted Patents, identify on an element-by-element basis all evidence, including portions of the specifications of the Asserted Patents and of any related patents or applications cited by page, column and line number (where relevant) and/or by reference to figures and their reference numerals (where relevant), that You contend provide sufficient written description support under 35 U.S.C. § 112 for that element.

**RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 10:**

Solas objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome. Solas objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is impermissibly compound. Solas further objects to this interrogatory to the extent that it seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege, the work product doctrine, or any other applicable privilege. Solas further objects to this request because it prematurely seeks disclosure of expert opinion. Solas further

objects that this interrogatory seeks contentions on a matter upon which Defendants bear the burden of proof by clear and convincing evidence. Defendants' invalidity contentions fail to sustain any burden as to this issue and fail to adequately set forth with particularity any contention that the asserted claims lack written description support.

Subject to and without waiving its specific or general objections, Solas responds as follows. Any contentions regarding written description at this stage of the litigation must necessarily be preliminary, both because written description is the proper subject of expert analysis, and because conclusions regarding written description require consideration of all, or at least a substantial portion, of the relevant evidence. An expert opinion on written description would be premature at this point at least because Defendants have not yet served their expert reports detailing their theories as to the alleged inadequacy of the written description of the Asserted Claims. Defendants carry the burden of proof to show that the Asserted Claims lack adequate written description, and Solas is not required to respond to theories that have not yet been fully propounded by Defendants. Should Defendants serve expert reports setting forth their theories alleging that the Asserted Claims lack adequate written description, Solas will serve a rebuttal expert report concerning validity on December 4, 2020, in accordance with the Court's Scheduling Order (Dkt. No. 59), and Solas directs Defendants to that expert report.

Solas's investigation is ongoing; Solas reserves the right to modify or supplement this response should additional information become available.

**SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 10 (SEPT. 11, 2020):**

Solas further responds as follows. Despite bearing the burden to prove lack of written description by clear and convincing evidence, Defendants assertions are deficient and do not provide Solas with adequate notice. For example, Defendants' final invalidity contentions merely

list various claim elements as purportedly lacking sufficient written description without any additional explanation, making it impossible for Solas to understand or even respond to Defendants' assertions.

A POSITA reading the specifications of the asserted patents, as well as any material incorporated by reference, would recognize that the specifications describe the full scope of each claim term identified by Defendants, and that the inventor(s) possessed the full scope of that term. An exemplary set of supporting portions of each specification is provided below. In addition to these identified exemplary disclosures, Solas incorporates all materials cited in the parties' claim construction briefing concerning these limitations or portions thereof. To the extent that relevant claim language was construed by the Court, the claim construction proceedings in this case provide further support that the terms are consistent with the intrinsic evidence and have sufficient written description support. The below listings are not intended to be an exhaustive list, and should Defendants later be allowed to present actual theories and arguments supporting their contentions that the disclosed elements lack written description, Solas expressly reserves the right to rely on portions of the intrinsic record not included in this response.

<b>'891 Patent Claim Limitation</b>	<b>Exemplary Disclosures</b>
"taps a diode driving current"	Abstract, Fig. 1, 1:64-2:18, 2:65-3:12, 3:13-26, Claims 1, 3.
"current measuring and voltage regulating circuit"	Abstract, Fig. 1, 1:64-2:18, 2:65-3:12, 3:13-26, Claims 1, 3.

“the diode during driving of said gate of said third transistor due to its non-linear switching characteristic acts as a switch for a current deviation”	Abstract, Fig. 1, 1:64-2:18, 2:65-3:12, 3:13-26, Claims 1, 3.
“providing to the data conductor a voltage signal which is dependent on a current measuring and a voltage comparison”	Abstract, Fig. 1, 1:5-12, 1:64-2:18, 2:65-3:12, 3:13-26, Claims 1, 3.
“wherein all above mentioned elements of the driving circuit are located at a same side of said light emitting diode, so that no contacts must be guided through a semiconductor material of the diode”	Abstract, Fig. 1, 1:45-54, 2:19-31, Claims 1, 3.

<b>'068 Patent Claim Limitation</b>	<b>Exemplary Disclosures</b>
“a plurality of light emitting layers which are formed on said plurality of pixel electrodes”	Figs. 1-4 and associated description, Abstract, 3:29-54, 4:15-23,
“a plurality of signal lines which are patterned together with the gates of said plurality of driving transistors”	Figs. 23, 24, 25 (including associated descriptions), Abstract, 1:38-40, 2:52-53, 2:62-65, 8:47-51, 9:44-53, 11:4-6, 14:46-48, 25:4-27, 26:32-60, Claims 1, 3, 13, 15,
“a plurality of supply lines which are patterned together with the sources and drains of said plurality of driving transistors”	Abstract, Figs. 23, 24, 25, 1:38-40, 2:52-53, 2:62-65, 8:47-51, 9:44-53, 11:4-6, 14:46-48,

# 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.