

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

HTC CORPORATION AND HTC AMERICA, INC.,
Petitioners,

v.

U.S. PHILIPS CORPORATION,
Patent Owner.

PTAB Case No. IPR2017-00856
Patent No. 5,910,797

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW
OF U.S. PATENT NO. 5,910,797**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|--|------|
| EXHIBIT LIST | iv |
| I. INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| II. MANDATORY NOTICES UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(B) | 2 |
| A. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST | 2 |
| B. RELATED MATTERS | 2 |
| C. NOTICE OF COUNSEL AND SERVICE INFORMATION | 3 |
| III. REQUIREMENTS FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW | 4 |
| A. GROUND FOR STANDING..... | 4 |
| B. IDENTIFICATION OF CHALLENGE..... | 5 |
| 1. Claims Challenged..... | 5 |
| 2. The Prior Art | 5 |
| 3. Supporting Evidence Relied Upon For The Challenge | 5 |
| 4. Statutory Ground(s) Of Challenge And Legal Principles..... | 5 |
| 5. Claim Construction | 6 |
| 6. How Claims Are Unpatentable Under Statutory Grounds | 7 |
| IV. OVERVIEW OF THE 797 PATENT..... | 7 |
| A. PRIORITY DATE OF THE 797 PATENT | 7 |
| B. STATE OF PRIOR ART TECHNOLOGIES BEFORE THE 797 PATENT..... | 7 |
| C. SUMMARY OF THE 797 PATENT | 14 |
| D. SUMMARY OF PROSECUTION FILE HISTORY..... | 17 |
| E. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART | 23 |
| F. PROPOSED CLAIM CONSTRUCTION..... | 23 |
| 1. “data processing means” (Claims 1, 11)..... | 24 |
| 2. “screen means” (Claims 1, 4, 6) | 25 |
| 3. “programmed calculating means” (Claims 1, 11)..... | 26 |
| 4. “sensing means” (Claim 1) | 27 |
| 5. “inclination vector” (Claim 4) | 28 |
| 6. “linewise” (Claim 4) | 28 |

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

| | Page |
|---|-------------|
| V. THERE IS A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT AT LEAST ONE CLAIM OF THE 797 PATENT IS UNPATENTABLE | 29 |
| A. IDENTIFICATION OF THE REFERENCES AS PRIOR ART..... | 29 |
| 1. Tsukamoto (Ex. 1005) | 29 |
| 2. Onozawa (Ex. 1007) | 29 |
| 3. LaBiche (Ex. 1006)..... | 30 |
| B. SUMMARY OF INVALIDITY POSITIONS | 30 |
| VI. DETAILED EXPLANATION OF GROUNDS FOR UNPATENTABILITY OF CLAIMS 1, 4, 6-9, 11 OF THE 797 PATENT | 30 |
| A. GROUND 1: CLAIMS 1, 6, 8-9, AND 11 ARE UNPATENTABLE UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) AS BEING OBVIOUS OVER TSUKAMOTO | 30 |
| 1. Claim 1 is rendered obvious by Tsukamoto | 31 |
| 2. Claim 6 is rendered obvious by Tsukamoto | 40 |
| 3. Claim 8 is rendered obvious by Tsukamoto | 43 |
| 4. Claim 9 is rendered obvious by Tsukamoto | 44 |
| 5. Claim 11 is rendered obvious by Tsukamoto | 44 |
| B. GROUND 2: CLAIMS 1, 6, 8-9, AND 11 ARE UNPATENTABLE UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) AS BEING OBVIOUS OVER TSUKAMOTO IN VIEW OF LABICHE..... | 50 |
| 1. Claim 1 is rendered obvious by Tsukamoto in view of LaBiche | 52 |
| 2. Claim 6 is rendered obvious by Tsukamoto in view of LaBiche | 55 |
| 3. Claim 8 is rendered obvious by Tsukamoto in view of LaBiche | 55 |
| 4. Claim 9 is rendered obvious by Tsukamoto in view of LaBiche | 56 |
| 5. Claim 11 is rendered obvious by Tsukamoto in view of LaBiche | 56 |

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

| | Page |
|---|-------------|
| C. GROUND 3: CLAIMS 1, 4, 6-7, AND 11 ARE UNPATENTABLE UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) AS BEING OBVIOUS OVER ONOZAWA | 57 |
| 1. Claim 1 is rendered obvious by Onozawa | 57 |
| 2. Claim 4 is rendered obvious by Onozawa | 66 |
| 3. Claim 6 is rendered obvious by Onozawa | 67 |
| 4. Claim 7 is rendered obvious by Onozawa | 67 |
| 5. Claim 11 is rendered obvious by Onozawa | 67 |
| VII. CONCLUSION..... | 68 |

EXHIBIT LIST

- Ex. 1001 U.S. Patent No. 5,910,797 to Buek et al. (“797 Patent”)
- Ex. 1002 File History of U.S. Patent No. 5,910,797 (“797 File History”)
- Ex. 1003 Declaration of Kenneth A. Parulski (“Parulski Decl.”)
- Ex. 1004 Declaration of Meghan Bright (“Bright Declaration”)
- Ex. 1005 Japanese Unexamined Patent Application Publication No. H6-4208 to Tsukamoto et al. and Certified Translation (“Tsukamoto”)
- Ex. 1006 U.S. Patent No. 4,839,838 to LaBiche et al. (“LaBiche”)
- Ex. 1007 Japanese Unexamined Patent Application Publication No. H6-289802 to Onozawa et al. and Certified Translation (“Onozawa”)
- Ex. 1008 Definition of “-wise,” Merriam-Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary 1358 (10th ed. 1994)
- Ex. 1009 Definition of “data processing,” Merriam-Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary 293 (10th ed. 1994)
- Ex. 1010 Definition of “screen,” Merriam-Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary 1049 (10th ed. 1994)
- Ex. 1011 Definition of “programmed,” Merriam-Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary 931 (10th ed. 1994)
- Ex. 1012 Definition of “calculating,” Merriam-Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary 161 (10th ed. 1994)
- Ex. 1013 Definition of “sensing,” Merriam-Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary 1066 (10th ed. 1994)
- Ex. 1014 Definition of “stationary,” Merriam-Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary 1149 (10th ed. 1994)
- Ex. 1015 Definition of “non-,” Merriam-Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary 788 (10th ed. 1994)

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.