

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

CORETRONIC CORPORATION and
OPTOMA CORPORATION,

Petitioners,

- vs. -

MAXELL, LTD.,

Patent Owner

IPR2025-00477

PETITION FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW

OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,850,313

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	MANDATORY NOTICES UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.8.....	1
	A. Parties-in-Interest	1
	B. Related Matters	1
	C. Lead and Back-up Counsel and Service Information	1
II.	GROUNDS FOR STANDING.....	2
III.	REQUESTED RELIEF	2
IV.	REASONS FOR THE REQUESTED RELIEF	2
	A. Projection-Type Image Display Apparatuses Having an Image Display Element and Capable of Projecting on a Screen Obliquely Using a Projection Lens Were Well-Known Long Before the '313 Patent	3
	B. '313 Patent Summary	5
	C. Prosecution History	8
	D. Priority Date	9
	E. Challenged Claims	9
	F. Discretionary Denial Under § 325(d) or § 314 is Not Warranted	9
V.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	12
VI.	STATUTORY GROUNDS FOR CHALLENGES.....	12
VII.	LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART.....	13
VIII.	CLAIMS 1-3 ARE UNPATENTABLE	14
	A. The Claims of the '313 Patent.....	14
	1. Independent Claim 1	14

2. Dependent Claims 2 and 3	15
B. Ground 1: Claims 1 and 3 are invalid under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over Yamagishi '723 in view of Itohiya '986 and Itohiya '759.	15
1. Overview of Prior Art.....	15
2. Motivation to Combine Yamagishi '723 with Itohiya '986 and Itohiya '759.....	21
3. Element-by-Element Invalidity Analysis	24
C. Ground 2: Claim 2 is invalid under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over Yamagishi '723 in view of Itohiya '986 and Itohiya '759, and Further in View of Ohzawa.....	38
1. Ohzawa	38
2. Motivation to Combine Ohzawa with Yamagishi '723, Itohiya '986, and Itohiya '759	40
3. Element-by-Element Analysis	41
D. Ground 3: Claims 1 and 3 are invalid under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over Itohiya '759 in view of Itohiya '986.....	42
1. Overview of Prior Art.....	42
2. Motivation to Combine Itohiya '759 with Itohiya '986.....	43
3. Element-by-element analysis.....	45
E. Ground 4: Claim 2 is invalid under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over Itohiya '759 in view of Itohiya '986 and Further in View of Ohzawa	56
1. Ohzawa	56
2. Motivation to Combine Ohzawa with Itohiya '759 and Itohiya '986.....	56

3.	Element-by-Element Analysis	57
F.	Ground 5: Claim 1 is invalid under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over Karasawa in view of Yamagishi ‘706 and Itohiya ‘759.	57
1.	Overview of Prior Art.....	57
2.	Motivation to Combine Karasawa with Yamagishi ‘706 and Itohiya ‘759.....	62
3.	Element-by-element analysis.....	64
G.	Ground 6: Claim 2 is invalid under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over Karasawa in view of Yamagishi ‘706 and Itohiya ‘759 and Further in View of Ohzawa.....	77
1.	Ohzawa	77
2.	Motivation to Combine Ohzawa with Karasawa, Yamagishi ‘706, and Itohiya ‘759	78
3.	Element-by-Element Analysis	78
H.	Ground 7: Claim 3 is invalid under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over Karasawa in view of Yamagishi ‘706 and Itohiya ‘759 and Further in View of Itohiya ‘986	78
1.	Itohiya ‘986.....	78
2.	Motivation to Combine Itohiya ‘986 with Karasawa, Yamagishi ‘706, and Itohiya ‘759.....	79
3.	Element-by-Element Analysis	79
IX.	SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS	81
X.	CONCLUSION.....	81

PETITIONERS' EXHIBIT LIST

EX1001	U.S. Patent No. 7,850,313 (the '313 Patent)
EX1002	Prosecution History of the '313 Patent
EX1003	CV of Dr. Jose Sasian
EX1004	Declaration of Dr. Jose Sasian, dated January 16, 2025
EX1005	US2006/0132723A1 (“Yamagishi ’723”)
EX1006	JP2006047986A (“Itohiya ’986”)
EX1007	US2005/0275759A1 (“Itohiya ’759”)
EX1008	US6,542,204B1 (“Ohzawa”)
EX1009	JP2003248169A (“Karasawa”)
EX1010	US2005/0219706A1 (“Yamagishi ’706”)
EX1011	<i>First Amended Docket Control Order, Maxell, Ltd. v. Coretronic Corp. et al., Case No. 5:24-cv-00088 (E.D. Tex. Jan. 7, 2025)</i>
EX1012	US2006/0285080A1 (“Kurihara”)

I. MANDATORY NOTICES UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.8

A. Parties-in-Interest

The Petitioners are Coretronic Corporation (“Coretronic”) and Optoma Corporation (“Optoma”) (collectively, “Petitioners”). Coretronic, Optoma, and Optoma Technology, Inc. (“Optoma USA”) are real parties in interest.

B. Related Matters

Patent Owner Maxell, Ltd. (“Maxell”) has asserted U.S. Patent No. 7,850,313 (“the ‘313 Patent”) against Petitioners in *Maxell, Ltd. v. Coretronic Corp. et al.*, Case No. 5:24-cv-00088 (E.D. Tex.). That case is currently pending.

Petitioners are not aware of any other related matters.

C. Lead and Back-up Counsel and Service Information

Lead Counsel

Donald R. McPhail
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
1900 Duke Street
Suite 600
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Phone: 703-684-2500
Fax: 612-332-9081
dmcphail@merchantgould.com
USPTO Reg. No.: 35,811

Back-up Counsel

John S. Kern
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
1900 Duke Street
Suite 600
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Phone: 703-684-2500
Fax: 612-332-9081
jkern@merchantgould.com
USPTO Reg. No.: 42,719

Alexander B. Englehart
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
1900 Duke Street
Suite 600
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Phone: 703-684-2500
Fax: 612-332-9081
aenglehart@merchantgould.com
USPTO Reg. No.: 62,031

Please address all correspondence to lead and back-up counsel at coretronic313ipr@merchantgould.com. Petitioners consent to electronic service.

II. GROUNDS FOR STANDING

Petitioners certify that the '313 Patent is available for *inter partes* review and that Petitioners are not barred or estopped from requesting *inter partes* review challenging the patent claims on the grounds identified in this Petition.

III. REQUESTED RELIEF

Petitioners request that the Board review the accompanying prior art and analysis, institute a trial for an *inter partes* review of claims 1-3 of the '313 Patent ("the Challenged Claims"), and cancel those claims as unpatentable.

IV. REASONS FOR THE REQUESTED RELIEF

The Challenged Claims of the '313 Patent would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art ("POSITA") as of their priority date, and are therefore unpatentable. The claims of the '313 Patent recite nothing more than an obvious combination of optical and mechanical elements that had been known and used by POSITAs for many years prior to the filing of the '313 Patent.


This Petition's showing that the cited art renders the Challenged Claims unpatentable is fully supported by the Declaration of Dr. Jose Sasian (EX1004), a

Professor of Optical Sciences for over 20 years at the University of Arizona. EX1004, ¶9. Professor Sasian is familiar with the state of the art before the '313 Patent was filed, and fully agrees with and supports the showing herein that the claims at issue merely recite long-known optical and mechanical elements arranged in an obvious fashion. EX1004, ¶¶28-179.

Accordingly, the Board should institute trial and cancel the Challenged Claims.

A. Projection-Type Image Display Apparatuses Having an Image Display Element and Capable of Projecting on a Screen Obliquely Using a Projection Lens Were Well-Known Long Before the '313 Patent


The development of optical projectors goes back to the Magic Lantern, which evolved into slide projectors, overhead projectors, and movie film projectors. EX1004, ¶29. With the advent of micro-photolithography, optical projectors further evolved as digital projectors, and complex projectors for the fabrication of micro-electronic circuits. *Id.*




The main block components of an optical projector are a light source, a light condenser, a transparency or subject to be projected, a projection lens, and a screen. EX1004, ¶30.

The projection lens's function is to form an image of the slide, or image display such as a liquid crystal display (LCD) or digital micro-mirror display (DMD), on the screen. EX1004, ¶32.

Modern digital projectors use a light valve. *Id.* The light valve can be an LCD or a DMD. *Id.* A light valve can, in addition, transmit or reflect light cast by the condenser optics. *Id.*



Projectors that use a DMD image display work on reflecting light and may require a prism to input the light from the condenser optics. EX1004, ¶34.




The projection lens is often a multi-lens element so that sharp images can be cast at high contrast. EX1004, ¶36.

B. '313 Patent Summary

The '313 Patent describes a projection type image apparatus. EX1001, abstract; EX1004, ¶38. The described apparatus includes an image display element, a first lens group disposed in a light direction with respect to the image display element and configured to include a plurality of lenses, a second lens group disposed in a light direction with respect to the first lens group and configured to include a plurality of lenses, a reflection mirror configured to reflect lights emitted from the first and/or second lens groups so as to project upon a screen obliquely, a first mounting base on which the first lens group is mounted, a second mounting base on which the second lens group is mounted, and a chassis configured to store the first and second lens groups, the reflection mirror, and the first and second mounting

bases. *Id.* The first mounting base is fixed at a bottom of the chassis, while the second mounting base is moveable. *Id.*


The '313 Patent's Fig. 2, annotated below, depicts a cross-section of an embodiment of the claimed projection type image apparatus.



This figure shows an image display element 1 (orange), a first lens group 2 (yellow), a second lens group 3 (blue), a reflection mirror 4 (green), and a screen 5 (purple). EX1001, 4:61-5:43. Light is emitted from light source 8, passes through the image display element 1, the first lens group 2, and the second lens group 3, and then reflects from the reflection mirror 4 and is projected onto the screen 5 at an oblique angle θ_s . *Id.* The patent explains that “an oblique incidence of the light upon the screen produces various kinds of aberrations, including so-called a

trapezoidal distortion, i.e., an oblong configuration of projection from the image display element 1 becomes a trapezoid, and also other than that, due to the rotational asymmetry to the optical axis, etc., but according to the present invention, those are compensated upon the reflection surfaces of the rear lens group 3 ... and also those of the reflection optic system.” *Id.*, 6:8-16.

