

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

TIANMA MICROELECTRONICS CO. LTD.,
Petitioner,

v.

JAPAN DISPLAY INC. AND PANASONIC LIQUID CRYSTAL DISPLAY CO.,
LTD.,
Patent Owner

Case IPR No: IPR2021-01028

Patent No. 9,793,299

**PATENT OWNER JAPAN DISPLAY INC. AND PANASONIC LIQUID
CRYSTAL DISPLAY CO., LTD.'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO
PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF UNITED STATES PATENT
NO. 9,793,299 PURSUANT TO 35 U.S.C. § 313, 37 C.F.R. § 42.107**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	THE BOARD SHOULD EXERCISE ITS DISCRETION TO DENY INSTITUTION OF THE PETITION UNDER § 314(A) BASED ON THE <i>FINTIV</i> FACTORS	1
A.	<i>Fintiv</i> Factor 1: Whether the court granted a stay or whether evidence exists that one may be granted if an IPR is instituted.....	4
B.	<i>Fintiv</i> Factor 2: The proximity of the court's trial date to the projected statutory deadline for the PTAB's final written decision.....	7
C.	<i>Fintiv</i> Factor 3: The investment in the parallel proceeding by the court and the parties	8
D.	<i>Fintiv</i> Factor 4: The overlap between issues raised in the petition and in the parallel proceeding	11
E.	<i>Fintiv</i> Factor 5: The petitioner and the defendant in the parallel proceeding are the same party	14
F.	<i>Fintiv</i> Factor 6: Other circumstances impact the PTAB's exercise of discretion, including the merits.....	14
III.	THE BOARD SHOULD EXERCISE ITS DISCRETION TO DENY INSTITUTION OF THE PETITION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 325	16
A.	The <i>Becton Dickinson</i> factors weigh in favor of denying institution of claims 1, 3-6, and 8-11 (Ground 1)	17
B.	The <i>Becton Dickinson</i> factors weigh in favor of denying institution of claims 2 and 7 (Ground 2)	23
IV.	THE PETITION FAILS TO ESTABLISH UNPATENTABILITY FOR ANY CHALLENGED CLAIM.....	27
A.	The Petition Fails to Prove that <i>Maekawa</i> in Combination with <i>Takahata</i> Render Obvious Claims 1, 3-6, and 8-11 (Ground 1).....	27

B.	The Petition Fails to Prove that <i>Maekawa and Takahata</i> in Combination with <i>Nakanishi</i> Renders Obvious Claims 2 and 7 (Ground 2)	42
C.	The Petition Fails to Prove that <i>Maekawa and Takahata</i> in Combination with <i>Nagano</i> Render Obvious Claims 15 and 16 (Ground 3)	48
V.	CONCLUSION.....	52
	CERTIFICATE OF WORD COUNT.....	53
	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	54

EXHIBIT LIST

Ex. 2001	[DKT 104] First Amended Docket Control Order in <i>Japan Display Inc. and Panasonic Liquid Crystal Display Co., Ltd.</i> ; C.A. No. 2:20-cv-00283 (ED TX)
Ex. 2002	Petitioner's Patent Invalidity Contentions – Chart D-1 in <i>Japan Display Inc. and Panasonic Liquid Crystal Display Co., Ltd.</i> ; C.A. No. 2:20-cv-00283 (ED TX)
Ex. 2003	[PAPER 3] Notice of Filing Date and Time for Preliminary Response in <i>Tianma Microelectronics Co. Ltd. v. Japan Display Inc. and Panasonic Liquid Crystal Display Co., Ltd.</i> ; Case No. IPR2021-01028; Before the Patent Trial and Appeal Board
Ex. 2004	[DKT 96] Petitioner's P.R. 4-5(b) Responsive Claim Construction Brief in <i>Japan Display Inc. and Panasonic Liquid Crystal Display Co., Ltd.</i> ; C.A. No. 2:20-cv-00283 (ED TX)
Ex. 2005	[DKT 115] Memorandum Opinion and Order Denying Petitioner's Motion to Transfer in <i>Japan Display Inc. and Panasonic Liquid Crystal Display Co., Ltd.</i> ; C.A. No. 2:20-cv-00283 (ED TX)
Ex. 2006	[DKT 123] Claim Construction Memorandum Opinion and Order in <i>Japan Display Inc. and Panasonic Liquid Crystal Display Co., Ltd.</i> ; C.A. No. 2:20-cv-00283 (ED TX)
Ex. 2007	[DKT 131] [REDACTED] Petitioner's Motion for Leave to Supplement Invalidity Contentions in <i>Japan Display Inc. and Panasonic Liquid Crystal Display Co., Ltd.</i> ; C.A. No. 2:20-cv-00283 (ED TX)
Ex. 2008	U.S. Patent No. 7,148,944 to <i>Kinoshita et al.</i>
Ex. 2009	G. Walker, "Part 2: Fundamentals of Touch Technologies other than Projected Capacitive," SID Display Week 2014

Ex. 2010	Declaration of Mr. Thomas Credelle
Ex. 2011	Curriculum Vitae of Mr. Thomas Credelle
Ex. 2012	[DKT 142] Order granting Tianma Microelectronics Co. Ltd.'s Motion for Leave to Supplement Invalidity Contentions in <i>Japan Display Inc. and Panasonic Liquid Crystal Display Co., Ltd.</i> ; C.A. No. 2:20-cv-00283 (ED TX)

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.