


**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

In re *Inter Partes* Review of: : I hereby certify that this
U.S. Patent No. 7,518,879 : correspondence is being
Patent Issued: April 14, 2009 : electronically filed per 37 CFR
Named Inventors: Chung et al. : § 42.6(b)(1) with the U.S. Patent and
Patentee: Phison Electronics Corp. : Trademark Office via PRPS on
App. No.: 11/384,371 : 7/29/2013
App. Filed: March 21, 2006 :
Title: UNIVERSAL SERIAL BUS : Typed or printed name of person
(USB) MEMORY PLUG : signing this certificate
: Janelle Fava
: Signature
: 

Mail Stop PATENT BOARD
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,518,879

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
List of Exhibits.....	iv
I. <u>Introduction</u>	1
II. <u>Real Party in Interest</u>	1
III. <u>Related Proceedings</u>	1
IV. <u>Grounds for Standing and Eligibility</u>	1
V. <u>Lead and Back-up Counsel</u>	2
VI. <u>Service Information</u>	2
VII. <u>Fee Information</u>	2
VIII. <u>Specific Identification of Challenges</u>	3
IX. <u>Overview of the Chung '879 Patent</u>	4
X. <u>Claim Construction</u>	5
XI. <u>The Patent Claims are Invalid Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102-103</u>	6
A. Claims 1-4, 8-12, and 16 of the Chung '879 Patent are unpatentable as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over <u>Minneman et al.</u>	6
B. Claims 1-4, 8-12, and 16 of the Chung '879 Patent are unpatentable as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over <u>Minneman et al.</u> in view of <u>Takahashi et al.</u>	14
C. Claims 1-4 and 8 of the Chung '879 Patent are unpatentable as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over <u>Minneman et al.</u> in view of <u>AAPA</u>	23
D. Claims 9, 11, 12, and 16 of the Chung '879 Patent are unpatentable as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(a) and 102(e) over <u>Wang et al.</u>	28

E. Claims 1-4, 8, and 10 of the Chung '879 Patent are unpatentable as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Wang et al. in view of AAPA 31

F. Claims 1-4, 8-12, and 16 of the Chung '879 Patent are unpatentable as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Ni et al. 37

G. Claims 1-4, 8-12, and 16 of the Chung '879 Patent are unpatentable as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Ni et al. in view of Takahashi et al...... 44

XII. Conclusion 52

XIII. Certificate of ServiceCert. 1

LIST OF EXHIBITS

- PNY Exhibit 1001: U.S. Patent No. 7,518,879 to Chung et al., issued April 14, 2009
- PNY Exhibit 1002: Power of Attorney
- PNY Exhibit 1003: U.S. Patent No. 7,352,601 to Minneman et al., issued on April 1, 2008
- PNY Exhibit 1004: U.S. Patent Publication No. 2006/0002096 to Wang et al., published on January 5, 2006
- PNY Exhibit 1005: U.S. Patent No. 7,074,052 to Ni et al., issued on July 11, 2006
- PNY Exhibit 1006: U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0027809 to Takahashi et al., published on February 12, 2004

I. Introduction

PNY Technologies, Inc. (“PNY”) respectfully petitions for *inter partes* review of **Claims 1-4, 8-12, and 16** of United States Patent No. 7,518,879, which issued April 14, 2009, to Chung et al., (the “Chung ‘879 Patent”). A copy of the Chung ‘879 Patent is attached hereto and made a part hereof as PNY Exhibit 1001.

II. Real Party in Interest

The real party in interest is PNY Technologies, Inc.

III. Related Proceedings

A patent infringement lawsuit involving the Chung ‘879 Patent is presently pending in the United States District Court for the District of Delaware, and is captioned *Phison Electronics Corp. v. PNY Technologies Inc.*, Case No. 1:12-cv-01478-GMS (hereinafter the “Patent Lawsuit”). The Patent Lawsuit was filed on November 15, 2012, wherein Phison Electronics Corp. alleged infringement of the Chung ‘879 Patent and U.S. Patent No. 8,176,267.

IV. Grounds for Standing and Eligibility

PNY certifies that the Chung ‘879 Patent is eligible for *inter partes* review, and that PNY is not barred or estopped from requesting an *inter partes* review challenging the patent claims on the grounds identified herein. PNY further certifies that it has not filed a civil action challenging the validity of any claim of the Chung ‘879 Patent. PNY certifies that this *inter partes* review petition is not being filed more than one year after being served with a complaint alleging

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.