The ‘313 Patent also discloses and claims mounting bases for the front and rear lens groups. *Id.*, abstract; EX1004, ¶41. These are shown in Fig. 23(a), annotated below:



The patent explains that “on two (2) sets of mounting bases 210 and 220 are mounted the above-mentioned front lens group 2 (the rotationally symmetric

lenses 21-25) and the above-mentioned rear lens group 3 (lenses 31-34), respectively.” EX1001, 29:32-36. The patent then describes how one mounting base (light gray) is fixed, while the other mounting base (dark gray) is moveable. “[U]pon one of the mounting bases (for example, the mounting base 210) are fixed the above-mentioned front lens group 2 (the rotationally symmetric lenses 21-25) at the predetermined positions thereof.” *Id.*, 29:36-39. “[O]n the other mounting base (for example, the mounting base 220) are formed grooves 221, 222 and 223, in advance, and also that mounting base 220 is installed within the apparatus to be movable with respect to the mounting base 210 mentioned above.” *Id.*, 29:40-45.

The patent also describes an embodiment where a cylinder or barrel-shaped structure is used as a mounting base for the moveable lens group. “[I]t is also possible to achieve the [moveable lens] effect similar to that mentioned above, with using a cylinder, on an outer periphery of which are formed such the grooves as mentioned above, for example.” *Id.*, 30:6-9. “Further, with using a driving means including an electric motor therein, for example, it is also possible to adopt the structures, so that the rear lens group 3 (i.e., the lenses 31-34) can be move[d], respectively.” *Id.*, 30:18-21.

C. Prosecution History

The ‘313 Patent issued on December 14, 2010 from U.S. Patent Application No. 12/825,836, filed June 29, 2010. EX1004, ¶44. The patent claims priority as a

continuation of application No. 11/763,465, filed on June 15, 2007 and which became U.S. Patent No. 7,766,488. EX1002; EX1004, ¶44. It further claims foreign priority to Japanese Application No. 2006-166434, filed on June 15, 2006. *Id.* The claims of the '313 Patent were allowed without any rejections or amendments via a Notice of Allowance that was mailed on August 5, 2010. EX1002 at 202-05; EX1004, ¶44.

D. Priority Date

All of the references cited in the instant Petition qualify as prior art based on the assumed priority date of June 15, 2006, the filing date of the Japanese application to which the '313 Patent claims foreign priority.

E. Challenged Claims

Claims 1-3 of the '313 Patent are challenged.

F. Discretionary Denial Under § 325(d) or § 314 is Not Warranted

Petitioners have not been involved in any previous review of the '313 Patent. The Office has not considered the references or combinations of references forming the grounds for this Petition. Additionally, the Petition cites the Declaration of Dr. Sasian, which has likewise not been presented to the Office before. EX1004. As the same or similar arguments have not been previously considered by the Office, discretionary denial under §325(d) is not warranted here.

Likewise, denial under §314(a) is not warranted. The discretionary factors set forth in *Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc.*, do not favor denying institution. IPR2020-00019, Paper 11 (PTAB Mar. 20, 2020) (precedential).

Fintiv factor one is neutral. Upon institution of this petition, Petitioners may file a motion to stay the parallel litigation. Furthermore, while no motion to stay pending IPR has yet been filed in the Texas district court case, courts commonly stay cases upon IPR institution. *Cf. VMWare, Inc. v. Intell. Ventures II LLC*, IPR2020-00859, Paper 13 at 12 (PTAB Nov. 5, 2020).

Fintiv factor two is neutral. Although the trial date in the Texas litigation is currently March 23, 2026, that date could get pushed back. EX1011. *See Interim Fintiv Guidance* at 8-9 (June 21, 2022). The most recent statistics on median time-to-trial for civil actions in the Eastern District of Texas is 21.9 months.¹ Here, the complaint in the Texas litigation was filed on July 9, 2024, making the calculated trial date based on the median statistics in May 2026. The Board’s final written decision (FWD) in this case is expected in approximately July 2026—meaning that the district court trial could easily occur after the FWD if the trial gets pushed back only slightly more than a median trial in the Texas district court.

¹ *See* https://www.uscourts.gov/sites/default/files/2024-12/fcms_na_distprofile0930.2024.pdf.

Fintiv factor three weighs against discretionary denial. The court proceeding is at an early stage, with relatively little investment from the court and parties. The court has not yet issued any substantive orders relating to the ‘313 Patent. Expert reports have not been prepared on any issues in the Texas litigation. And Petitioners have been diligent—Petitioners filed this Petition around two and half months after receiving Patent Owner’s infringement contentions, less than two month after Patent Owner supplemented those contentions, and over five months before Petitioners’ bar date. Petitioners have not delayed filing for any strategic advantage.

Fintiv factor four weighs against discretionary denial. If this Petition is instituted, Petitioners stipulate that they will not pursue the grounds identified in this Petition before the district court. *See Sand Revolution II, LLC v. Cont’l Intermodal Grp.-Trucking LLC*, IPR2019-01393, Paper 24 at 11-12 (June 16, 2020). There will therefore be no overlap of issues between the two proceedings. Moreover, given the word limit imposed by 37 C.F.R. § 42.24(a)(1)(i), this Petition presents all grounds that Petitioners could have reasonably raised in one petition. Additionally, Patent Owner asserts only three claims in the district court, and this Petition challenges all three of those claims.

Fintiv factor five is neutral because Petitioners and Patent Owner are the same parties as in the district court.

Regarding *Fintiv* factor six, the strong merits of this Petition weigh heavily against discretionary denial. None of the references asserted herein were previously considered by the Patent Office, and Petitioners raise compelling, meritorious challenges that the Patent Owner cannot meaningfully rebut. This all underscores the conclusion that one or more claims of the '313 Patent are unpatentable by a preponderance of the evidence.

Thus, considering the *Fintiv* factors overall, institution would best serve the efficiency and integrity of the system. Discretionary denial is not warranted.

V. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION

Terms not construed in the discussion below have their plain and ordinary meaning consistent with the claim construction standards set forth under *Phillips v. AWH Corp.*, 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005). EX1004, ¶24.

VI. STATUTORY GROUNDS FOR CHALLENGES

Ground #1: Claims 1 and 3 of the '313 Patent are obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over US2006/0132723A1 (“Yamagishi '723” EX1005) in view of JP2006047986A (“Itohiya '986” EX1006) and US2005/0275759A1 (“Itohiya '759” EX1007).

Ground #2: Claim 2 of the '313 Patent is obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Yamagishi '723 in view of Itohiya '986, Itohiya '759, and US6,542,204B1 (“Ohzawa” EX1008)

Ground #3: Claims 1 and 3 of the '313 Patent are obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Itohiya '759 in view of Itohiya '986.

Ground #4: Claim 2 of the '313 Patent is obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Itohiya '759 in view of Itohiya '986 and Ohzawa.

Ground #5: Claim 1 of the '313 Patent is obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over JP2003248169A (“Karasawa” EX1009) in view of US2005/0219706A1 (“Yamagishi '706” EX1010) and Itohiya '759.

Ground #6: Claim 2 of the '313 Patent is obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Karasawa in view of Yamagishi '706, Itohiya '759, and Ohzawa.

Ground #7: Claim 3 of the '313 Patent is obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Karasawa in view of Yamagishi '706, Itohiya '759, and Itohiya '986.

VII. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART

As of June 15, 2006, a POSITA would have had a Ph.D. in electrical engineering, physics, optical sciences, optical engineering, or a related scientific or engineering field, and at least one to two years of work or research experience in optical engineering, optical design, or a related field. EX1004, ¶26. Alternatively, a POSITA could have had a Bachelor's degree in one of the foregoing areas and at least three to four years of work or research experience in optical engineering, optical design, optoelectronics, or a related field. *Id.*

VIII. CLAIMS 1-3 ARE UNPATENTABLE

A. The Claims of the '313 Patent

This petition's showing that the cited art renders the challenged claims unpatentable is fully supported by the Declaration of Jose Sasian (EX1004), a Professor of Optical Sciences at the University of Arizona for over 20 years. *Id.*, ¶9. Professor Sasian is familiar with the state of the art before the '313 Patent was filed (*see id.*, ¶¶28-36), and fully supports the showing herein that the claims at issue merely recite long-known optical and mechanical elements arranged in an obvious fashion. EX1004, ¶¶68-179.

1. Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 is the '313 Patent's only independent claim. It recites as follows:

1. A projection type image display apparatus, comprising:
 - an image display element;
 - a first lens group, being disposed in a light direction with respect to said image display element, which is configured to include a plural number of lenses;
 - a second lens group, being disposed in a light direction with respect to said first lens group, which is configured to include a plural number of lenses;
 - a reflection mirror, which is configured to reflect lights emitted from at least one of said first and second lens groups, so as to project upon said screen obliquely;
 - a first mounting base, on which said first lens group is mounted;
 - a second mounting base, on which said second lens group is mounted; and

a chassis, which is configured to store said first and second lens group, said reflection mirror, and said first and second mounting bases;

wherein said first mounting base is fixed at a bottom of said chassis, while said second mounting base is moveable.

2. Dependent Claims 2 and 3

Claims 2 and 3 both depend from claim 1. Claim 2 adds the limitation “wherein an optical axis of said first and second lens group is inclined to a normal line at a center of a surface of said image display element.” Claim 3 adds the limitation “further comprising: a rod member, which makes said second mounting base movable.”

B. Ground 1: Claims 1 and 3 are invalid under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over Yamagishi ‘723 in view of Itohiya ‘986 and Itohiya ‘759.

1. Overview of Prior Art

a) Yamagishi ‘723


(1) Qualification as Prior Art

Yamagishi ‘723 was filed as U.S. Application No. 11/299,042 on December 9, 2005 and published as U.S. Publication No. 2006/0132723 on June 22, 2006. EX1004, ¶46; EX1005. Accordingly, Yamagishi ‘723 qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) (pre-AIA) at least because it was filed before the priority date of the ’313 Patent (June 15, 2006) and later published. *Id.* Yamagishi ‘723 was neither cited nor considered by the Examiner during prosecution of the ’313 Patent. *Id.*

(2) General Overview

Yamagishi '723 generally discloses an optical system and rear projector. EX1005, title; EX1004, ¶47. The optical system comprises a lens system on which projection light from an image generating device is incident; and an aspherical mirror with negative power that is disposed on an optical path between the lens system and a screen, wherein a curvature of the aspherical mirror in the radial direction changes positive to negative on a way from a center to a periphery thereof. *Id.*, abstract; EX1004, ¶47.

Fig. 1 of Yamagishi '723, annotated below, shows the overall arrangement of a rear projector in accordance with Yamagishi '723's invention. EX1005, [0022].



