

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

-----X

In the Matter of

Investigation No.

COMPONENTS FOR CERTAIN

337-TA-1349

ENVIRONMENTALLY PROTECTED LCD

DIGITAL DISPLAYS AND PRODUCTS

-----X

OPEN SESSIONS

Pages: 837 through 1112 (with excerpts)

Place: Washington, D.C.

Date: October 10, 2023

HERITAGE REPORTING CORPORATION

Official Reporters

1220 L Street, N.W., Suite 206

Washington, D.C. 20005

(202) 628-4888

contracts@hrcourtreporters.com

1 UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION
2 Washington, D.C.
3 Before the Honorable MaryJoan McNamara
4 Administrative Law Judge
5

6 -----X

7 In the Matter of Investigation No.

8

9 COMPONENTS FOR CERTAIN 337-TA-1349

10 ENVIRONMENTALLY PROTECTED LCD

11 DIGITAL DISPLAYS AND PRODUCTS

12 -----X

13

14 International Trade Commission

15 500 E Street, SW

16 Washington, D.C.

17

18 Evidentiary Hearing

19 Tuesday, October 10, 2023

20 Volume IV

21

22 The parties met pursuant to notice of the
23 Administrative Law Judge at 9:30 a.m. Eastern.

24

25 Reported by: Linda S. Kinkade RDR CRR RMR RPR CSR

Heritage Reporting Corporation
(202) 628-4888

Samsung Exhibit 2005, Page 2 of 11
MRI v. Samsung - IPR2023-01201

1 A P P E A R A N C E S:

2

3 Counsel for Complainant Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd.,
4 Samsung Electronics America, Inc., Samsung Research America,
5 Inc., and Samsung International, Inc.:

6 GOODWIN PROCTER LLP

7 1900 N Street, NW

8 Washington, DC 20036

9 (202) 346-4266

10 Patrick J. McCarthy, Esq.

11 Annaka Nava, Esq.

12 Craig Lytle, Esq.

13 Sravan Tumuluri, Esq.

14

15 -and-

16 GOODWIN PROCTER LLP

17 Three Embarcadero Center

18 San Francisco, California 94111

19 (415) 733-6000

20 Jesse Cheng, Esq.

21

22

23

24

25 CONTINUED ON FOLLOWING PAGE

1 A P P E A R A N C E S (continued):

2

3 Counsel for Complainant Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd.,
4 Samsung Electronics America, Inc., Samsung Research America,
5 Inc., and Samsung International, Inc.:

