

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

LG ELECTRONICS, INC.
Petitioner

v.

ATI TECHNOLOGIES ULC
Patent Owner

Case: IPR2015-00321

Patent 7,095,945 B1

**PETITIONER'S RESPONSE TO PATENT OWNER'S MOTION FOR
OBSERVATION ON CROSS-EXAMINATION OF
DR. DAN SCHONFELD**

Mail Stop **Patent Board**
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

PETITIONER'S EXHIBIT LIST

Description	Exhibit No.
U.S. Patent No. 7,095,945	1001
Prosecution History of U.S. Patent No. 7,095,945	1002
Complaints filed in Related District Court Cases	1003
Declaration of Daniel Schonfeld, Ph.D. ("Schonfeld Decl.")	1004
U.S. Patent No. 6,233,389 ("Barton")	1005
U.S. Patent No. 6,397,000 ("Hatanaka")	1006
U.S. Patent No. 6,591,058 ("O'Connor")	1007
U.S. Patent No. 5,521,922 ("Fujinami")	1008
Declaration of Jamie Beaber	1009
Declaration of Michael Maas	1010
Deposition transcript of Dr. Mangione-Smith	1011
Supplemental Declaration of Daniel Schonfeld ("Schonfeld Suppl. Decl.")	1012

Table of Contents

I. INTRODUCTION1

II. RESPONSES.....1

 A. Response to Observation No. 1 1

 B. Response to Observation No. 2 2

 C. Response to Observation No. 3 2

 D. Response to Observation No. 4 3

 E. Response to Observation No. 5 3

 F. Response to Observation No. 6 4

I. INTRODUCTION

ATI Technologies ULC ("Patent Owner")'s Motion for Observation of Cross-Examination of Petitioner's Reply Witness Dr. Daniel Schonfeld (Paper No. 32) contains argumentative observations and should be expunged. Petitioner reserves its right to move to expunge or strike Patent Owner's observations.

Nevertheless, to the extent the Board does not expunge Patent Owner's observations, Petitioner submits the following responses to Patent Owner's Motion for Observation on Cross-Examination of Petitioner's Reply Witness Dr. Daniel Schonfeld.

II. RESPONSES

A. Response to Observation No. 1

In Exhibit 2013, at page 53, lines 2 to page 56, line 6, Dr. Schonfeld testified that his discussion of switches 8 and 25 relate only to the last limitation of claim 18—the simultaneous limitation which is the only limitation requiring any type of toggling. In Exhibit 2013, at page 57, line 22 to page 60, line 22 Dr. Schonfeld explained that recording can occur when switch 8 is set to contact A or B and explained the relation of the clock to switch 8. This testimony is relevant to establish Dr. Schonfeld's opinion of the switches in Hatanaka and in particular, the relation of switch 8 to the clock 45. This testimony is also relevant to put Dr. Schonfeld's testimony cited by Patent Owner in the proper context.

B. Response to Observation No. 2

In Exhibit 2013, at page 67, lines 8 to 16 Dr. Schonfeld testified as follows:

so the only thing I said is whatever rate is used for a particular hypothetical implementation of Hatanaka, as long as you doubled it or more, it would be sufficiently fast to allow for simultaneous storage and decoding, assuming that you do not have a storage device with multiple heads or magnetic disk or optical disk or any of the other devices disclosed in Hatanaka.

In Exhibit 2013, at page 68, lines 2 to 5 Dr. Schonfeld testified as follows:

I cannot answer specific numbers in a vacuum. The only thing I can specify is double whatever the rate that is used in the normal operation of Hatanaka.

See also id. at 15: 3-15.

This testimony is relevant to establish Dr. Schonfeld's understanding of the processing rate in order to perform simultaneous storing and decoding. This testimony is also relevant to put Dr. Schonfeld's testimony cited by Patent Owner in the proper context.

In Exhibit 2013, at page 71, line 3 to page 73, line 25, Dr. Schonfeld explained the support in Hatanaka for his opinion that switch 25 would toggle. *See also id.* 19:14-20:13. This testimony is relevant to establish that Dr. Schonfeld's opinions about the toggling of switches in Hatanaka are supported.

C. Response to Observation No. 3

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.