Yamagishi '723 explains that “[t]he rear projector 1 includes, inside a housing 2, a large screen 9, an image generating device 5 including a light source 3 and a light modulator (light valve) 4 that modulates emitted light from the light source 3 based on an image signal (data or information) to generate images, a projection optical system 10 that projects projection light 6 from the image generating device 5 onto the screen 9 from the rear surface thereof, and a large flat mirror 8 that reflects the projection light 6 and guides the projection light 6 to the screen 9.” EX1005, [0022].

Additionally, “[t]he optical system 10 includes the lens system 11 on which the projection light 6 that has been modulated by the light valve 4 of the image generating device 5 is incident and an aspherical mirror 12 with negative power as a whole. The aspherical mirror 12 is provided at a position facing the large flat mirror 8 on the optical paths between the lens system 11 and the screen 9.” EX1005, [0024].

b) Itohiya '986

(1) Qualification as Prior Art

Itohiya '986 was filed as Japanese Application No. 2005-164091 on June 3, 2005 and published as Japanese Publication No. 2006-47986 on February 16, 2006. EX1004, ¶51; EX1006. Accordingly, Itohiya '986 qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) (pre-AIA) at least because it was published more than one year before the earliest U.S. priority date of the '313 Patent (June 15, 2007). Itohiya '986 was neither cited nor considered by the Examiner during prosecution of the '313 Patent. *Id.*

(2) General Overview

Itohiya '986 discloses an optical device. EX1006, title; EX1004, ¶52. At least a portion of a lens system in the optical device can easily be adjusted in a precise fashion. EX1006, abstract; EX1004, ¶52. And at least a portion of the adjusted lens system can be stably affixed without the risk of causing eccentricity. EX1006, abstract; EX1004, ¶52.

Figure 2 of Itohiya '986, reproduced below, depicts a cross-section of the optics and lens barrel in an embodiment of Itohiya '986's invention:




FIG. 2

EX1004, ¶53. Itohiya '986 explains that “[a]n imaging lens 20 consisting of lenses 1-8, as shown in Figure 2, is disposed within fixed lens-barrel portion 14. Lenses 3-8 are supported more fixedly in a known constitution. Lenses 1 and 2, whose position on the optical axis greatly affects the image formation performance and focal length of imaging lens 20, are supported in such a way that [their] position on the optical axis can be adjusted by a lens position adjustment mechanism 30.”

EX1006, [0023].

c) Itohiya '759


(1) Qualification as Prior Art

Itohiya '759 was filed as U.S. Application No. 10/935,147 on September 8, 2004 and published as U.S. Publication No. 2005/0275759 on December 15, 2005.

EX1004, ¶55; EX1007. Accordingly, Itohiya '759 qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) (pre-AIA) at least because it was published more than one year before the earliest U.S. priority date of the '313 Patent (June 15, 2007). Itohiya '759 was neither cited nor considered by the Examiner during prosecution of the '313 Patent. *Id.*

(2) General Overview

Itohiya '759 discloses a rear-projection type imaging apparatus. EX1007, abstract; EX1004, ¶56. Figure 1 of Itohiya '759, annotated below, depicts a cross-section of a rear-projection television set in accordance with Itohiya '759's invention:



EX1004, ¶56. Itohiya '759 explains that “[t]he rear-group optical system 132 is disposed forward of the image display element 120. The rear-group optical system 132 is supported within a lens barrel 142 which can be formed by aluminum die-casting or of an engineering plastic (e.g., polycarbonate, PPS, etc.). Referring to FIG. 2, it is particularly preferred that the barrel 142 for the rear-group optical system is firmly supported on the lower cabinet 112 using any fastening means such as screw fastening. The intermediate mirror 134 is disposed forward of the rear-group optical system 132. The intermediate mirror 134 includes an intermediate mirror retaining member 144 which is supported on the barrel 132 for the rear-group optical system using any fastening means such as fitting/fixing means.” EX1007, [0041].

2. Motivation to Combine Yamagishi '723 with Itohiya '986 and Itohiya '759

A POSITA would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Yamagishi '723 with the teachings of Itohiya '986 and Itohiya '759—and would have had a reasonable expectation of success in making the combination—for a number of reasons, as explained by Dr. Sasian. EX1004, ¶¶69-72.

All three of these references are directed to optical systems that project light from an image-generating device onto a screen by way of groups of lenses. EX1004, ¶69; *see, e.g.*, EX1005, abstract; EX1006, [0001], [0014]; EX1007, abstract. Yamagishi '723 is directed to “[a]n optical system that projects projection light from an image generating device, onto a screen,” where the optical system comprises a

lens system and an aspherical mirror. EX1005, abstract. Itohiya '986 is directed to “optical devices such as rear-projection televisions and rear-projection projectors or other rear-projection video equipment which project enlarged images onto a screen from the rear” and “has the object of providing an optical device with which the position of at least part of a lens system on the optical axis can be easily adjusted, and in which at least part of the adjusted lens system can be stably fixed for a long period of time....” EX1006, [0001], [0014]. Itohiya '759 is directed to “[a] rear-projection type imaging apparatus, for example, rear-projection television set, capable of projecting, and displaying, an enlarged image onto a screen from the rearward thereof.” EX1007, abstract. Accordingly, the references are in the same field of endeavor and POSITAs would naturally have looked to all of them in their work in this area. EX1004, ¶69. Moreover, a POSITA would have understood that the teachings of Yamagishi '723 would have been compatible and operable in combination with the teachings of Itohiya '986 and Itohiya '759 to enhance Yamagishi '723. EX1004, ¶69.

A POSITA would further have recognized that Itohiya '986 specifically describes the benefits of having certain lenses in a rear projection system be moveable while other lenses in the system are fixed in place. EX1004, ¶70. In particular, Itohiya '986 explains that “[t]he optical device of the present invention has the effect that at least a part of the lens system can be easily precisely adjusted,

and at least a part of the adjusted lens system can be stably fixed without eccentricity.” EX1006, [0020]. To a POSITA, this would have been a matter of common sense because it would have been desirable to have some of the lenses in the projection system be moveable in order to allow for the precise focusing and/or magnification of a projected image on a screen. EX1004, ¶70. Itohiya ‘986 further explains that “[t]he optical device of the present invention also has the effect of enabling the constitution of an optical device of desired high precision without requiring the preparation of many spacing rings, without requiring large costs, and without requiring man-hours to select among and build in many components.” *Id.*, [0021]. A POSITA would thus have been motivated to take advantage of these benefits by combining Itohiya ‘986’s disclosures with those of Yamagishi ‘723. EX1004, ¶70.

Additionally, a POSITA would have recognized that Itohiya ‘759 describes details of how the fixed lenses in a system with both fixed and moveable lenses are firmly supported on the lower part of the optical system’s chassis. EX1007, [0040]-[0041]; EX1004, ¶71. Particularly because Itohiya ‘986 and Itohiya ‘759 share the same named inventor, a POSITA looking at Itohiya ‘986’s teachings relating to systems with fixed and moveable lenses would naturally have looked to Itohiya ‘759 for additional implementation details for such systems. EX1004, ¶71.

Ultimately, a POSITA would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Yamagishi '723 with those of Itohiya '986 and Itohiya '759, and would have recognized that combining these teachings would have produced predictable and operable results. EX1004, ¶72.


3. Element-by-Element Invalidity Analysis


a) Independent Claim 1

[1.0] A projection type image display apparatus, comprising;

Yamagishi '723 discloses a projection type image display apparatus.

EX1004, ¶¶73-74. Yamagishi '723's Figures 1 and 3 are annotated below:





Yamagishi '723 teaches that “[t]he present invention relates to an optical system that magnifies and projects projection light that has been modulated by an image generating device such as a liquid crystal device, DMD, based on image information onto a screen, and to a rear projector that uses the same.” EX1005, [0002].

[1.1] an image display element;


Yamagishi '723 discloses that its projection type image display apparatus includes an image display element. EX1004, ¶¶75-76.

Yamagishi '723 discloses “a light modulator (light valve) 4 that modulates emitted light from the light source 3 based on an image signal (data or information) to generate images.” *Id.*, [0022]. Further, “[t]he present invention relates to an optical system that magnifies and projects projection light that has been modulated by an image generating device such as a liquid crystal device, DMD, based on image information onto a screen, and to a rear projector that uses the same.” *Id.*, [0002]. A POSITA would have understood that a “light modulator” such as a liquid crystal device or DMD (Digital Micromirror Device) is an image display element as claimed. EX1004, ¶76.

[1.2] a first lens group, being disposed in a light direction with respect to said image display element, which is configured to include a plural number of lenses;

Yamagishi '723 discloses that its projection type image display apparatus includes a first lens group, being disposed in a light direction with respect to said image display element, which is configured to include a plural number of lenses. EX1004, ¶¶77-80.

Yamagishi '723's first lens group is shown in Fig. 3 below.



Yamagishi '723 teaches that “[t]he lens system 11 is composed of a front group GF with a negative refractive power that is disposed on the projection side (the screen 9 side), that is, the aspherical mirror 12 side and a rear group GR with a positive refractive power that is disposed on the image generating device 5 side.” *Id.*, [0024] (emphasis added). Yamagishi '723’s “rear group GR” corresponds to the “first lens group” claimed in the ‘313 Patent. EX1004, ¶79. As shown in Fig. 3, this rear group of lenses is proximate to the image display element (light modulator) 4 and is disposed in a light direction with respect to the image display element. *Id.*

Further, Yamagishi '723's rear group of lenses clearly includes a plural number of lenses. EX1004, ¶80. Yamagishi '723 explains that “[t]he rear group GR is composed of a total of eleven lenses” EX1005, [0029].

[1.3] a second lens group, being disposed in a light direction with respect to said first lens group, which is configured to include a plural number of lenses;

Yamagishi '723 discloses that its projection type image display apparatus includes a second lens group, being disposed in a light direction with respect to said first lens group, which is configured to include a plural number of lenses. EX1004, ¶¶81-83.

The second lens group corresponds to the “front group GF” shown in Yamagishi '723's Fig. 3 above. EX1004, ¶82. “The lens system 11 is composed of *a front group GF with a negative refractive power that is disposed on the projection side (the screen 9 side)*, that is, the aspherical mirror 12 side and a rear group GR with a positive refractive power that is disposed on the image generating device 5 side.” EX1005, [0024] (emphasis added). As shown in Fig. 3, this front group of lenses is proximate to the aspherical mirror 12 and is disposed in a light direction with respect to the first (rear) lens group. EX1004, ¶82.

