UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

HTC Corporation,
HTC America, Inc.,
LG Electronics, Inc.,
Samsung Electronics, Co., Ltd., and
Samsung Electronics America, Inc.
PETITIONERS

V.

Parthenon Unified Memory Architecture LLC
PATENT OWNER

Case IPR No: 2015-01501

Patent No. 7,777,753

Title: ELECTRONIC SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR SELECTIVELY ALLOWING ACCESS TO A SHARED MEMORY

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. §42.107

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. THE `753 PATENT 3

III. THE PROPOSED GROUNDS ARE REDUNDANT 4

IV. PETITIONER DOES NOT ESTABLISH A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT ANY CHALLENGED CLAIM IS INVALID 9

1. The MPEG Standard Was Considered During the Prosecution of the `753 Patent 9

2. Proposed Combinations Fail to Disclose All Claim Limitations 10

A. Gulick, the MPEG Standard, and Shanley (claims 1-4 and 7-10) 10

a. The proposed combination does not disclose the video circuit and the processor sharing the *main memory* (claim 1) 10

b. The proposed combination does not disclose storing the current video image to be displayed in the main memory (claim 1) or memory (claim 7) 11

c. The proposed combination does not disclose the processor retrieving non-image data from the main memory (claim 1) 16

d. The proposed combination does not disclose the decoder receiving data from the main memory (claim 2)/memory (claim 7) corresponding to a previously decoded video image (claim 2)/ image (claim 7) 17

B. Gulick, MPEG Standard, Shanley and Gove (claim 12) 20

C. Bowes and the MPEG Standard (claims 1 and 2) 20

a. The proposed combination does not disclose the decoder receiving an image to be decoded and a previously decoded image from the memory 21

b. The proposed combination does not disclose an arbiter that controls access to the main memory 26

c. The proposed combination does not disclose an arbiter that receives requests to access the memory from the processor 28

d. No motivation to combine Bowes and the MPEG Standard 31

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

D. Bowes, the MPEG Standard and Stearns (claim 3).....37
E. Bowes, the MPEG Standard and Shanley (claim 4).....38
F. Bowes, the MPEG Standard and Whai (claims 7-8).....38
G. Bowes, the MPEG Standard, Whai and Shanley (claims 9 and 10).....40
H. Bowes, the MPEG Standard, Whai and Gove (claim 12).....40
V. CONCLUSION.....41

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Abbott Labs. v. Sandoz, Inc.,
544 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2009) 15

Amkor Tech., Inc. v. Tessera, Inc.,
No. IPR2013-00242, 2013 WL 5653117 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 11, 2013).....7

Berk-Tek LLC v. Belden Tech. Inc.,
No. IPR2013-00057, 2013 WL 5947699 (P.T.A.B. May 14, 2013) 7

C.R Bard, Inc. v. M3 Sys., Inc.,
157 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 1998) 30

CONOPCP, Inc. v. The Procter & Gamble Co.,
No. IPR2013-00505, 2014 WL 1253037 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 12, 2014).....7

Epistar, et al. v. Trustees Of Boston University,
No. IPR2013-00298, Decision Not To Institute, Paper No. 18 (P.T.A.B. November 15, 2103) 34

Illumina, Inc. v. Trustees of Columbia Univ.,
No. IPR2012-00006, Paper 43 (P.T.A.B. May 10, 2013) 4, 5

In re Fine,
837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988) ..... passim

In re ICON Health & Fitness, Inc.
496 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2007) 16, 34

In re Wilson,
424 F.2d 1382 (CCPA 1970) 20

Kinetic Tech., Inc. v. Skyworks Solutions, Inc.,
IPR2014-00530, 2014 WL 4925282 (Patent Tr. & App. Bd. Sep. 29, 2014) 31

KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.,
550 U.S. 398 (2007).....30

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

Liberty Mutual Ins. Co. v. Progressive Casualty Ins. Co.,
No. CBM-2012-00003, Paper No. 8 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 25, 2012) 4

Oracle Corp. v. Clouding IP, LLC,
No. IPR 2013-00088, 2013 WL 5970180 (P.T.A.B. Jun 13, 2013) 6, 7

OSRAM Sylvania, Inc. v. Am Induction Techs., Inc.,
701 F.3d 698 (Fed. Cir. 2012) 35

Teleflex, Inc. v. Ficos N. America Corp.,
299 F.3d 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2002) 31

Trintec Indus., Inc. v. Top- U.S.A. Corp.,
295 F.3d 1292 (Fed. Cir. 2002) 17

United States v. Adams,
383 U.S. 39 (1966)..... 13, 34

RULES

35 U.S.C. § 314(a) 1

37 C.F.R § 42.1(b) 5

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKET ALARM

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.