

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

LG ELECTRONICS, INC.,
LG ELECTRONICS U.S.A., INC., and
LG ELECTRONICS MOBILECOMM U.S.A., INC.,
Petitioner

v.

CYPRESS SEMICONDUCTOR CORPORATION
Patent Owner

Case IPR2014-01396
Patent 6,249,825

DECLARATION OF JOHN GARNEY

EXHIBIT 2020

LG Elecs. v. Cypress Semiconductor
IPR2014-01396, U.S. Pat. 6,249,825

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. QUALIFICATIONS	1
III. MATERIALS CONSIDERED	6
IV. SUMMARY OF OPINIONS.....	6
V. LEGAL STANDARDS, PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	7
VI. '825 PATENT TECHNOLOGY BACKGROUND.....	8
VII. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	13
A. “Electronically [Simulate/Simulating] A Physical Disconnection And Reconnection Of The Peripheral Device”	13
B. “Computer Bus”	15
C. Prosecution History	17
VIII. CLAIMS 1-3, 10-13 AND 17 ARE NOT OBVIOUS OVER MICHELSON, PCCEXTEND AND DAVIS	19
A. Michelson Does Not Teach Electronically Simulating Physical Disconnection/Reconnection “Over A Computer Bus”	19
1. The Challenged Claims Require Electronic Simulation ... Over A Computer Bus	19
2. Michelson Does Not Teach Electronic Simulation ... Over A Computer Bus	20
B. Michelson Does Not Teach A “Second Configuration”	23
1. The Challenged Claims Require First and Second Configurations.....	23
2. Michelson’s CIS Data Stored In The EEPROM And FPGA Data Are Not First And Second Configurations.....	24

C. Michelson Does Not Teach Selection Of A Second Configuration Based On An Identification Code Read From The Peripheral Device26

D. One Of Ordinary Skill In The Art Would Not Have Combined The PCMCIA References.....27

1. A POSITA Would Not Combine Michelson And PCCextend27

a. Michelson Is Not A Testing Board.....29

b. The Manipulation Of Bus Signals With PCCextend Is Not Applicable To Michelson29

c. Michelson’s “Reset” Is Unrelated To PCCextend’s “Reset”32

d. Combining Michelson And PCCextend Would Result In An Inoperable System.....34

2. A POSITA Would Not Combine Michelson, PCCextend And Davis35

E. Claims 18 And 20 Are Not Anticipated By Davis.....38

1. Davis Does Not Teach Electrical Simulation “Over Said Computer Bus”.....39

F. Claims 5, 7, 15 And 16 Are Not Obvious Over Michelson, PCCextend, Davis And The APA40

1. More Than “Routine Engineering” Is Required To Substitute A USB Bus For The PCMCIA Buses In The PCMCIA References41

2. The Substitution Of A USB Bus For A PCMCIA Bus Would Not Yield A Predictable Variation.....46

G. Claim 19 Is Not Obvious Over Davis And The APA.....47

H. Anchor Chips And Cypress Practiced The Claimed Inventions47

IX. CONCLUSION.....47

I, John Garney, declare and state as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. I have been retained by Kaye Scholer LLP at the rate of \$275 per hour to provide opinions in connection with the *Inter Partes* review of U.S. Patent Nos. 6,249,825 (the “’825 patent”). My compensation is not affected by the outcome of this proceeding.

2. I have no financial interest in any of the parties, or the ’825 patent.

II. QUALIFICATIONS

3. I received a Bachelor’s of Science in Mathematics and a Bachelor’s of Science in Computer Science from Purdue University in 1978. I received a Master’s of Science in Computer Science from Purdue University in 1980.

4. I was employed by Intel Corporation from 1980 through 2007 with two years (1988-1989) spent in a joint venture (BiiN) spun off by Intel/Siemens. I held a variety of positions while at Intel, starting as a Software Evaluation Engineer and finally as a Senior Staff Systems Architect in the Research and Development part of the Corporate Technology Group.

5. While employed at Intel Corporation as a software architect in 1991, I was Intel’s software representative to the Personal Computer Memory Card International Association (“PCMCIA”). As part of my responsibilities as Intel’s representative, I extensively reviewed the pre release 2.0 specification and discussed and debated clarifications and corrections to the specification in several full membership meetings.

6. I co-defined the Socket Services and Card Services portions of the

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.