Further, Yamagishi '723's front group of lenses clearly includes a plural number of lenses. EX1004, ¶83. Yamagishi '723 explains that “[t]he front group GF includes, in order from the projection side, that is, the aspherical mirror 12 side,

a first lens group G1 with negative refractive power and a second lens group G2 with positive refractive power....” EX1005, [0025].

[1.4] a reflection mirror, which is configured to reflect lights emitted from at least one of said first and second lens groups, so as to project upon said screen obliquely;

Yamagishi '723 discloses that its projection type image display apparatus includes a reflection mirror, which is configured to reflect lights emitted from at least one of said first and second lens groups, so as to project upon said screen obliquely. EX1004, ¶¶84-87.


As a threshold matter, the reference to “said screen” here is indefinite because no “screen” is referenced earlier in the claim and thus “said screen” lacks antecedent basis. However—and without waiving this indefiniteness position for purposes of related litigation—in this petition, Petitioners will proceed to map the claimed “screen” to the prior art notwithstanding its lack of antecedent basis.

In any event, the claimed “reflection mirror” corresponds to Yamagishi '723's aspherical mirror 12, shown in Fig. 3 above. EX1004, ¶85. “The aspherical mirror 12 is provided at a position facing the large flat mirror 8 on the optical paths between the lens system 11 and the screen 9.” EX1005, [0024]. “Since the aspherical mirror 12 whose curvature in the radial direction falls from a center of the mirror toward the periphery with the sign of the curvature becoming inverted on the way is used, it is possible to favorably correct aberration across the entire screen using an optical

system with rotational symmetry that is easy to align instead of using an optical system that is asymmetrical about the optical axis, such as a system including an anamorphic aspherical surface or a free-form surface.” *Id.*, [0073]. “Accordingly, by combining this lens system with the aspherical mirror 12 that has a negative power, it is possible to project the projection light 6 onto the screen 9 with a large incident angle.” *Id.*, [0069].

The aspherical mirror 12 projects upon the screen 9 obliquely, as shown in

Fig. 1:




EX1004, ¶86. As shown here, light reflects from the aspherical mirror 12, hits and is reflected from the flat mirror 8 obliquely, and then hits the screen 9 obliquely. *Id.*, ¶87 The aspherical mirror 12 is thus “configured to reflect lights emitted from at least one of said first and second lens groups, so as to project upon said screen obliquely” as claimed. *Id.*

[1.5] a first mounting base, on which said first lens group is mounted;

While Yamagishi ‘723’s first lens group must inherently be mounted on something, Yamagishi ‘723 does not expressly disclose a first mounting base on which its first lens group is mounted. EX1004, ¶¶88-90. However, Itohiya ‘986 discloses such a first mounting base for a first lens group, and it would have been obvious to combine Itohiya ‘986’s disclosure in this regard with Yamagishi ‘723. *Id.*

Itohiya ‘986 generally states that “[t]he present invention pertains to optical devices such as rear-projection televisions and rear-projection projectors or other rear-projection video equipment which project enlarged images onto a screen from the rear, and optical devices such as high-resolution surveillance cameras, especially optical devices requiring high-precision optical adjustment and the maintenance of the optical stability of the lens system.” EX1006, [0001].

Itohiya '986 further discloses that “[o]ptical device 10 of the first embodiment is a projection lens system for rear-projection type video equipment such as rear-projection televisions and rear-projection projectors. *As shown in Figure 1, optical device 10 has a product mounting flange portion 12 and a fixed lens barrel portion 14 integrally molded from synthetic resin material. An imaging lens 20 consisting of lenses 1-8, as shown in Figure 2, is disposed within fixed lens-barrel portion 14. Lenses 3-8 are supported more fixedly in a known constitution.*” *Id.*, [0023] (emphasis added). Itohiya '986's Figs 1 and 2 are reproduced below:



[1.6] a second mounting base, on which said second lens group is mounted; and

While Yamagishi '723's second lens group must inherently be mounted on something, Yamagishi '723 does not expressly disclose a second mounting base on which its second lens group is mounted. EX1004, ¶¶91-93. However, Itohiya '986

discloses such a second mounting base for a second lens group, and it would have been obvious to combine Itohiya '986's disclosure in this regard with Yamagishi '723. *Id.*

Itohiya '986 discloses that "Lenses 1 and 2, whose position on the optical axis greatly affects the image formation performance and focal length of imaging lens 20, are supported in such a way that [their] position on the optical axis can be adjusted by a lens position adjustment mechanism 30." EX1006, [0023].


Itohiya '986 further teaches that, "as shown in Figures 1 and 2, [the device] is assembled so that the three cam studs 75 are respectively cam-engaged in each of the cam grooves 40 on sliding lens frame 32. At the same time, adjustment fixing screw 62 is screwed into threaded hole 64 on sliding stud 44, wherein columnar part 50 is slidably engaged with straight sliding groove 38. In this state, cam groove 40 is guided by cam stud 75 through the rotation of adjustment fixing screw 62 around the optical axis. I.e., when adjustment fixing screw 62 is rotated around the optical axis, columnar part 50 moves within straight sliding groove 38. *As a result, lenses 1 and 2, supported by sliding lens frame 32, move along the optical axis, adjusting the position of the lenses 1 and 2. Id.*, [0029] (emphasis added).

[1.7] a chassis, which is configured to store said first and second lens group, said reflection mirror, and said first and second mounting bases;

Yamagishi '723 discloses that its projection type image display apparatus includes a chassis, which is configured to store the first and second lens group and the reflection mirror. EX1004, ¶¶94-97. Moreover, in the combined system with Itohiya '986, the chassis would also store the first and second mounting bases. *Id.*

Yamagishi '723's housing 2 is shown in Fig. 1, reproduced below, and corresponds to the claimed chassis.

Fig. 1



EX1004, ¶95. Yamagishi ‘723 teaches that “FIG. 1 shows the overall arrangement of a rear projector according to the one of the aspect of the present invention. The rear projector 1 includes, *inside a housing 2*, a large screen 9, an image generating device 5 including a light source 3 and a light modulator (light valve) 4 that modulates emitted light from the light source 3 based on an image signal (data or information) to generate images, a projection optical system 10 that projects projection light 6 from the image generating device 5 onto the screen 9 from the rear surface thereof, and a large flat mirror 8 that reflects the projection light 6 and guides the projection light 6 to the screen 9.” EX1005, [0022] (emphasis added).

Yamagishi ‘723’s Fig. 1 shows the housing 2 storing the first and second lens groups and the reflection mirror. EX1004, ¶97. Further, a POSITA would understand that, in the combination with Itohiya ‘986, the housing 2 would also store the first and second mounting bases for the first and second lens groups. *Id.* These mounting bases would naturally be placed inside the same chassis as the lens groups that they are supporting. *Id.*

[1.8] wherein said first mounting base is fixed at a bottom of said chassis, while said second mounting base is moveable.

Yamagishi ‘723 does not expressly disclose a first mounting base fixed at a bottom of the chassis of its projection type display apparatus, or a second mounting base that is moveable. EX1004, ¶¶98-100. As discussed above in connection with

limitations [1.5] and [1.6], Itohiya '986 discloses a fixed first mounting base and a moveable second mounting base. *Id.* However, Itohiya '986 may not specifically disclose the details of how its first mounting base is fixed at a bottom of a chassis. *Id.* A POSITA would therefore look to Itohiya '759 for such additional details. *Id.*

In this regard, Itohiya '759 discloses that “[t]he rear-group optical system 132 is disposed forward of the image display element 120. *The rear-group optical system 132 is supported within a lens barrel 142 which can be formed by aluminum die-casting or of an engineering plastic (e.g., polycarbonate, PPS, etc.). Referring to FIG. 2, it is particularly preferred that the barrel 142 for the rear-group optical system is firmly supported on the lower cabinet 112 using any fastening means such as screw fastening.*” EX1007, [0041] (emphasis added).


Accordingly, the combination of Yamagishi '723, Itohiya '986, and Itohiya '759 discloses a projection type display apparatus wherein the first mounting base is fixed at a bottom of the chassis, while the second mounting base is moveable. EX1004, ¶100.

b) Dependent Claim 3

[3.0/3.1] The projection type image display apparatus, according to claim 1, further comprising: a rod member, which makes said second mounting base movable.

Yamagishi '723 may not expressly disclose a rod member that makes a second mounting base moveable. EX1004, ¶¶101-103. However, Itohiya '986 discloses

such a rod member that makes a second mounting base moveable, and it would have been obvious to combine Itohiya '986's disclosure in this regard with Yamagishi '723. *Id.* Itohiya '986's Figs. 1 and 2 are reproduced below:



Itohiya '986 discloses that “[f]irst, as shown in Figures 1 and 2, [the device] is assembled so that the three cam studs 75 are respectively cam-engaged in each of the cam grooves 40 on sliding lens frame 32. At the same time, *adjustment fixing screw 62* is screwed into threaded hole 64 on sliding stud 44, wherein columnar part 50 is slidably engaged with straight sliding groove 38. In this state, cam groove 40 is guided by cam stud 75 through the rotation of adjustment fixing screw 62 around the optical axis. I.e., *when adjustment fixing screw 62 is rotated around the optical axis, columnar part 50 moves within straight sliding groove 38. As a result, lenses 1 and 2, supported by sliding lens frame 32, move along the optical axis, adjusting*

the position of the lenses 1 and 2.” EX1006, [0029] (emphasis added). Itohiya ‘986’s adjustment fixing screw 62 corresponds to the ‘313 Patent’s claimed “rod member,” and makes the second mounting base moveable. EX1004, ¶102.

C. Ground 2: Claim 2 is invalid under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over Yamagishi ’723 in view of Itohiya ’986 and Itohiya ’759, and Further in View of Ohzawa


1. Ohzawa

a) Qualification as Prior Art

Ohzawa was filed as U.S. Application No. 09/493,268 on January 28, 2000 and issued as U.S. Patent No. 6,542,204 on April 1, 2003. EX1004, ¶58; EX1008. Accordingly, Ohzawa qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) (pre-AIA) at least because it was issued more than one year before the earliest U.S. priority date of the ‘313 Patent (June 15, 2007). Ohzawa was neither cited nor considered by the Examiner during prosecution of the ‘313 Patent. *Id.*

b) General Overview

Ohzawa discloses a display optical system that has an illumination optical system for emitting illumination light, a plurality of reflection-type display devices, a projection optical system, and a plane-parallel mirror. EX1008, abstract; EX1004, ¶59. Ohzawa’s Fig. 1, reproduced below, is “a diagram illustrating the construction of the projection optical system employed in the display optical system of a first embodiment of the present invention....” EX1008, 3:30-32.



