

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: IPR2021-01061

Patent No. 10,423,034

**PATENT OWNERS JAPAN DISPLAY INC. AND PANASONIC LIQUID
CRYSTAL DISPLAY CO., LTD'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO
PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF UNITED STATES PATENT
NO. 10,423,034 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 *FINTIV* FACTORS2

A. *Fintiv* Factor 1: Whether the court granted a stay or whether evidence exists that one may be granted if an IPR is instituted.....4

B. *Fintiv* Factor 2: The proximity of the court’s trial date to the projected statutory deadline for the PTAB’s final written decision.....7

C. *Fintiv* Factor 3: The investment in the parallel proceeding by the court and the parties8

D. *Fintiv* Factor 4: The overlap between issues raised in the petition and in the parallel proceeding11

E. *Fintiv* Factor 5: The petitioner and the defendant in the parallel proceeding are the same party14

F. *Fintiv* Factor 6: Other circumstances impact the PTAB’s exercise of discretion, including the merits.....14

III. The ’034 Patent.....15

IV. Asserted Prior Art.....17

A. U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2008/0007679 (“Ochiai”) (Ex.1005)17

B. U.S. Patent No. 6,356,330 (“Ando”) (Ex.1006)20

V. THE PETITION FAILS TO ESTABLISH A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT ANY ONE OF THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS IS UNPATENTABLE.22

A. The Combination of Ochiai and Ando does not render claim 1 obvious24

B. Ochiai in view of Ando and Hattori42

C. Ochiai in view of Ando and Yanagawa	43
VI. CONCLUSION.....	43
CERTIFICATE OF WORD COUNT.....	44
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	45

EXHIBIT LIST

Ex.2001	First Amended Docket Control Order (Dkt. No. 140)
Ex.2002	Defendant's Preliminary Invalidity Contentions
Ex.2003	Declaration of Thomas L. Credelle under 37 C.F.R. § 1.68
Ex.2004	Curriculum Vitae of Thomas L. Credelle
Ex.2005	Defendant's Motion for Leave to Supplement Invalidity Contentions (Redacted) (Dkt. No. 131)
Ex.2006	Order granting Tianma Microelectronics Co. Ltd.'s Motion for Leave to Supplement Invalidity Contentions (Dkt. No. 142)

I. INTRODUCTION

Japan Display Inc. and Panasonic Liquid Crystal Display Co., Ltd. (together, “Patent Owner”) submit this Response to IPR2021-01061 for *Inter Partes* Review (“Petition”) of U.S. Patent No. 10,423,034 (“the ’034 Patent”) (Ex.1001) filed by Tianma Microelectronics Co., Ltd. (“Petitioner”). This Petition should be denied for at least two reasons: (1) weighing of the *Fintiv* factors for discretionary denial under 35 U.S.C. § 314(a) heavily favors denial, and (2) Petitioner fails to establish a reasonable likelihood that any of the challenged claims is unpatentable.

Petitioner essentially concedes that none of the *Fintiv* factors weigh in its favor but Factors 4 (lack of overlap) and 6 (strong merits), which it relies on to “outweigh the other relevant factors.” Pet. 8. Factors 4 and 6, however, do not weigh in Petitioner’s favor. Petitioner attempts to avert the overlap between the district court litigation and this Petition by stipulating that it will not pursue any ground that it raised or reasonably could have raised in this Petition. But by the time a decision on institution is due for this Petition, the parties will have already completed the vast majority of work related to invalidity and only trial will remain.

Moreover, Factor 6 does not weigh in Petitioner’s favor because the merits of Petitioner’s arguments are not strong. Petitioner asserts the same combination of primary and secondary references for each of its three grounds. These two references are significantly diverse in the types of technology they disclose and

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.