

Filed on behalf of: PNC Bank, N.A.
JPMorgan Chase & Co.
JP Morgan Chase Bank, N.A.

By: Lionel M. Lavenue
Timothy J. May
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, LLP
901 New York Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20001-4413
Telephone: 202-408-4000
Facsimile: 202-408-4400
E-mail: lionel.lavenue@finnegan.com
timothy.may@finnegan.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

PNC Bank, N.A., JP Morgan Chase & Co., and JP Morgan Chase Bank, N.A.,
Petitioner

v.

Maxim Integrated Products, Inc.,
Patent Owner

Patent No. 6,105,013

DECLARATION OF HENRY N. DREIFUS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction..... 1

II. Qualifications..... 2

III. Materials Reviewed 4

IV. Overview of the '013 Patent..... 5

V. Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art..... 8

VI. Claim Construction..... 9

VII. Certain References Disclose and/or Render Obvious All Elements of Claims 1-6, 8-12, 14, and 15 of the '013 Patent..... 9

 A. *Hawkes* Discloses All Elements of Claims 1-3, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, and 15 of the '013 Patent..... 10

 1. Microcontroller Core 12

 2. Math Coprocessor // Modular Exponentiation Accelerator Circuit..... 12

 3. Memory Circuitry // Memory Circuit 13

 4. Input/Output Circuit..... 14

 5. Real Time Clock // Clock Circuit 15

 6. Energy Circuit..... 15

 B. *Hawkes* Renders Claims 1-3, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, and 15 of the '013 Patent Obvious 16

 C. *Hawkes* in Combination With *Cooper* Renders Claims 4 and 10 of the '013 Patent Obvious..... 16

 D. *Hawkes* in Combination With *Hardware Hacker* Renders Claim 5 of the '013 Patent Obvious..... 18

| | | |
|----|---|----|
| E. | <i>Chorley</i> Discloses All Elements of Claims 1-3, 6, 9, 11, 12, 14, and 15 of the '013 Patent..... | 19 |
| 1. | Microcontroller Core | 20 |
| 2. | Math Coprocessor // Modular Exponentiation Accelerator Circuit..... | 21 |
| 3. | Memory Circuitry // Memory Circuit | 22 |
| 4. | Input/Output Circuit..... | 23 |
| 5. | Real Time Clock // Clock Circuit | 23 |
| 6. | Energy Circuit..... | 25 |
| F. | <i>Chorley</i> in Combination With <i>Hawkes</i> Renders Claims 1-3, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, and 15 of the '013 Patent Obvious..... | 25 |
| G. | <i>Chorley</i> in Combination With <i>Cooper</i> or in combination with <i>Hawkes</i> and <i>Cooper</i> Renders Claims 4 and 10 of the '013 Patent Obvious | 27 |
| H. | <i>Chorley</i> in Combination With <i>Hardware Hacker</i> or in combination with <i>Hawkes</i> and <i>Hardware Hacker</i> Renders Claim 5 of the '013 Patent Obvious..... | 28 |
| I. | <i>Blandford</i> Discloses All Elements of Claims 1-4, 6, 9, 10, 12, and 15 of the '013 Patent..... | 29 |
| 1. | Microcontroller Core | 31 |
| 2. | Math Coprocessor // Modular Exponentiation Accelerator Circuit..... | 32 |
| 3. | Memory Circuitry // Memory Circuit | 32 |
| 4. | Input/Output Circuit..... | 33 |
| 5. | Real Time Clock // Clock Circuit | 33 |
| 6. | Energy Circuit..... | 34 |

J. *Blandford* in Combination With *Hardware Hacker* Renders
Claim 5 of the '013 Patent Obvious35

VIII. Conclusion36

I, Henry N. Dreifus, declare as follows:

I. Introduction

1. I have been retained by PNC Bank, N.A., JP Morgan Chase & Co., and JP Morgan Chase Bank, N.A. (collectively, “Petitioner”) as an independent expert consultant in this proceeding before the United States Patent and Trademark Office. Although I am being compensated at my rate of \$350.00 per hour for the time I spend on this matter, no part of my compensation depends on the outcome of this proceeding, and I have no other interest in this proceeding.

2. I understand that this proceeding involves U.S. Patent No. 6,105,013 (“the ’013 patent”) (attached as Ex. 1001 to the petition). The application for the ’013 patent was filed on March 10, 1998, as U.S. Patent Application No. 09/041,190, which is based on U.S. Provisional Patent Application No. 60/004,510, filed September 29, 1995, and the patent issued on August 15, 2000.

3. I have been asked to consider whether certain references disclose or render obvious the claims of the ’013 patent.

4. I have been advised that a patent claim may be invalid as obvious if the differences between the subject matter patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art. I have also been advised that several factual inquiries underlie a determination of obviousness. These inquiries

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.