Ohzawa explains that “[a]lthough not shown, in reality, on the left-hand side of what is shown in FIG. 1 is disposed an object plane (a screen). The projection optical system is provided with, from the object-plane side, lens elements L1, L2, and L3, an aperture stop 1, lens elements L4 to L6, plane- parallel mirrors 2 and 3, a lens element L7 acting as a condenser lens, and a reflection-type display device 4 composed of a reflection-type LCD and acting as an image plane. Note that reference symbol a indicates the optical axis of the projection optical system.” *Id.*, 3:44-53.

The angle θ_o shown on the right side of Fig. 1 is “the angle between a normal to the surface of the reflection-type display device 4 and the optical axis α .” EX1008, 5:57-59; EX1004, ¶61. Ohzawa further discloses that θ_o should be in the range of $5^\circ < \theta_o < 15^\circ$, and thus that the optical axis should be at an incline relative to the normal to the surface of the reflection-type display device 4. EX1008, 5:33-37; EX1004, ¶61. Ohzawa explains that “[i]f this angle is equal to or less than the lower

limit of the condition noted above, it is impossible to design the optical system to allow separation of illumination and projection light. In contrast, if the angle is equal to or greater than the upper limit of the condition, it is impossible to correct the trapezoidal distortion and the coma aberration caused by oblique projection from the reflection-type display device without increasing the number of decentered lens elements and also increasing the decentering amount of those decentered lens elements. This leads to an undesirable increase in manufacturing cost.” EX1008, 5:59-6:2.

2. Motivation to Combine Ohzawa with Yamagishi '723, Itohiya '986, and Itohiya '759

A POSITA would have been motivated to further combine Ohzawa with the combined system of Yamagishi '723, Itohiya '986, Itohiya '759, and would have had a reasonable expectation of success in making the combination. EX1004, ¶105. As Ohzawa explains, there are significant benefits to having the optical axis of the lens groups be at an incline relative to a normal line at a center of a surface of the image display element. *See* EX1008, 5:59-6:2; EX1004, ¶105. For example, this arrangement allows the illumination light to be separated from the projection light, thereby avoiding undesirable interference between the illumination and projection light. *Id.* Moreover, arranging the lenses and image display element in this way allows a designer to obtain the benefits of avoiding interference between the illumination and projection light while correcting the trapezoidal distortion and the

coma aberration caused by oblique projection without needing to increase the number of lens elements or the decentering amount of the lens elements, and thus without increasing the manufacturing cost of the system. *Id.* Further, tilting an image display element relative to an optical axis was a well-known technique in the projector art in the relevant timeframe. *See, e.g.,* EX1012, abstract. A POSITA would thus have been motivated to combine Ohzawa's teachings with those of Yamagishi '723, Itohiya '986, Itohiya '759. *Id.*

3. Element-by-Element Analysis

a) Claim 2

[2.0/2.1] The projection type image display apparatus, according to claim 1, wherein an optical axis of said first and second lens group is inclined to a normal line at a center of a surface of said image display element.

Ohzawa discloses a projection type image display apparatus wherein an optical axis of first and second lens groups is inclined to a normal line at a center of a surface of an image display element. EX1004, ¶¶106-107. As discussed above, the angle θ_0 shown on the right side of Ohzawa's Fig. 1 is "the angle between a normal to the surface of the reflection-type display device 4 and the optical axis α ." EX1008, 5:57-59; EX1004, ¶106. Ohzawa further discloses that θ_0 should be in the range of $5^\circ < \theta_0 < 15^\circ$, and thus that the optical axis should be at an incline relative to the normal to the surface of the reflection-type display device 4. EX1008, 5:33-37;

EX1004, ¶106. Ohzawa explains that “[i]f this angle is equal to or less than the lower limit of the condition noted above, it is impossible to design the optical system to allow separation of illumination and projection light. In contrast, if the angle is equal to or greater than the upper limit of the condition, it is impossible to correct the trapezoidal distortion and the coma aberration caused by oblique projection from the reflection-type display device without increasing the number of decentered lens elements and also increasing the decentering amount of those decentered lens elements. This leads to an undesirable increase in manufacturing cost.” EX1008, 5:59-6:2.

D. Ground 3: Claims 1 and 3 are invalid under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over Itohiya ’759 in view of Itohiya ’986.

1. Overview of Prior Art

a) Itohiya ’759

(1) Qualification as Prior Art

See Section VIII.B.1.c.(1), *supra*.

(2) General Overview

See Section VIII.B.1.c.(2), *supra*.

a) Itohiya ’986

(1) Qualification as Prior Art

See Section VIII.B.1.b.(1), *supra*.

(2) General Overview

See Section VIII.B.1.b.(2), *supra*.

2. Motivation to Combine Itohiya '759 with Itohiya '986.

A POSITA would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Itohiya '759 with the teachings of Itohiya '986—and would have had a reasonable expectation of success in making the combination—for a number of reasons, as explained by Dr. Sasian. EX1004, ¶¶109-113.

Both of these references are directed to optical systems that project light from an image generating device onto a screen by way of lenses. EX1004, ¶109; *see, e.g.*, EX1006, [0001], [0014]; EX1007, abstract. Accordingly, the references are in the same field of endeavor and POSITAs would naturally have looked to them in their work. EX1004, ¶109. Moreover, a POSITA would have understood that the teachings of Itohiya '759 would have been compatible and operable in combination with the teachings of Itohiya '986. *Id.*

Particularly because Itohiya '759 and Itohiya '986 share the same named inventor, a POSITA looking at Itohiya '759's teachings relating to rear projection optical systems would naturally have looked to Itohiya '986 for additional ideas on how to implement and/or improve such systems. EX1004, ¶110.

For example, a POSITA would have recognized that Itohiya '986 describes the benefits of having certain lenses in a rear projection system be moveable while other lenses in the system are fixed in place. EX1004, ¶111. Itohiya '986 explains that “[t]he optical device of the present invention has the effect that at least a part of

the lens system can be easily precisely adjusted, and at least a part of the adjusted lens system can be stably fixed without eccentricity.” EX1006, [0020]. Itohiya ‘986 further explains that “[t]he optical device of the present invention also has the effect of enabling the constitution of an optical device of desired high precision without requiring the preparation of many spacing rings, without requiring large costs, and without requiring man-hours to select among and build in many components.” *Id.*, [0021]. A POSITA would thus have been motivated to take advantage of these benefits by combining Itohiya ‘986’s disclosures with those of Itohiya ‘759. EX1004, ¶111.

Additionally, a POSITA would have recognized that Itohiya ‘986 describes details of how the moveable lenses in a system with both fixed and moveable lenses can be moved and adjusted. EX1006, [0023], [0029]; EX1004, ¶112. Particularly because Itohiya ‘986 and Itohiya ‘759 share the same named inventor, a POSITA looking at Itohiya ‘759’s teachings relating to systems with fixed and moveable lenses would naturally have looked to Itohiya ‘986 for additional implementation details for such systems. EX1004, ¶112.

Ultimately, a POSITA would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Itohiya ‘759 with those of Itohiya ‘986, and would have recognized that combining these teachings would have produced predictable and operable results. EX1004, ¶113.


3. Element-by-element analysis

a) Independent Claim 1

[1.0] A projection type image display apparatus, comprising;

Itoshiya '759 discloses a projection type image display apparatus. EX1004, ¶¶114-115. For example, Itoshiya '759 teaches that “[t]he present invention relates to a rear-projection type imaging apparatus which can project, and display, an enlarged image onto a screen from the rearward thereof, such as rear-projection television sets or rear projectors. In particular, the present invention relates to a rear-projection type imaging apparatus configured to reduce vibration in a projection lens system due to sounds coming out of woofers.” EX1007, [0002].

Itoshiya '759's Fig. 1 is annotated below:



[1.1] an image display element;

Itohiya ‘759 discloses a projection type image display apparatus that includes an image display element. EX1004, ¶116. Itohiya ‘759 teaches that “[t]he image display element 120 may be in the form of a liquid crystal panel. A projection lens system 130 is disposed in the central portion of the lower cabinet 112 forward of the image display element 120 for enlarging and projecting the image displayed by the image display element 120.” EX1007, [0037].

[1.2] a first lens group, being disposed in a light direction with respect to said image display element, which is configured to include a plural number of lenses;

Itohiya '759 discloses a projection type image display apparatus that includes a first lens group, being disposed in a light direction with respect to said image display element, which is configured to include a plural number of lenses. EX1004, ¶¶117-118.

Itohiya '759 teaches that “[t]he projection lens system 130 comprises a rear-group optical system 132 including a plurality of convex lenses for converging rays from the image displayed by the image display element 120 The rear-group optical system 132 may comprise a single convex lens or a combination of one or more convex lenses with one or more concave lenses.” EX1007, [0040]. As shown in Fig. 1, the first lens group (rear-group optical system 132) is disposed in a light direction with respect to the image display element 120. EX1004, ¶118. And Itohiya '759 specifically describes how its rear-group optical system 132 includes a “plurality,” *i.e.*, a plural number, of lenses. EX1007, [0040]; EX1004, ¶118.

[1.3] a second lens group, being disposed in a light direction with respect to said first lens group, which is configured to include a plural number of lenses;

Itohiya '759 discloses a projection type image display apparatus that includes a second lens group, being disposed in a light direction with respect to said first lens

group, which is configured to include a plural number of lenses. EX1004, ¶¶119-121.

Itohiya '759 teaches that “[t]he projection lens system 130 comprises ... a front-group optical system 136 including a plurality of concave lenses ... The front-group optical system 136 may comprise a single concave lens or a combination of one or more concave lenses with one or more convex lenses.” EX1007, [0040]. Itohiya '759 specifically describes how its front-group optical system 136 includes a “plurality,” *i.e.*, a plural number, of lenses. *Id.*; EX1004, ¶120.

Itohiya '759 further describes how “the image projection system 130 may be configured so that the optical axes of the front-group and rear-group optical systems 136, 132 will be aligned with each other without the provision of the intermediate mirror 134.” EX1007, [0040]. Accordingly, Itohiya '759 describes how the second lens group (front-group optical system 136) is disposed in a light direction with respect to the first lens group (rear-group optical system 132). EX1004, ¶121.


