

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.,
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., and GOOGLE LLC,
Petitioner

v.

SCRAMOGE TECHNOLOGY LTD.,
Patent Owner

IPR2022-00284
Patent 9,997,962

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

Mail Stop "PATENT BOARD"
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Table of Contents

I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THE PATENTED TECHNOLOGY	2
A. The '962 Patent Was Invented by LG Innotek	2
B. Overview of the '962 Patent	3
C. Challenged '962 Patent Independent Claims	6
III. OVERVIEW OF ASSERTED REFERENCES.....	7
A. Suzuki (Ex. 1005)—the primary reference—does not disclose the claimed invention.....	7
B. Okada (Ex. 1006)—a secondary reference—does not compensate for the failures of Suzuki	11
C. Lee (Ex. 1007)—a secondary reference—does not compensate for the failures of Suzuki	11
D. Lin (Ex. 1014)—a tertiary reference—does not compensate for the failures of Suzuki or Okada	12
IV. PETITIONER HAS NOT ESTABLISHED A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF INVALIDITY OF THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS	12
A. <u>Ground 1</u> : Claims 1-8 and 18-19 are not rendered obvious by Suzuki in view of Okada.....	13
1. Suzuki does not render obvious 1[a]/18[a] “a substrate.”	13
a. The '962 patent claims a “substrate.”.....	14
b. The Petition fails to show that Suzuki discloses the claimed “substrate.”.....	14
2. The Petition’s Suzuki-Okada combination does not render obvious 1[d]/18[d] “an adhesive layer formed between the second magnetic sheet and the receiving coil.”	17

a.	The '962 patent claims “an adhesive layer formed between the second magnetic sheet and the receiving coil.”.....	18
b.	The Petition’s Suzuki-Okada combination does not render obvious the claimed “adhesive layer formed between the second magnetic sheet and the receiving coil.”.....	20
B.	<u>Ground 2</u> : Dependent Claims 2-8 Are Not Rendered Obvious by the Combination of Suzuki, Okada, and Yang.	23
C.	<u>Ground 3</u> : Claims 1-8 and 18-19 are Not Rendered Obvious by the Combination of Suzuki, Okada, and Lin.	23
D.	<u>Ground 4</u> : Dependent Claims 2-8 Are Not Rendered Obvious by the Combination of Suzuki, Okada, Lin, and Yang.....	24
E.	<u>Ground 5</u> : Claims 1-8 and 18-19 are Not Rendered Obvious by Suzuki in view of Lee.	24
1.	The Petition fails to show that the combination of Suzuki and Lee renders obvious the claimed “substrate.”	24
2.	The Petition’s Suzuki-Lee combination does not render obvious the claimed “adhesive layer formed between the second magnetic sheet and the receiving coil.”	28
V.	INSTITUTION SHOULD BE DENIED UNDER § 325(d).....	29
VI.	INSTITUTION SHOULD BE DENIED UNDER § 314(a).....	31
A.	Factors 1-3 do not compel institution.	33
B.	Factor 4 weighs against institution, as Petitioner delayed filing after learning of Suzuki, Okada, Lee and Yang.	34
C.	Factor 5 also weighs against institution, as Petitioner has no valid excuse for its delay.....	35
D.	Factor 6 weighs heavily against institution, as the district court is set to rule on the validity on the same claims.....	36

E.	Factor 7 also weighs against institution, as Petitioner’s strategic timing prevents coordination/consolidation with earlier IPR, wastes the Board’s resources, and prejudices Patent Owner.....	38
F.	Summary of Factors.....	40
VII.	ALL <i>FINTIV</i> FACTORS WEIGH AGAINST INSTITUTION	40
A.	<u>Factor 1</u> : The district court has not granted a stay, nor is there any evidence that a stay will be granted.	42
B.	<u>Factor 2</u> : The district court trial will occur before the deadline for a final decision in this proceeding.	44
C.	<u>Factor 3</u> : By the time an institution decision is reached, the parties and the court will have completed claim construction and discovery will be underway.	46
D.	<u>Factor 4</u> : There is substantial overlap between this IPR and the district court proceedings.	47
E.	<u>Factor 5</u> : Petitioner is a defendant in the district court litigation.....	49
F.	<u>Factor 6</u> : The petition is without merit and unlikely to succeed.....	50
VIII.	CONCLUSION.....	54

PATENT OWNER'S EXHIBIT LIST

Exhibit No.	Description
2001	Notice of IPR Petitions, <i>Scramoge Technology Ltd. v. Samsung Electronics Co. Ltd. and Samsung Electronics America, Inc.</i> , Case No. 6:21-cv-00454-ADA, Dkt. No. 38 (W.D. Tex. Dec. 14, 2021)
2002	Scheduling Order, <i>Scramoge Technology Ltd. v. Samsung Electronics Co. Ltd. and Samsung Electronics America, Inc.</i> , Case No. 6:21-cv-00454-ADA, Dkt. No. 46 (W.D. Tex. Jan. 21, 2022)
2003	Law360 Article: <i>West Texas Judge Says He Can Move Faster Than PTAB</i>
2004	Text Order Denying Motion to Stay Pending IPR, <i>Solas OLED Ltd. v. Google, Inc.</i> , Case No. 6:19-cv-00515-ADA (W.D. Tex. June 23, 2020)
2005	Order Denying Motion to Stay Pending IPR, <i>Multimedia Content Management LLC v. DISH Network L.L.C.</i> , Case No. 6:18-cv-00207-ADA, Dkt. No. 73 (W.D. Tex. May 30, 2019)
2006	Scheduling Order, <i>Correct Transmission LLC v. Adtran, Inc.</i> , Case No. 6:20-cv-00669-ADA, Dkt. No. 34 (W.D. Tex. Dec. 10, 2020)
2007	Scheduling Order, <i>Maxell Ltd. v. Ampere Technology Ltd.</i> , Case No. 6:21-cv-00347-ADA, Dkt. No. 37 (W.D. Tex. Nov. 8, 2021)
2008	Standing Order Governing Proceedings in Patent Cases, Judge Alan D. Albright (Mar. 7, 2022)
2009	Claim Construction Order, <i>Solas OLED Ltd. v. Apple Inc.</i> , Case No. 6:19-cv-00537-ADA, Dkt. No. 61 (W.D. Tex. Aug. 30, 2020)
2010	Plaintiff Scramoge Technology Ltd.'s Preliminary Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Infringement Contentions to Samsung in

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.