

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.,
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.,
Petitioners,

v.

NANOCO TECHNOLOGIES LTD.,
Patent Owner.

Case No. IPR2021-00186
U.S. Patent No. 8,524,365

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE
PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.107(a)**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT..... 1

II. THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 314(a).....4

 A. All of the factors considered under *Fintiv* support a discretionary denial in order to promote the most efficient and fair adjudication of the parties’ dispute.....6

 1. The district court denied Petitioner’s motion for a stay6

 2. The district court’s trial date will precede the Board’s projected statutory deadline for a final written decision by approximately seven months.....7

 3. The parties have invested significant resources in the Parallel Proceeding10

 4. There is substantial overlap between the issues raised in the petition and in the Parallel Proceeding12

 5. The Petitioner and the Defendant in the Parallel Proceeding are the same party14

 6. Additional circumstances weigh in favor of the Board’s exercise of discretion14

III. OVERVIEW OF QUANTUM DOTS.....15

IV. OVERVIEW OF NANOPARTICLE SYNTHESIS METHODS21

 A. Nanorods and Nanowires23

 1. The Vapor-Liquid-Solid Method23

 2. The Solution-Liquid-Solid Method25

 B. Quantum Dots.....27

 1. The Solid-State Method27

| | | |
|------|---|----|
| 2. | The Hot-Injection Method | 28 |
| 3. | The Heat-Up Method | 30 |
| 4. | The Molecular Cluster-Assisted Method | 32 |
| V. | THE CHALLENGED '365 PATENT | 33 |
| VI. | CLAIM CONSTRUCTION | 35 |
| A. | Molecular Cluster Compound | 35 |
| VII. | THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE IT DOES NOT ESTABLISH THE REQUIRED REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF SUCCESS OF PROVING CHALLENGED CLAIMS UNPATENTABLE..... | 37 |
| A. | The Proposed Grounds 1-4: Banin | 37 |
| 1. | Banin Does Not Disclose a Molecular Cluster Compound | 37 |
| 2. | Adding Herron to Banin Cannot Render Obvious Any of the Challenged '365 Patent Claims..... | 42 |
| a. | Banin and Herron (Ground 3)..... | 43 |
| B. | Proposed Ground 5: Zaban in View of Farneth/Yu | 48 |
| 1. | A Person of Skill in the Art Would Not Combine Zaban's Group III-V Quantum Dot Process with Farneth's Group II-VI Solid-state Intermediate | 48 |
| a. | A Person of Skill in the Art Would Not Swap Zaban's Zinc Acetate for Farneth's 10-Zinc Precursor Because It Would Change the Nature of Zaban's Quantum Dots | 49 |
| b. | Petitioner's purported motivation does not come from any of the references | 52 |
| C. | Proposed Grounds 6 and 7: Lucey in View of Ahrenkiel | 54 |

| | | |
|-------|--|----|
| 1. | Lucey Uses the Hot-Injection Method to make Quantum Dots, While Ahrenkiel Uses the SLS Method to Make Quantum Rods..... | 54 |
| 2. | Even Replacing Lucey’s Precursor with Ahrenkiel’s Multiple Precursors Would Not Practice the Claims of the ’365 Patent Because Both of Ahrenkiel’s Precursors Provide the Ions to Be Incorporated into the Semiconductor Core..... | 55 |
| 3. | Lucey’s Expressly Teaches Away from Ahrenkiel’s Chlorine-Based Precursors..... | 57 |
| 4. | There Is No Motivation to Combine Lucey and Ahrenkiel, and No Reasonable Expectation of Success | 58 |
| VIII. | CONCLUSION..... | 61 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

| | Page(s) |
|---|----------------|
| Cases | |
| <i>Apple Inc., v. Fintiv, Inc.</i> , IPR2020-00019, Paper 11 (PTAB March 20, 2020) | <i>passim</i> |
| <i>Apple Inc. v. Fintiv</i> , IPR2020-00019, Paper 15 (PTAB May 13, 2020) | 7, 10 |
| <i>Apple Inc. v. Seven Networks, LLC</i> , IPR2020-00235, Paper 10 (PTAB July 28, 2020) | 8 |
| <i>In re Am. Acad. of Sci. Tech Ctr.</i> , 367 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2004) | 45 |
| <i>In re Fine</i> , 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988) | 53 |
| <i>In re Fritch</i> , 972 F.2d 1260 (Fed. Cir. 1992) | 53 |
| <i>In re NuVasive, Inc.</i> , 842 F.3d 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2016) | 53 |
| <i>Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Smith Nephew, Inc.</i> , 688 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2012) | 42 |
| <i>Nanoco Technologies Ltd. v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd.</i> , No. 2:20-cv-00038 (E.D. Tex.)..... | 5, 6 |
| <i>NHK Spring Co., Ltd. v. Intri-Plex Techs., Inc.</i> , IPR2018-00752, Paper 8, 20 (PTAB Sept. 12, 2018)..... | 5, 7, 15 |
| <i>Otsuka Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd. v. Sandoz, Inc.</i> , 678 F.3d 1280 (Fed. Cir. 2012) | 47 |
| <i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc) | 35 |

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.