6 GOODWIN PROCTER LLP

7 100 Northern Avenue

8 Boston, Massachusetts 02210

9 (617) 570-1000

10 Douglas Kline, Esq.

11 Srikanth Reddy, Esq.

12

13 -and-

14 Goodwin Procter LLP

15 620 Eighth Avenue

16 New York, New York 10018

17 (212) 813-8800

18 Naomi Birbach, Esq.

19 Gabriella Montes, Esq.

20

21

22

23

24

25 CONTINUED ON FOLLOWING PAGE

1 A P P E A R A N C E S (continued):

2

3 Counsel for Respondent Manufacturing Resources

4 International, Inc.:

5 KILPATRICK TOWNSEND & STOCKTON LLP

6 607 14th Street, NW

7 Washington, DC 20005

8 (202) 508-5800

9 Aarti Shah, Esq.

10

11 -and-

12 KILPATRICK TOWNSEND & STOCKTON LLP

13 1420 Fifth Avenue, Suite 3700

14 Seattle, Washington 98101

15 (206) 467-9600

16 Dario A. Machleidt, Esq.

17 Kathleen R. Geyer, Esq.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25 CONTINUED ON FOLLOWING PAGE

1 A P P E A R A N C E S (continued):

2

3 Counsel for Respondent Manufacturing Resources

4 International, Inc.:

5 KILPATRICK TOWNSEND & STOCKTON LLP

6 1100 Peachtree Street NE, Suite 2800

7 Atlanta, Georgia 30309

8 (404) 815-6500

9 Russell A. Korn, Esq.

10 David A. Reed, Esq.

11 Joshua H. Lee, Esq.

12 Courtney S. Dabbieri, Esq.

13

14 -and-

15

16 KILPATRICK TOWNSEND & STOCKTON LLP

17 1080 Marsh Road

18 Menlo Park, California 94025

19 (650) 326-2400

20 Matthew J. Meyer, Esq.

21

22

23

24

25 CONTINUED ON FOLLOWING PAGE

1 A P P E A R A N C E S (continued):

2

3 Counsel for Respondent Manufacturing Resources

4 International, Inc.:

5 KILPATRICK TOWNSEND & STOCKTON LLP

6 4208 Six Forks Road, Suite 1400

7 Raleigh, North Carolina 27609

8 (919) 420-1700

9 Kasey E. Koballa, Esq.

10

11 -and-

12 KILPATRICK TOWNSEND & STOCKTON LLP

13 1801 Century Park East, Suite 2300

14 Los Angeles, California 90067

15 (310) 310-7015

16 Sarah Y. Kamran, Esq.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25 *** Index appears at end of transcript ***

1 O P E N S E S S I O N

2 BY MR. REDDY:

3 Q. Now, Mr. Flasck, I'd like to ask you about some
4 of your opinions regarding the validity of the '117 patent.
5 And let's start by talking about the Takahashi reference.

6 If I could have slide 34 from Mr. Flasck's
7 presentation, please.

8 Mr. Flasck, the display in Takahashi is embedded
9 into a wall, correct?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. Now in your opinion -- it's your opinion, sorry,
12 that the wall-embedded liquid crystal panel unit in
13 Takahashi includes a case as required by claim 1, correct?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. And you've identified what you contend is a case
16 in green on slide 34, correct?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. And in your opinion the case is defined by
19 element 23 on the left and element 22 on the right, correct?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. Now elements 22 and 23 are not the outermost case
22 in Takahashi, correct?

23 A. That's correct, Takahashi has an inner case and
24 an outer case.

25 Q. Elements 22 and 23 are the inner case in

1 Takahashi, correct?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. The outermost case is defined by elements 5 and
4 6, correct?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. And so elements 22 and 23 are both completely
7 inside what you call the outermost case, right?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. Now in your expert report you identified
10 different elements from Takahashi as satisfying the case
11 limitation, correct?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. And specifically you said in your expert report
14 that elements 6 and 5 satisfy the case limitation in claim
15 1, correct?

16 A. In one portion of my expert report in the case
17 portion, yes, I did.

18 Q. And then, as you mentioned in your deposition,
19 after reviewing the report Dr. Smith prepared, you changed
20 your opinion as to what the case is, correct?

21 A. I think what happened was an edit was missed, but
22 after I read Dr. Smith's report I realized that we had
23 missed something, and I think an edit was missed, but, in
24 any case, I clarified my opinion at that point to say that
25 the case of relevance was 22 and 23.

1 O P E N S E S S I O N

2 BY MR. REDDY:

3 Q. Now, Mr. Flasck, I'd like to ask you about some
4 of your opinions regarding the validity of the '117 patent.
5 And let's start by talking about the Takahashi reference.

6 If I could have slide 34 from Mr. Flasck's
7 presentation, please.

8 Mr. Flasck, the display in Takahashi is embedded
9 into a wall, correct?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. Now in your opinion -- it's your opinion, sorry,
12 that the wall-embedded liquid crystal panel unit in
13 Takahashi includes a case as required by claim 1, correct?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. And you've identified what you contend is a case
16 in green on slide 34, correct?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. And in your opinion the case is defined by
19 element 23 on the left and element 22 on the right, correct?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. Now elements 22 and 23 are not the outermost case
22 in Takahashi, correct?

23 A. That's correct, Takahashi has an inner case and
24 an outer case.

25 Q. Elements 22 and 23 are the inner case in

1 Takahashi, correct?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. The outermost case is defined by elements 5 and
4 6, correct?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. And so elements 22 and 23 are both completely
7 inside what you call the outermost case, right?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. Now in your expert report you identified
10 different elements from Takahashi as satisfying the case
11 limitation, correct?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. And specifically you said in your expert report
14 that elements 6 and 5 satisfy the case limitation in claim
15 1, correct?

16 A. In one portion of my expert report in the case
17 portion, yes, I did.

18 Q. And then, as you mentioned in your deposition,
19 after reviewing the report Dr. Smith prepared, you changed
20 your opinion as to what the case is, correct?

21 A. I think what happened was an edit was missed, but
22 after I read Dr. Smith's report I realized that we had
23 missed something, and I think an edit was missed, but, in
24 any case, I clarified my opinion at that point to say that
25 the case of relevance was 22 and 23.