
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC., HTC CORPORATION, HTC AMERICA, INC., SAMSUNG
ELECTRONICS CO. LTD, SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.,
SAMSUNG TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA, LLC AND
AMAZON.COM, INC.
Petitioners

v.

MEMORY INTEGRITY, LLC
Patent Owner

U.S. Patent No. 7,296,121

Inter Partes Review Case No. 2015-00163

**MEMORY INTEGRITY, LLC'S PATENT OWNER
RESPONSE PURSUANT TO 37 CFR § 42.120**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION1

II. MEMORY INTEGRITY’S CLAIM CONSTRUCTIONS.....1

 A. “states”2

 B. “programmed”12

 C. “read response data”19

III. PETITIONERS HAVE NOT MET THEIR BURDEN TO SHOW
UNPATENTABILITY OF THE INSTITUTED CLAIMS.....20

 A. Petitioners Failed to Demonstrate That Koster Anticipates Claims
 4-6 and 11-12.....20

 1. Koster Does Not Disclose “Probe Filtering Information
 Representative Of States Associated With Selected Ones Of
 The Cache Memories” As Required By Claims 4-6 and 11-12....21

 2. Koster Does Not Disclose That “Each Of The Processing
 Nodes Is Programmed To Complete A Memory Transaction
 After Receiving A First Number Of Responses” As Recited In
 Claims 11 and 12.....25

 3. Koster Does Not Disclose “Temporary Storage Associated
 Therewith For Holding Read Response Data” As Recited in
 Claim 1230

 B. Petitioners Failed To Demonstrate That Claims 19-24 Are Obvious
 Over Koster In View of Smith34

 1. The Petition Fails To Demonstrate That The Combination Of
 Koster And Smith Teaches The “Probe Filtering Information
 Representative Of States” Limitation Of Claims 19-2434

IV. CONCLUSION.....35

EXHIBIT LIST

Exhibit No.	Description
Memory Integrity-2001	Plaintiff Memory Integrity, LLC’s Initial Identification of Asserted Claims And Accused Products, served on Petitioners in <i>Memory Integrity LLC v. Amazon.com Inc., et al.</i> , Nos. 1:13-cv-01795, -01796, -01802, -01808 (D. Del. served Oct. 13, 2014)
Memory Integrity-2002	Excerpts from D. E. Culler, J. P. Singh, and A. Gupta PARALLEL COMPUTER ARCHITECTURE, pp. 279-280 (1999)
Memory Integrity-2003	Sorin <i>et al.</i> , “Specifying and Verifying a Broadcast and a Multicast Snooping Cache Coherence Protocol,” IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON PARALLEL AND DISTRIBUTED SYSTEMS, Vol. 13, No. 6, pp. 1-23(June 2002)
Memory Integrity-2004	Excerpts from Merriam-Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary (10 th ed. 1999)
Memory Integrity-2005	Excerpts from David A. Patterson, <i>et al.</i> , COMPUTER ORGANIZATION AND DESIGN (3d ed. 2005)
Memory Integrity-2006	Declaration of Jonathan D. Baker in Support of Patent Owner’s Opposition to Petitioner’s Motion to Correct Exhibit 1007 Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(c)
Memory Integrity-2007	U.S. Patent Application No. 10/288,347
Memory Integrity-2008	U.S. Patent No. 7,107,408 to Glasco
Memory Integrity-2009	U.S. Patent No. 7,107,409 to Glasco
Memory Integrity-2010	Sorin, et al., A PRIMER ON MEMORY CONSISTENCY AND CACHE COHERENCE (2011)
Memory Integrity-2011	Excerpts from D. E. Culler, J. P. Singh, and A. Gupta PARALLEL COMPUTER ARCHITECTURE, pp. 302, 307-310 (1999)
Memory Integrity-2012	Excerpts from Microsoft Computer Dictionary (1999)
Memory Integrity-2013	Excerpts from Modern Dictionary of Electronics (7 th ed. 1999)

Exhibit No.	Description
Memory Integrity-2014	Excerpts from Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary (10 th ed. 1999)
Memory Integrity-2015	Excerpts from Laughton et al., ELECTRICAL ENGINEER'S REFERENCE BOOK, pp. 15/3 (16 th ed. 2003)
Memory Integrity-2016	Declaration of Vojin G. Oklobdzija, PhD in Support of Patent Owner's Responses
Memory Integrity-2017	Curriculum Vitae of Vojin G. Oklobdzija, PhD

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>CAE Screenplates, Inc. v. Heinrich Fiedler GmbH & Co. KG</i> , 224 F.3d 1308 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	17
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Proxyconn, Inc.</i> , 789 F.3d 1292 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	2, 3
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (<i>en banc</i>)	16
<i>Therasense, Inc. v. Becton, Dickinson & Co.</i> , 593 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	23, 25, 26, 34
Statutes	
35 U.S.C. § 316(e)	20
Other Authorities	
37 C.F.R. § 42.1(d)	20
Jose Duato, <i>et al.</i> , INTERCONNECTION NETWORKS – AN ENGINEERING APPROACH (1997)	32
M.A. Laughton, <i>et al.</i> , ELECTRICAL ENGINEER’S REFERENCE BOOK (2003)	17
MERRIAM-WEBSTER’S COLLEGIATE DICTIONARY	15
MICROSOFT COMPUTER DICTIONARY	14, 17
MODERN DICTIONARY OF ELECTRONICS	15
NEWTON’S TELECOM DICTIONARY (20th ed. 2004)	13, 14
Michael John Sebastian Smith, APPLICATION-SPECIFIC INTEGRATED CIRCUITS (1997)	1

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.