

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

PANASONIC CORPORATION
Petitioner

v.

NEODRON LTD.
Patent Owner

Case IPR2021-01115
Patent No. 8,946,574

**PETITION FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW OF
U.S. PATENT NO. 8,946,574
UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 311-319 AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.100 *ET SEQ.***

Mail Stop: Patent Board
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Notices, Statements and Payment of Fees	2
	A. Real Party In Interest Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1).....	2
	B. Related Matters Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2)	2
	C. Lead and Back-Up Counsel Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3)	2
	D. Service Information Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4).....	3
III.	Grounds for Standing.....	3
IV.	Fees under 37 C.F.R. § 42.103	3
V.	The '574 Patent and Prosecution History	3
	A. The '574 Patent	3
	B. The '574 Prosecution History	5
VI.	Identification of Challenge Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(B).....	5
	A. Prior Art.....	5
	B. Challenges	6
VII.	Discretionary Considerations	7
	A. The Prior Art was Not Considered During Prosecution	7
	B. The <i>General Plastics</i> Factors Favor Institution	7
	C. The <i>Fintiv</i> Factors Strongly Favor Institution.....	8
	1. whether the court granted a stay or evidence exists that one may be granted if a proceeding is instituted;	9
	2. proximity of the court's trial date to the Board's projected statutory deadline for a final written decision;	9

3.	investment in the parallel proceeding by the court and the parties;.....	9
4.	overlap between issues raised in the petition and in the parallel proceeding;.....	9
5.	whether the petitioner and the defendant in the parallel proceeding are the same party; and.....	9
6.	other circumstances that impact the Board’s exercise of discretion, including the merits.....	9
VIII.	Level of Ordinary Skill In The Art.....	12
A.	Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art	12
B.	State of the Art	12
IX.	Claim Construction.....	16
A.	“the substrate, with drive or sense electrodes of a touch sensor disposed on a first surface and a second surface of the substrate, the first surface being opposite the second surface, the drive or sense electrodes being made of a conductive mesh conductive material comprising metal” (claims 1, 8).....	16
B.	“conductive mesh [of] conductive material” (claims 1, 8, 15).....	16
X.	Detailed Explanation and Supporting Evidence.....	17
A.	Ground 1: Claims 1-4, 6-11, and 13-15 Are Obvious Over Hsu and Mozdzyn.....	17
1.	Summary of Hsu	17
2.	Summary of Mozdzyn.....	18
3.	Detailed Claim Analysis	20
B.	Ground 2: Claims 1-4, 6-11, and 13-15 Are Obvious Over Hsu and Philipp.....	43
1.	Summary of Philipp	43

2.	Detailed Claim Analysis	45
C.	Ground 3: Claims 1-3, 7-10, and 14-15 Are Obvious Over Hsu and Chang.....	59
1.	Summary of Chang	59
2.	Detailed Claim Analysis	60
D.	Ground 4: Claims 4, 6, 11, and 13 Are Obvious Over Hsu in view of Chang and Frey.	71
1.	Summary of Frey	71
2.	Detailed Claim Analysis	72
XI.	Secondary Considerations of Non-Obviousness	76
XII.	Conclusion	76

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
<i>Apple v. Fintiv, Inc.</i> , IPR2020-00019, Paper 11 (PTAB Mar. 20, 2020)	8, 9, 11
<i>ArthroCare Corp. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.</i> , 406 F.3d 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	28
<i>Comcast Cable Communs. Corp. v. Finisar Corp.</i> , 571 F. Supp. 2d 1137 (N.D. Cal. July 11, 2008)	27, 30, 32
<i>Eli Lilly & Co. v. Barr Labs., Inc.</i> , 251 F.3d 955 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	27
<i>General Plastic Industrial Co., Ltd. v. Canon Kabushiki Kaisha</i> , IPR2016-01357 Paper 19 (PTAB. Sept. 6, 2017).....	7
<i>HP Inc. v. Neodron Ltd.</i> , IPR2020-00459, Paper 17 (PTAB Sep. 14, 2020).....	passim
<i>In re Cruciferous Sprout Litig.</i> , 301 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	29
<i>In re Japikse</i> , 181 F.2d 1019 (CCPA 1950)	71
<i>In re Kuhle</i> , 526 F.2d 553 (CCPA 1975)	71
<i>In re O’Farrell</i> , 853 F.2d 894 (Fed. Cir. 1988)	66
<i>In re Vaeck</i> , 947 F.2d 488 (Fed. Cir. 1991)	67, 69
<i>Intelligent Bio-Systems, Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge, Ltd.</i> , 821 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	66

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.