[1.4] a reflection mirror, which is configured to reflect lights emitted from at least one of said first and second lens groups, so as to project upon said screen obliquely;

Itohiya '759 discloses a projection type image display apparatus that includes a reflection mirror, which is configured to reflect lights emitted from at least one of said first and second lens groups, so as to project upon said screen obliquely. EX1004, ¶¶122-126.

Itohiya '759 teaches that “[t]he image display element 120 may be in the form of a liquid crystal panel. A projection lens system 130 is disposed in the central portion of the lower cabinet 112 forward of the image display element 120 for enlarging and projecting the image displayed by the image display element 120. An image projecting mirror 140 is disposed on the rearward part of the upper cabinet 110 for reflecting the image projected by the projection lens system 130 and projecting it onto a screen from the backward thereof.” EX1007, [0037].

Further, “[p]referably, the image projecting mirror 140 is fixedly mounted and supported on the rearward part of the upper cabinet 110. The reflecting face of the image projecting mirror 140 is oriented at an angle of 60 degrees relative to the horizontal plane. The reflecting face of the image projecting mirror 140 may be positioned at any angle other than 60 degrees relative to the horizontal plane. Alternatively, the imaging apparatus may comprise a plurality of image projecting mirrors. Furthermore, the imaging apparatus may be configured so that a projection lens system can project an image onto a screen from the backward thereof without the use of the image projecting mirror.” *Id.*

Itohiya '759's projection mirror 140 is shown in Fig. 1, reproduced below:




As shown in Fig. 1, light is reflected from the projection mirror 140 such that it projects onto screen 150 obliquely. EX1004, ¶126.

[1.5] a first mounting base, on which said first lens group is mounted;

Itohiya '759 discloses a projection type image display apparatus that includes a first mounting base, on which said first lens group is mounted. EX1004, ¶¶127-128.

Itoshiya '759 teaches that “[t]he rear-group optical system 132 is disposed forward of the image display element 120. The rear-group optical system 132 is supported within a lens barrel 142 which can be formed by aluminum die-casting or of an engineering plastic (e.g., polycarbonate, PPS, etc.)” EX1007, [0041]. Itoshiya '759 further teaches that, “[r]eferring to FIG. 2, it is particularly preferred that the barrel 142 for the rear-group optical system is firmly supported on the lower cabinet 112 using any fastening means such as screw fastening.” *Id.* Itoshiya '759's Fig. 2 is reproduced below:



[1.6] a second mounting base, on which said second lens group is mounted; and

Itohiya '759 discloses a projection type image display apparatus that includes a second mounting base, on which said second lens group is mounted. EX1004, ¶¶129-130.


Itohiya '759 teaches that “[t]he front-group optical system 136 is supported within a barrel 146 for the front-group optical system. The barrel 146 can be made of aluminum die-casting or of an engineering plastic (e.g., polycarbonate, PPS, etc.)” EX1007, [0041].

[1.7] a chassis, which is configured to store said first and second lens group, said reflection mirror, and said first and second mounting bases;

Itohiya '759 discloses a projection type image display apparatus that includes a chassis, which is configured to store said first and second lens group, said reflection mirror, and said first and second mounting bases. EX1004, ¶¶131-133.

Itohiya '759 teaches that “[t]he rear-projection television set (100) comprises *a housing (114), ...*” EX1007, abstract (emphasis added). Further, “[t]he rear-projection television set 100 comprises a housing 114 for receiving various components. The housing 114 preferably includes an upper cabinet 110 and a lower cabinet 112. Alternatively, the housing 114 may be of an integral structure without dividing into upper and lower cabinets.” *Id.*, [0035].

As shown in Fig. 2, the chassis (housing 114) is configured to store the first and second lens groups, reflection mirror, and first and second mounting bases:



EX1004, ¶133.

[1.8] wherein said first mounting base is fixed at a bottom of said chassis, while said second mounting base is moveable.

Itohiya ‘759 discloses that the first mounting base is fixed at a bottom of the chassis. EX1004, ¶¶134-137. For example, Itohiya ‘759 teaches that “[t]he rear-group optical system 132 is supported within a lens barrel 142 which can be formed by aluminum die-casting or of an engineering plastic (e.g., polycarbonate, PPS, etc.). Referring to FIG. 2, it is particularly preferred that the barrel 142 for the rear-group optical system is firmly supported on the lower cabinet 112 using any fastening means such as screw fastening.” EX1007, [0041].

Itohiya ‘759 further discloses that “the front-group optical system 136 may be configured to include one or more lenses which are movable to perform the focusing

of the optical systems in the direction of optical axis.” *Id.*, [0040]. However, Itohiya ‘759 may not expressly disclose that the second mounting base itself is moveable. EX1004, ¶135. Itohiya ‘986, though, discloses this, and it would have been obvious to combine Itohiya ‘986 with Itohiya ‘759. *Id.*

For example, Itohiya ‘986 discloses in connection with its Fig. 2 that “[l]enses 3-8 are supported more fixedly in a known constitution. Lenses 1 and 2, whose position on the optical axis greatly affects the image formation performance and focal length of imaging lens 20, are supported in such a way that [their] position on the optical axis can be adjusted by a lens position adjustment mechanism 30.” EX1006, [0023]. Itohiya ‘986’s Fig. 2 is reproduced below:




FIG. 2

Itohiya ‘986 further explains that “as shown in Figures 1 and 2, [the device] is assembled so that the three cam studs 75 are respectively cam-engaged in each of

the cam grooves 40 on sliding lens frame 32. At the same time, adjustment fixing screw 62 is screwed into threaded hole 64 on sliding stud 44, wherein columnar part 50 is slidably engaged with straight sliding groove 38. In this state, cam groove 40 is guided by cam stud 75 through the rotation of adjustment fixing screw 62 around the optical axis. I.e., when adjustment fixing screw 62 is rotated around the optical axis, columnar part 50 moves within straight sliding groove 38. As a result, lenses 1 and 2, supported by sliding lens frame 32, move along the optical axis, adjusting the position of the lenses 1 and 2.” *Id.*, [0029]. Accordingly, Itohiya ‘986 discloses that the second mounting base is moveable. EX1004, ¶137. When Itohiya ‘986’s disclosure in this regard is combined with Itohiya ‘759, the combined structure has a first mounting base that is fixed at a bottom of the chassis, while the second mounting base is moveable. *Id.*

b) Dependent Claim 3

[3.0/3.1] The projection type image display apparatus, according to claim 1, further comprising: a rod member, which makes said second mounting base movable.

Itohiya ‘986 discloses a rod member, which makes the second mounting base movable. EX1004, ¶¶138-139. As shown in Itohiya ‘986’s Fig. 2 reproduced above, “adjustment fixing screw 62 is screwed into threaded hole 64 on sliding stud 44, wherein columnar part 50 is slidably engaged with straight sliding groove 38. In this state, cam groove 40 is guided by cam stud 75 through the rotation of adjustment

fixing screw 62 around the optical axis. I.e., when adjustment fixing screw 62 is rotated around the optical axis, columnar part 50 moves within straight sliding groove 38. As a result, lenses 1 and 2, supported by sliding lens frame 32, move along the optical axis, adjusting the position of the lenses 1 and 2.” EX1006, [0029]. Itohiya ‘986’s adjustable fixing screw 62 makes the second mounting base moveable and corresponds to the claimed rod member. EX1004, ¶138.

E. Ground 4: Claim 2 is invalid under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over Itohiya ’759 in view of Itohiya ’986 and Further in View of Ohzawa

1. Ohzawa

a) Qualification as Prior Art

See Section VIII.C.1.a, *supra*.

b) General Overview

See Section VIII.C.1.b, *supra*.

2. Motivation to Combine Ohzawa with Itohiya ’759 and Itohiya ’986

A POSITA would have been motivated to further combine Ohzawa with the combined system of Itohiya ’759 and Itohiya ‘986, and would have had a reasonable expectation of success in making the combination. EX1004, ¶141. As described above in Section VIII.C.2, there are significant benefits to having the optical axis of the lens groups be at an incline relative to a normal line at a center of a surface of the image display element, and a POSTIA would have been motivated to capitalize on these benefits by applying Ohzawa’s teachings. *Id.*

3. Element-by-Element Analysis

a) Claim 2

[2.0/2.1] The projection type image display apparatus, according to claim 1, wherein an optical axis of said first and second lens group is inclined to a normal line at a center of a surface of said image display element.

See Section VIII.C.3.a, supra.

F. Ground 5: Claim 1 is invalid under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over Karasawa in view of Yamagishi '706 and Itohiya '759.

1. Overview of Prior Art

a) Karasawa

(1) Qualification as Prior Art


Karasawa was filed as Japanese Application No. 2002-46988 on February 22, 2002 and published as Japanese Publication No. 2003-248169 on September 5, 2003. EX1004, ¶62; EX1009. Accordingly, Karasawa qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) (pre-AIA) at least because it was published more than one year before the earliest U.S. priority date of the '313 Patent (June 15, 2007). Karasawa was neither cited nor considered by the Examiner during prosecution of the '313 Patent. *Id.*

(2) General Overview


Karasawa is directed to a projection lens and projector with three lens groups. EX1009, abstract; EX1004, ¶63. Karasawa explains that “a projector can be

provided that includes an lighting optical system that emits illumination light, a light modulation device that modulates illumination light emitted from the lighting optical system in response to an image signal, and a projection lens for projecting an optical image formed in the light modulation device to a predetermined surface, and that is characterized by using the projection lens according to the first invention as the projection lens. This results in a small, thin projector with a large angle of view and bright projections. The color synthesis optical system can also be positioned on the light modulator side of the projection lens while having sufficient optical performance and telecentricity. Therefore, a projector can be provided that can reduce the color shaking caused by the angular properties of the color synthesis optical system.” EX1009, [0022]. Karasawa’s Fig. 7 is reproduced below:

[FIG. 7]



Karasawa further explains how “FIG. 1 is a diagram illustrating lens configuration of a projection lens according to the first embodiment of the present invention. From the screen side, in order, it is comprised of the first lens group G1 having negative power, the second lens group G2 having negative power, and the third lens group G3 having positive power.” *Id.*, [0024]. Karasawa’s Fig. 1 is annotated below:



b) Yamagishi '706


(1) Qualification as Prior Art

Yamagishi '706 was filed as U.S. Application No. 11/087,477 on March 23, 2005 and published as U.S. Publication No. 2005/0219706 on October 6, 2005. EX1004, ¶65; EX1010. Accordingly, Yamagishi '706 qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) (pre-AIA) at least because it was published more than one year before the earliest U.S. priority date of the '313 Patent (June 15, 2007). Yamagishi '706 was neither cited nor considered by the Examiner during prosecution of the '313 Patent. *Id.*

