

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 CORP.,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2014-01405  
Patent 6,493,770 B1

Before SALLY C. MEDLEY, DONNA M. PRAISS, and  
PATRICK M. BOUCHER, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

PRAISS, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION  
Institution of *Inter Partes* Review  
*37 C.F.R. § 42.108*

LG Electronics, Inc., LG Electronics U.S.A., Inc., and LG Electronics Mobilecomm U.S.A., Inc. (“Petitioner”) filed a Petition (Paper 1, “Pet.”) to institute an *inter partes* review of claims 1–3, 5, 7, 10–13, and 15–20 of U.S. Patent No. 6,493,770 B1 (“the ’770 patent”) pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §§ 311–319. A Preliminary Response (Paper 6, “Prelim. Resp.”) was filed by Cypress Semiconductor Corporation (“Patent Owner”). We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 314. For the reasons that follow, we authorize institution of an *inter partes* review.

## I. BACKGROUND

We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 314, which provides that an *inter partes* review may be authorized only if “the information presented in the petition . . . and any [preliminary] response . . . shows that there is a reasonable likelihood that the petitioner would prevail with respect to at least 1 of the claims challenged in the petition.” 35 U.S.C. § 314(a).

Petitioner challenges claims 1–3, 5, 7, 10–13, 15–20 of the ’770 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and claims 18–20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Pet. 3–4. We institute an *inter partes* review as to claims 1–3, 5, 7, 10–13, and 15–20 as discussed below.

### A. *Related Proceedings*

The ’770 patent was asserted in a complaint filed in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California in *Cypress Semiconductor, Corp. v. LG Electronics, Inc.*, No. 4:13-cv-04034. *Id.* at 2. U.S. Patents 6,012,103 and 6,249,825 B1, which are related to the ’770 patent through continuation applications, are also asserted in the litigation and are the

subject of concurrently-filed *inter partes* review proceedings IPR2014-01386 and IPR2014-01396, respectively. *Id.*

*B. The '770 patent (Ex. 1001)*

The '770 patent, titled “System for Reconfiguring a Peripheral Device by Downloading Information from a Host and Electronically Simulating a Physical Disconnection and Reconnection to Reconfigure the Device,” is directed to a system and method for reconfiguring, from a first configuration to a second manufacturer specific configuration through an electronic reset, a peripheral device connected by a computer bus and port to a host computer. Ex. 1001, Abstr. A peripheral interface device for a standardized computer peripheral device bus and port emulates a physical disconnection and reconnection of the peripheral device. *Id.* Reconfiguring the peripheral device without physically disconnecting it is solved by a switch connected to a data line in the peripheral device. *Id.* at 6:59–7:6, 7:12–22. The switch changes the voltage state of the data lines, which the host computer monitors and uses to detect the connection of a peripheral device. *Id.* at 6:27–43.

*C. Illustrative Claims*

Independent claims 1, 11, and 18 are illustrative of the claims at issue:

1. A system for reconfiguring a peripheral device having a first configuration connected by a computer bus to a host computer, the system comprising:

a first circuit configured to download information for a second configuration from the host computer into the peripheral device over the computer bus; and

a second circuit configured to electronically simulate a physical disconnection and reconnection of the peripheral device to reconfigure the peripheral device to said

second configuration while supplying electrical power to said peripheral device.

11. A method for reconfiguring a peripheral device having a first configuration connected by a computer bus to a host computer, the method comprising the steps of:

(A) downloading information for a second configuration from the host computer into the peripheral device over the computer bus; and

(B) electronically simulating a physical disconnection and reconnection of the peripheral device to reconfigure the peripheral device to said second configuration while supplying electrical power to said peripheral device.

18. A system for reconfiguring a peripheral device having a configuration connected by a computer bus to a host computer, the system comprising:

a first circuit configured to detect the peripheral device connected to the computer bus; and

a second circuit configured to electronically simulate a physical disconnection and reconnection of the peripheral device to reset said configuration of said peripheral device while supplying electrical power to said peripheral device.

#### *D. The Prior Art*

Petitioner relies on the following prior art in addition to asserted admitted prior art in the '770 patent ("APA"):

Reference	Publication	Date	Exhibit
Michelson	US 5,628,028	May 6, 1997	1003
Davis	US 5,862,393	Jan. 19, 1999	1005
Yap	US 6,073,193	June 6, 2000	1002
PCCextend	PCCextend 100 User's Manual	Apr. 3, 1995	1004

Petitioner also relies on the Declaration of Geert Knapen dated August 27, 2014 ("Knapen Declaration," Ex. 1012).

*E. The Asserted Grounds*

Petitioner challenges claims 1–3, 5, 7, 10–13, and 15–20 of the ’770 patent on the following grounds:

Claims Challenged	Basis	Reference(s)
1, 5, 7, 10, 11, 15–17	§ 103(a)	APA and Yap
2, 3, 12, 13	§ 103(a)	APA, Yap, Michelson
1–3, 10–13, 16–18, 20	§ 103(a)	Michelson, PCCextend, Davis
5, 7, 15, 19	§ 103(a)	Michelson, PCCextend, Davis, APA
18–20	§ 102(e)	Yap

*F. Claim Interpretation*

As a first step in our analysis, we determine the meaning of the claims, for purposes of this decision, using the “broadest reasonable construction in light of the specification of the patent in which [they] appear[.]” 37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b). Under that standard, claim terms are given their ordinary and customary meaning, as would be understood by one of ordinary skill in the art in the context of the entire disclosure. *In re Translogic Tech., Inc.*, 504 F.3d 1249, 1257 (Fed. Cir. 2007).

Petitioner proposes a construction for the claim term “electronically [simulate/simulating] a physical disconnection and reconnection of the peripheral device” (claims 1 and 11) that is broad enough not to exclude the reset circuit of dependent claims 10 and 17. Pet. 7–8. Patent Owner does not address the proposed claim construction in the Preliminary Response.

Regarding the claim term “electronically [simulate/simulating] a physical disconnection and reconnection of the peripheral device,” we determine at this preliminary stage that the broadest reasonable interpretation includes the reset operation of dependent claims 10 and 17. Accordingly, based on the current record, we construe this term to mean “using an electronic circuit to perform an action, such as an electronic reset,

# 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.