

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SAMSUNG DISPLAY CO., LTD.,
Petitioner,

v.

PICTIVA DISPLAYS INTERNATIONAL LTD.,
Patent Owner.

Case No. IPR2024-01095
Patent No. 11,828,425

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY SUPPLEMENTATION

EXHIBIT LIST

Exhibit	Description
2001	Disclaimer, U.S. Patent 11,828,425 (filed Oct. 25, 2024)
2002	Declaration of P. Morgan Pattison, Ph.D.
2003	Kim, H. M., Seo, J. H., Han, W. K., Lee, K. H., Kang, H. J., Yoon, S. S., & Kim, Y. K. (2011), Improvement of Mixed Electron Transport Structure Red Phosphorescent Organic Light-Emitting Diodes, <i>Molecular Crystals and Liquid Crystals</i> , 538(1), 53-60
2004	Arunandan Kumar, Ritu Srivastava, Priyanka Tyagi, D. S. Mehta, M. N. Kamalasanan, Effect of doping of 8-hydroxyquinolinatolithium on electron transport in tris(8-hydroxyquinolinato)aluminum, <i>J. Appl. Phys.</i> 1 June 2011; 109 (11): 114511
2005	Chan Seok Oh, Jun Yeob Lee, High triplet energy n-type dopants for high efficiency in phosphorescent organic light-emitting diodes, <i>Organic Electronics</i> , Volume 16, 2015, Pages 34-39
2006	Sunwoo Kang, Sang Ho Jeon, Taekyung Kim, Unraveling the complexation effect of electron transporting materials with Liq on the charge transport properties: A theoretical perspective, <i>Chemical Physics Letters</i> , Volume 810, 2023, 140207
2007	T. Sasaki, T. Oono, T. Shimizu, H. Fukagawa, Effects of Energy-Level Alignment on Operating Voltages of Blue Organic Light-Emitting Diodes. <i>Adv. Mater. Interfaces</i> 2023, 1, 2201925
2008	Vadim I. Adamovich, Steven R. Cordero, Peter I. Djurovich, Arnold Tamayo, Mark E. Thompson, Brian W. D'Andrade, Stephen R. Forrest, New charge-carrier blocking materials for high efficiency OLEDs, <i>Organic Electronics</i> , Volume 4, Issues 2-3, 2003, Pages 77-87
2009	Björn Lüssem, Chang-Min Keum, Daniel Kasemann, Ben Naab, Zhenan Bao, and Karl Leo, Doped Organic Transistors, <i>Chemical Reviews</i> 2016 116 (22), 13714-13751

Exhibit	Description
2010	U.S. Patent No. 11,585,504
2011	U.S. Patent No. 10,605,422
2012	U.S. Patent No. 9,797,567
2013	Federal Court Management Statistics for U.S. District Courts, available from https://www.uscourts.gov/statistics/table/na/federal-courtmanagement-statistics/2024/06/30-1
2014	Samsung Invalidity Contentions in the parallel district court case
2015	2024-12-16 Email from Samsung to Pictiva re “IPR2024-01095 – Stipulation”
2016	Deposition Transcript of Dr. Schubert with Ex. 1 of the deposition (Schubert Declaration)

I. *Sand Revolution* Stipulation Does Not Alter *Fintiv* Analysis

Nearly three weeks after Pictiva's sur-reply, Samsung offered a *Sand Revolution* stipulation. EX2015. But as the Board has observed, a *Sand Revolution* stipulation is often considered "to weigh only marginally against denying institution." *AT&T Services Inc. v. ASIS Tech. Licensing Inc.*, IPR2024-00992, Paper 14 at 13 (PTAB, Dec. 16, 2024) (citing *Nokia of Am. Corp. v. Soto*, IPR2023-00680, Paper 30 at 13 (PTAB Dir. Review Dec. 3, 2024)). Indeed, on the same day that Samsung belatedly offered the stipulation, the Board issued two decisions denying institution despite a stipulation that also agreed not to raise grounds based on "the primary prior art references asserted in [the] Petition" and is allegedly "broader than a *Sand Revolution* stipulation." *Id.*; see also *AT&T Services Inc. v. ASIS Tech. Licensing Inc.*, IPR2024-00997, Paper 15 at 12 (PTAB, Dec. 16, 2024) (same). The Board nevertheless found that the fourth *Fintiv* factor still "weighs only marginally against discretionary denial." *Id.*

The same conclusion should apply here: Samsung can simply add one more reference to the Diekmann-Ma or Suzuki-Ma combination and call it a new ground. See, EX2014 at 232 (invalidity grounds include Suzuki or Diekmann and "any one of ... Ma" and other references). That does not reduce overlap with the district court case. Discretionary denial remains proper.

II. The Testimony of Samsung's Expert, Dr. Schubert, Confirms That Samsung Has Not Made Out a *Prima Facie* Case

In the district court, Samsung's expert, Dr. Schubert, testified that element 1[f] should "mean in a spectral range that includes the full spectrum from infrared radiation to UV operation during operation," which "needs to include the entire visible spectrum[.]" EX2016, 127:8-128:4, 132:6-16, 133:16-20. He confirmed that emissions in merely a portion of the visible range, such as emissions in the blue or red light range, would not satisfy Samsung's definition for the term. *Id.*, 134:4-18.

But the '425's element 1[h] additionally requires that "the organic layer sequence comprises an emission layer comprising an iridium-containing compound." Pet. 26, 58. For 1[h], Petitioner relies on Ir-complexes that emit only in some, but not all, of the visible range. For instance, Ir(ppy) is "a green light-emitting ... compound." Pet. 26. Petitioner does not explain how the Diekmann combination satisfies both 1[f] and 1[h] under Samsung's proposed construction. Petitioner also provides no analysis on the emission range for Suzuki's Ir-1 to Ir-12 complexes or combinations thereof. Pet. 58; EX1006, [0303]-[0309]. Hence, the Petition also fails to explain why the Suzuki combination discloses all limitations of the claims under Samsung's interpretation. The Board should therefore decline to institute because the Petition has not shown how the claims are unpatentable under Samsung's own proposed claim construction (37 C.F.R. §104(b)(3), (4)).

Dated: December 25, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Hong Zhong/

H. Annita Zhong. (Reg. No. 66,530)

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.6, that on December 25, 2024, a complete copy of the **PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY SUPPLEMENTATION** and **EXHIBITS 2015-2016** were served upon the following, by ELECTRONIC MAIL:

COVINGTON & BURLING LLP

Scott C. Weidenfeller (Reg. No. 54,531)

sweidenfeller@cov.com

David A. Garr (Reg. No. 74,932)

dgarr@cov.com

SDC-Pictiva-IPR@cov.com

/Susan M. Langworthy/

Susan M. Langworthy