(2) General Overview

Yamagishi '706 is directed to a projection lens system that projects projection light from a light modulator onto a screen and which is telecentric on an input side. EX1010, abstract; EX1004, ¶66. Yamagishi '706's Fig. 1 is reproduced below:

Fig. 1



Yamagishi '706 teaches that “[t]he rear projector 1 shown in FIG. 1 includes, inside a housing 2, a light source 3, a light modulator (light valve) 4 that modulates light from the light source 3 according to an image signal to form an image, a projection lens system 5 that projects projection light 8 from the light valve 4 onto a screen 9 from the rear surface side, and mirrors 6 and 7 that reflect and guide the projection light 8 to the screen 9.” EX1010, [0006]. Further, “[t]his lens system 5 is a retrofocus-type lens system in which lens groups with negative and positive powers are disposed from the screen side, and is telecentric on input side that is side of the

light valve 4, which makes the lens system suited to a projector in which the light valve 4 is a liquid crystal panel or a DMD.” *Id.*, [0030]. Yamagishi ‘706’s primary description is “based on a fixed focal length lens-type lens system where no lenses aside from the focusing lenses move, but the present invention can also be applied to a zoom lens system in which a lens or lens group for zooming also moves.” *Id.*, [0064].

c) Itohiya ‘759

(1) Qualification as Prior Art

See Section VIII.B.1.c.(1), *supra*.

(2) General Overview

See Section VIII.B.1.c.(2), *supra*.

2. Motivation to Combine Karasawa with Yamagishi ‘706 and Itohiya ‘759.

A POSITA would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Karasawa with the teachings of Yamagishi ‘706 and Itohiya ‘759—and would have had a reasonable expectation of success in making the combination—for a number of reasons, as explained by Dr. Sasian. EX1004, ¶¶145-148.

All three of these references are directed to optical systems that project light from an image generating device onto a screen by way of lenses. EX1004, ¶145; *see, e.g.*, EX1009, abstract, [0022]; EX1010, abstract, [0006], [0030]; EX1007, abstract. Accordingly, the references are in the same field of endeavor and POSITAs

would naturally have looked to them in their work. EX1004, ¶145. Moreover, a POSITA would have understood that the teachings of Karasawa would have been compatible and operable in combination with the teachings of Yamagishi ‘706 and Itohiya ‘759. *Id.*

For example, Karasawa discloses that “[a]ccording to a preferred aspect of the present invention, it is also characterized in that at least some of the lenses constituting the second lens group or the front group are movable along the optical axis.” EX1009, [0019]. Consistent with this disclosure of having at least some lenses be moveable, a POSITA would have recognized that Yamagishi ‘706 describes having certain lenses in a rear projection system be moveable while other lenses in the system are fixed in place. EX1004, ¶146. In particular, Yamagishi ‘706 explains that its primary disclosure relates to “a fixed focal length lens-type lens system where no lenses aside from the focusing lenses move.” EX1010, [0064]. In other words, some of the lenses are fixed in place, while other lenses are allowed to move. EX1004, ¶146. A POSITA would have been motivated to take advantage of these teachings by combining Yamagishi ‘706’s disclosures with those of Karasawa. *Id.* For example, having only certain lenses (*e.g.*, the focusing lenses) move would have reduced the expense, and improved the reliability, of the system as compared to a system where all of the lenses are allowed to move. *Id.*

Additionally, a POSITA would have recognized that Itohiya ‘759 describes details of how the fixed lenses in a system with both fixed and moveable lenses are firmly supported on the lower part of the optical system’s chassis. EX1007, [0040]-[0041]; EX1004, ¶147. A POSITA looking at Karasawa’s and Yamagishi ‘706’s teachings relating to systems with fixed and moveable lenses would naturally have looked to Itohiya ‘759 for additional implementation details for such systems. EX1004, ¶147.

Ultimately, a POSITA would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Yamagishi ‘706 and Itohiya ‘759 with those of Karasawa and would have recognized that combining these teachings would have produced predictable and operable results. EX1004, ¶148.


3. Element-by-element analysis

a) Independent Claim 1

[1.0] A projection type image display apparatus, comprising;

Karasawa discloses a projection type image display apparatus. EX1004, ¶149. Karasawa explains that “[a]ccording to the second invention, a projector can be provided that includes an lighting optical system that emits illumination light, a light modulation device that modulates illumination light emitted from the lighting optical system in response to an image signal, and a projection lens for projecting an optical


image formed in the light modulation device to a predetermined surface.” EX1009, [0022]. Karasawa’s Fig. 7 is reproduced below:



[1.1] an image display element;


Karasawa discloses a projection type image display apparatus that includes an image display element. EX1004, ¶150. Karasawa teaches that its apparatus includes “a light modulation device that modulates illumination light emitted from the lighting optical system in response to an image signal.” EX1009, [0022]. Further, “FIG. 8 is a diagram illustrating a schematic configuration and optical path from the light modulation device 14R [shown as 14] in the projection light generating section

102 to the projection lens L when red image light is used as a representative example.” *Id.*, [0070]. Karasawa’s Fig. 8 is annotated below:



[1.2] a first lens group, being disposed in a light direction with respect to said image display element, which is configured to include a plural number of lenses;

Karasawa discloses a projection type image display apparatus that includes a first lens group, being disposed in a light direction with respect to said image display element, which is configured to include a plural number of lenses. EX1004, ¶¶151-153. Karasawa’s Fig. 1 is annotated below:



Karasawa explains that “FIG. 1 is a diagram illustrating lens configuration of a projection lens according to the first embodiment of the present invention. From the screen side, in order, it is comprised of the first lens group G1 having negative power, the second lens group G2 having negative power, and the third lens group G3 having positive power.” EX1009, [0024]. Moreover, “[t]he three-piece cemented lens cemented lens in the third lens group G3 mainly has the function of correcting chromatic aberration. Also, the meniscus-shaped positive lens L36 with aspheric surface ASP2 compensates for image plane curvature and distortion aberration. This makes possible well-balanced correction of all aberrations. Also, in

this embodiment, the first lens group G1 and the second lens group G2 constitute the front group FL, and the third lens group constitutes the rear group RL.” *Id.*, [0035].

Karasawa’s third lens group G3 or RL corresponds to the “first lens group” of the ‘313 Patent. EX1004, ¶153. In this regard, Karasawa explains that “[t]he aberration correction function is performed by the biconvex-shaped positive lens L31 on the screen side for under-correction, the three piece negative lens for over-correction, and the biconvex-shaped positive lens L35 on the liquid crystal panel side, which is the imaging surface, for under-correction.” EX1009, [0034]. As shown in Fig. 1, this lens group has a plural number of lenses and is disposed in a light direction with respect to the image display element. EX1004, ¶153.

[1.3] a second lens group, being disposed in a light direction with respect to said first lens group, which is configured to include a plural number of lenses;

Karasawa discloses a projection type image display apparatus that includes a second lens group, being disposed in a light direction with respect to said first lens group, which is configured to include a plural number of lenses. EX1004, ¶¶154-156.


Karasawa explains that “the first lens group G1 and the second lens group G2 constitute the front group FL....” EX1009, [0035]. “First, the first lens group G1 consists of a meniscus-shaped negative lens L11 with a convex surface facing the screen side, a bi-convex-shaped positive lens L12, and a meniscus-shaped negative

lens L13 with a convex surface facing the screen side, in order from the screen side. The screen side face of the meniscus-shaped negative lens L13, ASP1, is an aspheric surface.” *Id.*, [0027]. “The second lens group G2 consists of a meniscus-shaped negative lens L21 with a convex surface facing the screen side and prism P for folding the optical path. The meniscus-shaped negative lens L21 is movable along the optical axis AX. The meniscus-shaped negative lens L21, when combined with the first lens group G1, has a stronger negative power at the screen side portion than the front aperture FS. As a result, a long back focus can be obtained in all systems of the projection lens.” *Id.*, [0030].

Karasawa’s front lens group FL corresponds to the “second lens group” of the ‘313 Patent. EX1004, ¶156. As shown in Fig. 1, this lens group has a plural number of lenses and is disposed in a light direction with respect to the first lens group (rear group RL). *Id.*

[1.4] a reflection mirror, which is configured to reflect lights emitted from at least one of said first and second lens groups, so as to project upon said screen obliquely;

Karasawa discloses a projection type image display apparatus that includes a reflection mirror, which is configured to reflect lights emitted from at least one of said first and second lens groups, so as to project upon said screen obliquely. EX1004, ¶¶157-158. Karasawa’s Fig. 7 is annotated below:




Karasawa explains that “[l]ight from the projection light generating section 102 enters the reflective mirror 103 as it spreads through the projection optical system 16. Reflective mirror 103 then reflects the projection light to the screen section 104 side.” EX1009, [0069]. As shown in Fig. 7, light is reflected from the reflective mirror 103 such that it projects onto screen section 104 obliquely. EX1004, ¶158.

[1.5] a first mounting base, on which said first lens group is mounted;


Karasawa discloses a projection type image display apparatus that includes a first mounting base, on which said first lens group is mounted. EX1004, ¶¶159-161. Karasawa teaches that “[n]ext, the mounting portion of projection optical system 16 is described. FIGS. 10(a), (b), (c) are diagrams showing the state in which the projection lens L according to the first through third embodiments described above is held in the lens barrel 200. Lens barrel 200 has a fixing flange 201 in the vicinity of prism P. The fixing flange 201 has a hole in which the screws 202 (FIG. 11) engage. FIG. 11(a) is an upper perspective view of a configuration securing the projection optical system 16 and the optical engine section 203. In addition, FIG. 11(b) is a downward perspective view of a configuration securing the projection optical system 16 and the optical engine section 203. Here, the optical engine section 203 includes light modulation devices 14R, 14G, 14B, and color synthesis optical system 15.” EX1009, [0089]. Karasawa’s Figs. 10(a), (b), and (c) are reproduced below:

[FIG. 10]



Karasawa's Figs. 11(a) and (b) are reproduced below:

[FIG. 11]



The projection optical system 16 includes the first and second lens groups described above in connection with limitations [1.2] and [1.3]. EX1009, [0068], [0086]; EX1004, ¶161. Accordingly, Karasawa's lens barrel 200 corresponds to a mounting base on which both the first and second lens groups are mounted. EX1004, ¶161.

