

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO. LTD., SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS  
AMERICA, INC. AND APPLE, INC.,

Petitioners

v.

NEONODE SMARTPHONE LLC,

Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2021-00145

U.S. Patent No. 8,812,993

---

**PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	5
A. “An Electronic Device” .....	5
B. “Tap-Activatable” .....	8
C. “System Function” .....	9
III. GROUNDS 1A-1D: PETITIONERS FAIL TO SHOW THAT CLAIMS 1- 8 ARE OBVIOUS OVER HISATOMI AND REN, AND ASSORTED OTHER REFERENCES .....	13
A. Ground 1A: Petitioners Fail to Prove that Claims 1-3, 7 and 8 are Obvious Over the Combination of Hisatomi and Ren.....	13
1. Hisatomi is Not Prior Art.....	13
2. Claim 1 is Not Obvious Over Hisatomi/Ren .....	17
a. Petitioners’ Purported Hisatomi/Ren Combination Does Not Disclose a Tap-Present State (Limitation 1[b]) .....	17
(1) Hisatomi Does Not disclose Tap-Activatable Icons or a Tap-Present State.....	17
(2) A POSA Would Not have been Motivated to Incorporate the a→c→a Variant of Ren’s Direct Off Strategy into Hisatomi .....	22
b. Hisatomi does Not Disclose Icons for a Plurality of System Functions (Limitation 1[b]) .....	30
3. Claims 2, 7-8 are Not Obvious Over Hisatomi/Ren .....	33
4. Claim 3 is Not Obvious Over Hisatomi/Ren .....	33

B. Ground 1B: Petitioners Fail to Prove that Claim 4 is Obvious Over the Combination of Hisatomi/Ren and Allard-656 .....35

1. Allard-656 is Not Analogous Art.....36

a. Allard-656 is Not in the Same Field of Endeavor as the ‘993 Patent .....36

b. Allard-656 is Not Reasonably Pertinent to the Problem Addressed by the ‘993 Patent .....38

2. A POSA Would Not have been Motivated to Combine Hisatomi and Allard-656.....40

C. Ground 1C: Petitioners Fail to Prove that Claim 5 is Obvious Over the Combination of Hisatomi/Ren and Tanaka .....42

D. Ground 1D: Petitioners Fail to Prove that Claim 6 is Obvious Over the Combination of Hisatomi/Ren and Kodama.....43

IV. PETITIONERS HAVE NOT SHOWN THAT CLAIMS 1- 8 ARE RENDERED OBVIOUS BY THE PRIOR ART ASSERTED IN GROUNDS 2A-D .....45

A. Ground 2A: Petitioners Fail to Prove that Claims 1-3, 7 and 8 are Obvious Over the Combination of Hansen and Gillespie.....45

1. Claim 1 is Not Obvious Over Hansen/Gillespie.....45

a. Hansen Does Not Disclose an “Electronic Device” As Recited in the Preamble (Limitation 1[pre]) .....45

b. Hansen does Not Disclose Icons for a Plurality of System Functions (Limitation 1[b]) .....52

c. Hansen Does Not Disclose a Tap-Absent State (Limitation 1[c]) .....53

d.	A POSA Would Not have been Motivated to Incorporate an “Otherwise Activatable Graphic” Into Hansen’s Display (Limitation 1[c]) .....	54
(1)	Hansen Teaches Away from Petitioners’ Proposed Modification, and Petitioners’ Modification would have Resulted in an Inferior System .....	55
(2)	Petitioners’ Proposed Modification to Hansen would have Provided No Benefit.....	56
2.	Claims 2, 7-8 are Not Obvious Over Hansen/Gillespie .....	57
3.	Claim 3 is Not Obvious Over Hansen/Gillespie.....	58
B.	Ground 2B: Petitioners Fail to Prove that Claim 4 is Obvious Over the Combination of Hansen/Gillespie and Allard-656 .....	59
1.	Allard-656 is not Analogous Art. ....	59
2.	A POSA Would Not have been Motivated to Combine Hansen and Allard-656 .....	60
C.	Ground 2C: Petitioners Fail to Prove that Claim 5 is Obvious Over the Combination of Hansen/Gillespie and Tanaka .....	61
D.	Ground 2D: Petitioners Fail to Prove that Claim 6 is Obvious Over the Combination of Hansen/Gillespie and Tanaka .....	61
V.	SECONDARY EVIDENCE OF NON-OBVIOUSNESS CONFIRMS THE PATENTABILITY OF THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS .....	62
A.	The Neonode N1 and N2 Gesture-Based Interface Demonstrated the Commercial Success of the Challenged Claims.....	62
B.	There was Significant Industry Praise of the Neonode N1 and N2 Gesture-Based Interface .....	64

C. The Neonode N1 and N2 Gesture-Based Interface  
Received Initial Skepticism from Neonode's Competitors.....65

D. Samsung Licensed the Application to which the '993  
Patent Claims Priority, Demonstrating Industry Respect .....66

VI. CONCLUSION.....67

# 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.