

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION**

JAPAN DISPLAY INC. and PANASONIC LIQUID CRYSTAL DISPLAY CO. LTD.	§	
	§	
Plaintiffs,	§	C.A. NO. 2:20-cv-00283-JRG
	§	
v.	§	
	§	
TIANMA MICROELECTRONICS CO. LTD.	§	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
	§	
Defendant	§	
<hr/>		
JAPAN DISPLAY INC.	§	
	§	C.A. NO. 2:20-cv-00284-JRG
v.	§	
	§	
TIANMA MICROELECTRONICS CO. LTD.	§	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
	§	
Defendant.	§	
<hr/>		
JAPAN DISPLAY INC.,	§	
	§	C.A. NO. 2:20-cv-00285-JRG
v.	§	
	§	
TIANMA MICROELECTRONICS CO. LTD.	§	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
	§	
Defendant.	§	
<hr/>		

**PLAINTIFFS' DISCLOSURE OF
ASSERTED CLAIMS AND INFRINGEMENT CONTENTIONS**

Pursuant to the Court's Orders dated December 22, 2020 in each of the above-captioned cases (Dkt. Nos. 22, 19, and 20, respectively) and Patent Local Rules 3-1 and 3-2, plaintiffs Japan Display Inc. ("JDI" or "Plaintiff") and Panasonic Liquid Crystal Display Co., Ltd. (individually, "PLD" or, together with JDI, "Plaintiffs") serve this Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Infringement Contentions ("Infringement Contentions").

These Infringement Contentions are derived from Plaintiffs' good faith evaluation of information known to Plaintiffs at this time based upon reasonably available public information and documents, including time-consuming and resource-intensive reverse engineering efforts. Plaintiffs reserve the right to supplement and/or amend these Infringement Contentions in view of information and/or documents that may be obtained during discovery, further investigation, the Court's claim construction ruling, applicable case law and authorities, and/or any other reasons permitted under the Court's orders, the Patent Rules, and the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

I. P.R. 3-1 DISCLOSURE OF ASSERTED CLAIMS AND INFRINGEMENT CONTENTIONS

A. Each claim of each patent in suit that is allegedly infringed by each opposing party;

Based upon information reasonably available to Plaintiffs at this time, including time-consuming and resource-intensive reverse engineering efforts, Plaintiffs allege that Defendant has directly or indirectly infringed the following claims of the patents listed below (collectively, the "Asserted Claims" of the "Asserted Patents"), either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, by, through, or in connection with the making, having made, use, offer for sale, sale, and/or importation of certain products:

-283 Case

1. Claims 1-11 of U.S. Patent No. 8,218,119 ("the '119 patent"). *See also* Exhibits A1 through A6.

2. Claims 1-3, 5-13, and 15-19 of U.S. Patent No. 10,139,687 (“the ’687 patent”). *See also* Exhibits B1 through B6.
3. Claims 1-8, and 10-21 of U.S. Patent No. 9,715,132 (“the ’132 patent”). *See also* Exhibits C1 through C6.
4. Claims 1-11, 15, and 16 of U.S. Patent No. 9,793,299 (“the ’299 patent”). *See also* Exhibits D1 through D7.
5. Claims 1, 3-9, and 11-14 of U.S. Patent No. 10,018,859 (“the ’859 patent”). *See also* Exhibits E1 through E6.
6. Claims 1-5 of U.S. Patent No. 8,218,118 (“the ’118 patent”). *See also* Exhibits F1 through F2.
7. Claims 1, 2, 4, and 6-8 of U.S. Patent No. 10,423,034 (“the ’034 patent”). *See also* Exhibits G1 through G6.
8. Claims 1-2 of U.S. Patent No. 10,330,989 (“the ’989 patent”). *See also* Exhibit H1.
9. Claims 1-6 of U.S. Patent No. 7,936,429 (“the ’429 patent”). *See also* Exhibits I1 through I6.

-284 Case

1. Claims 1-4, 12, and 14 of U.S. Patent No. 9,310,654 (“the ’654 patent”). *See also* Exhibit J1.
2. Claims 1-9 of U.S. Patent No. 8,830,409 (“the ’409 patent”). *See also* Exhibits K1 through K8.
3. Claims 1, 2, 4, and 6-8 of U.S. Patent No. 9,817,288 (“the ’288 patent”). *See also* Exhibits L1 through L6.

-285 Case

1. Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, and 8 of U.S. Patent No. 7,636,142 (“the ’142 patent”). *See also* Exhibits M1 through M6.
2. Claims 1-4 of U.S. Patent No. 7,385,665 (“the ’665 patent”). *See also* Exhibits N1 through N8.
3. Claims 1-4, 6-12, and 14-16 of U.S. Patent No. 9,939,698 (“the ’698 patent”). *See also* Exhibits O1 through O6.

B. Separately for each asserted claim, each accused apparatus, product, device, process, method, act, or other instrumentality (“Accused Instrumentality”) of each opposing party of which the party is aware. This identification shall be as specific as possible. Each product, device, and apparatus must be identified by name or model number, if known. Each method or process must be identified by name, if known, or by any product, device, or apparatus which, when used, allegedly results in the practice of the claimed method or process;

The Asserted Patents are directed to improvements in liquid crystal displays (“LCDs”) incorporating thin film transistor (“TFT”) technologies (“TFT LCDs”). Based upon a diligent investigation of information reasonably available to Plaintiffs at this time, Plaintiffs contend that Defendant makes, has made, uses, offers for sale, sells, and/or imports thousands of unique models of TFT LCDs that potentially infringe the Asserted Patents, but that a full accounting of all potentially infringing models of TFT LCDs is exclusively within Defendant’s knowledge. Further, it is impossible for Plaintiffs to determine infringement from publicly available documentation regarding Defendant’s TFT LCD products without purchasing each product and engaging in time-consuming and resource-intensive reverse engineering of each product. It is neither possible nor reasonably practical to identify each and every infringing product at this time. For instance, in most cases infringing products were incorporated into other products and branded and sold under the trade names of various third-party companies, making it impractical to identify all of them. Additionally, Defendant is continually developing and selling new models and will undoubtedly introduce additional models during the course of this case. This information is readily available

to Defendant, who has access to the design details and manufacturing specifications of Defendant's TFT LCD products. Therefore, the full scope of Defendant's infringement is not publicly available to Plaintiffs, who do not have unlimited time or resources. *See, e.g., MOSAID Techs. Inc. v. Micron Tech., Inc.*, No. 2:06-CV-302 (DF), 2008 WL 11344767, at *2 (E.D. Tex. Jan. 29, 2008) (holding that "the cumulative authority in this district" is that when "there is a lack of public information" a plaintiff need not "perform reverse engineering on every accused product[] to satisfy P.R. 3-1.").

Even so, Plaintiffs have undertaken a reasonable investigation of publicly available information, including time-consuming and resource-intensive reverse engineering efforts, and have identified the following of Defendant's TFT LCD products that practice the Asserted Claims and are representative of Defendant's broader infringement (the "Representative Products"):

- [1] TL062FVMC70;
- [2] TL079QDXP02;
- [3] TL051VVXS09;
- [4] TL063FVMC80;
- [5] TL063FVMCA1;
- [6] NL1294A5ANA0125439391221;
- [7] TM062JDSC03; and
- [8] TM070RDHP03.

Appendix 1 provides a chart specifically identifying which of the claims are asserted against each of the Representative Products.

Plaintiffs accuse the Representative Products as well as all other reasonably similar products that Defendant has made, had made, used, offered for sale, sold, and/or imported since

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.