[1.6] a second mounting base, on which said second lens group is mounted; and

Karasawa discloses a projection type image display apparatus that includes a mounting base, on which said second lens group is mounted. EX1004, ¶¶162-163. As discussed in connection with limitation [1.5], Karasawa's lens barrel 200 corresponds to a mounting base on which both the first and second lens groups are mounted.


Karasawa may not expressly disclose a "second" mounting base on which the second lens group is mounted, distinct from the first mounting base. EX1004, ¶163. However, Yamagishi '706 discloses this concept. *Id.* For example, Yamagishi '706 teaches that "[t]he present invention has been described based on a fixed focal length lens-type lens system where no lenses aside from the focusing lenses move...." EX1010, [0064]. In other words, Yamagishi '706's group of focusing lenses move, while its other lenses are fixed in place. EX1004, ¶163. Karasawa also discloses that "at least some of the lenses constituting the second lens group or the front group

are movable along the optical axis.” EX1009, [0019]. Accordingly, a POSITA would have understood that Yamagishi ‘706 discloses distinct mounting bases for its moveable and fixed lens groups, and would have been motivated to combine Yamagishi ‘706’s disclosure in this regard with Karasawa to obtain the benefits of having both moveable and fixed lenses in the system. *Id.*

[1.7] a chassis, which is configured to store said first and second lens group, said reflection mirror, and said first and second mounting bases;

Karasawa discloses a projection type display apparatus that includes a chassis, which is configured to store said first and second lens group, said reflection mirror, and said first and second mounting bases. EX1004, ¶¶164-165. Karasawa’s Fig. 7 is reproduced below:

[FIG. 7]



Karasawa describes how “[r]ear projectors also have a configuration that mounts a transparent-type screen in the front of a cabinet and houses all optical components in the cabinet.” EX1009, [0003]. Further, “FIG. 7 is a diagram illustrating a schematic of an internal configuration of a rear projector according to the fourth embodiment. The rear projector 101 according to this embodiment includes projection lenses according to the first through third embodiments described above.” *Id.*, [0067].

[1.8] wherein said first mounting base is fixed at a bottom of said chassis, while said second mounting base is moveable.

Karasawa discloses that “[a]ccording to a preferred aspect of the present invention, it is also characterized in that at least some of the lenses constituting the second lens group or the front group are movable along the optical axis.” EX1009, [0019]. In this regard, Karasawa further teaches that “[a]lso, the first unit U1 is configured with a meniscus-shaped negative lens L11 of the first lens group G1 and a biconvex-shaped positive lens L12. Further, the second unit U2 is configured with a meniscus-shaped negative lens L13. Thus, the first unit U1 is movable along the optical axis AX.” *Id.*, [0028]. Additionally, “[t]he second lens group G2 consists of a meniscus-shaped negative lens L21 with a convex surface facing the screen side and prism P for folding the optical path. The meniscus-shaped negative lens L21 is movable along the optical axis AX.” *Id.*, [0030].

Karasawa may not expressly disclose separate mounting bases for its two lens groups where the first mounting base is fixed at a bottom of the chassis while the second mounting base is moveable. EX1004, ¶¶166-170. However, Yamagishi ‘706 discloses this concept. *Id.* For example, Yamagishi ‘706 teaches that “[t]he present invention has been described based on a fixed focal length lens-type lens system where no lenses aside from the focusing lenses move....” EX1010, [0064]. In other words, Yamagishi ‘706’s group of focusing lenses move, while its other lenses are fixed in place. EX1004, ¶167. While Yamagishi ‘706 may not disclose the details

of how its first mounting base is fixed at a bottom of a chassis, a POSITA would look to Itohiya ‘759 for such additional details. EX1004, ¶167.

In this regard, Itohiya ‘759 discloses that “[t]he rear-group optical system 132 is disposed forward of the image display element 120. *The rear-group optical system 132 is supported within a lens barrel 142 which can be formed by aluminum die-casting or of an engineering plastic (e.g., polycarbonate, PPS, etc.). Referring to FIG. 2, it is particularly preferred that the barrel 142 for the rear-group optical system is firmly supported on the lower cabinet 112 using any fastening means such as screw fastening.*” EX1007, [0041] (emphasis added).

Accordingly, the combination of Karasawa, Yamagishi ‘706, and Itohiya ‘759 discloses a projection type display apparatus wherein the first mounting base is fixed at a bottom of the chassis, while the second mounting base is moveable. EX1004, ¶169.

G. Ground 6: Claim 2 is invalid under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over Karasawa in view of Yamagishi ‘706 and Itohiya ‘759 and Further in View of Ohzawa

1. Ohzawa

a) Qualification as Prior Art

See Section VIII.C.1.a, supra.

b) General Overview

See Section VIII.C.1.b, supra.

2. Motivation to Combine Ohzawa with Karasawa, Yamagishi ‘706, and Itohiya ‘759

A POSITA would have been motivated to further combine Ohzawa with the combined system of Karasawa, Yamagishi ‘706, and Itohiya ‘759, and would have had a reasonable expectation of success in making the combination. EX1004, ¶172. As described above in Section VIII.C.2, there are significant benefits to having the optical axis of the lens groups be at an incline relative to a normal line at a center of a surface of the image display element, and a POSTIA would have been motivated to capitalize on these benefits by applying Ohzawa’s teachings. *Id.*

3. Element-by-Element Analysis

a) Claim 2

[2.0/2.1] The projection type image display apparatus, according to claim 1, wherein an optical axis of said first and second lens group is inclined to a normal line at a center of a surface of said image display element.

See Section VIII.C.3.a, *supra*.

H. Ground 7: Claim 3 is invalid under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over Karasawa in view of Yamagishi ‘706 and Itohiya ‘759 and Further in View of Itohiya ‘986

1. Itohiya ‘986

a) Qualification as Prior Art

See Section VIII.B.1.b.(1), *supra*.

b) General Overview

See Section VIII.B.1.b.(2), *supra*.

2. Motivation to Combine Itohiya '986 with Karasawa, Yamagishi '706, and Itohiya '759

A POSITA would have been motivated to further combine Itohiya '986 with the combined system of Karasawa, Yamagishi '706, and Itohiya '759, and would have had a reasonable expectation of success in making the combination. EX1004, ¶175. Karasawa discloses moveable lenses, Yamagishi '706 discloses the concept of having one lens group moveable and another lens group fixed, and Itohiya '759 discloses the mechanical details of how a first mounting base for one of the lens groups is fixed at a bottom of the chassis. *See supra*. However, these references lack an express disclosure of a mechanism for manipulating the moveable group of lenses. EX1004, ¶175. A POSITA would naturally have looked to Itohiya '986's detailed disclosure of an adjustment fixing screw (rod member) as a mechanism to make the second mounting base moveable. *Id.*


3. Element-by-Element Analysis

a) Claim 3

[3.0/3.1] The projection type image display apparatus, according to claim 1, further comprising: a rod member, which makes said second mounting base movable.

Karasawa, Yamagishi '706, and Itohiya '759 do not expressly disclose a rod member that makes a second mounting base moveable. EX1004, ¶¶176-178.

However, Itohiya '986 discloses such a rod member that makes a second mounting base moveable, and it would have been obvious to combine Itohiya '986's disclosure in this regard with Karasawa, Yamagishi '706, and Itohiya '759. *Id.* Itohiya '986's Figs. 1 and 2 are reproduced below:



Itohiya '986 discloses that “[f]irst, as shown in Figures 1 and 2, [the device] is assembled so that the three cam studs 75 are respectively cam-engaged in each of the cam grooves 40 on sliding lens frame 32. At the same time, *adjustment fixing screw 62 is screwed into threaded hole 64 on sliding stud 44, wherein columnar part 50 is slidably engaged with straight sliding groove 38. In this state, cam groove 40 is guided by cam stud 75 through the rotation of adjustment fixing screw 62 around the optical axis. I.e., when adjustment fixing screw 62 is rotated around the optical axis, columnar part 50 moves within straight sliding groove 38. As a result, lenses*

1 and 2, supported by sliding lens frame 32, move along the optical axis, adjusting the position of the lenses 1 and 2.” EX1006, [0029] (emphasis added).

IX. SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS

Petitioners and Dr. Sasian are not aware of any secondary considerations that would make claims 1-3 of the ‘313 Patent nonobvious over the prior art considered herein. EX1004, ¶179. Regardless, any possible secondary considerations would not overcome the above-cited prior art, which clearly demonstrates that the subject matter of claims 1-3 of the ‘313 Patent would have been obvious to a POSITA as of June 15, 2006. *Id.*

X. CONCLUSION

For the reasons above, Petitioners ask that the Patent Office order an *inter partes* review trial and cancel the Challenged Claims as unpatentable.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 17, 2025

/Donald R. McPhail/
Donald McPhail
Counsel for Petitioners
Registration No. 35,811

CERTIFICATE OF WORD COUNT

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.24, the undersigned attorney for the Petitioners declares that the argument section of this Petition has 13,892 words, according to the word count tool in Microsoft Word™.

/Donald R. McPhail/
Donald R. McPhail
Counsel for Petitioners
Registration No. 35,811

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies, in accordance with 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.105 and 42.6, that service was made on the Patent Owner as detailed below.

Date of service January 17, 2025

Manner of service Electronic Mail and UPS Mail Service

Documents served Petition for *Inter Partes* Review, including Exhibits and Power of Attorney

Served upon:

Bryan C. Nese (Via Electronic Mail) Mayer Brown 1999 K Street, NW Washington, DC 20006-1101 202-263-3266 bnese@mayerbrown.com Litigation Counsel	Antonelli, Terry, Stout & Kraus, LLP - Arlington, VA (Via UPS) 1300 North Seventeenth Street Suite 1800 Arlington, VA 22209
AMANDA STREFF BONNER (Via UPS) 71 S. Wacker Drive Chicago, IL 60606	

Please address all correspondence to lead and back-up counsel at coretronic313ipr@merchantgould.com. Petitioners consent to electronic service.

Date: January 17, 2025

Respectfully Submitted,

/Donald R. McPhail/
Donald R. McPhail
Counsel for Petitioners
Registration No. 35,811
Merchant and Gould PC
1900 Duke Street, Suite 600

Alexandria, VA 22314
Telephone: (703) 518-4509
E-Mail: dmcphail@merchantgould.com