

**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: 2015-01502

Patent No. 7,542,045

Title: ELECTRONIC SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR DISPLAY USING A DECODER AND  
ARBITER TO SELECTIVELY ALLOW ACCESS TO A SHARED MEMORY

---

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

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. INTRODUCTION.....1

II. THE `045 PATENT.....3

III. THE PROPOSED GROUNDS ARE REDUNDANT .....4

IV. PETITIONER DOES NOT ESTABLISH A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT ANY CHALLENGED CLAIM IS INVALID.....8

    A. Rathnam (claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-10, 12-13 and 15-17)..... 8

        1. Rathnam does not disclose a video decoder configured to receive a current video image to be decoded from the [main]/[system] memory ..... 12

        2. Rathnam does not disclose the video decoder receiving data from the [main]/[system] memory corresponding to a previously decoded video image.... 19

        3. Rathnam’s VLIW CPU cannot be both the recited video decoder and the recited CPU..... 23

        4. Rathnam does not disclose a microprocessor that stores non-image data in the [main]/[system] memory ..... 25

        5. Rathnam does not disclose an arbiter that controls access to the main/system memory..... 28

    B. Bowes and the MPEG Standard (claims 1, 4-5, 7, 10, 12, 16-17)..... 31

        1. The MPEG Standard Was Considered During the Prosecution of the `045 Patent..... 31

        2. The Combination of Bowes and the MPEG Standard Does Not Disclose Every Element of the Challenged Claims..... 32

            a. The proposed combination does not disclose the video decoder receiving an image to be decoded and a previously decoded image from the [main]/[system] memory .....32

            b. The proposed combination does not disclose an arbiter that controls access to the main/system memory .....37

        3. No Motivation to Combine Bowes and the MPEG Standard..... 38

C. Bowes, the MPEG Standard and Rathnam (claims 9, 15) .....45  
D. Bowes, the MPEG Standard and Stearns (claims 2, 6, 13).....45  
V. CONCLUSION .....46

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Cases**

*Amkor Tech., Inc. v. Tessera, Inc.*,  
IPR2013-00242, 2013 WL 5653117, (Patent Tr. & App. Bd. Oct. 11, 2013) .....6

*Berk-Tek LLC v. Belden Tech. Inc.*,  
IPR2013-00057, 2013 WL 5947699 (Patent Tr. & App. Bd. May 14, 2013).....6

*C.R Bard, Inc. v. M3 Sys., Inc.*,  
157 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 1998) .....38

*CONOPCP, Inc. v. The Procter & Gamble Co.*,  
IPR2013-00505, 2014 WL 1253037 (Patent Tr. & App. Bd. 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) .....42

*Ex Parte Avigdor Eldar*,  
Appeal 2010-005611, 2012 WL 5387422 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 30, 2012) .....23

*Hopkins Mfg. Corp. v. Cequent Performance Prods., Inc.*,  
IPR2015-00613, 2015 WL 4760586 (Patent Tr. & Ap. Bd. Aug. 7, 2015) .....23

*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) ..... 43, 44, 45

*In re ICON Health & Fitness, Inc.*  
496 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2007) .....41

*In re Schreiber*,  
128 F.3d 1473 (Fed. Cir. 1977) .....24

<i>In re Skvorecz</i> , 580 F.3d 1262 (Fed. Cir. 2009) .....	19
<i>In re Wilson</i> , 424 F.2d 1382 (CCPA 1970) .....	30
<i>Karlin Tech., Inc. v. Surgical Dynamics, Inc.</i> , 177 F.3d 968 (Fed. Cir. 1999) .....	29
<i>Kinetic Tech., Inc. v. Skyworks Solutions, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00530, 2014 WL 4925282 (Patent Tr. & App. Bd. Sep. 29, 2014) .....	39
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	37
<i>Liberty Mutual Ins. Co. v. Progressive Casualty Ins. Co.</i> , No. CBM-2012-00003, Paper No. 8 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 25, 2012) .....	4
<i>Lorex Canada, Inc. v. E-Watch, Inc.</i> , 2014 WL 2507794, IPR2013-00521 (Patent Tr. & App. Bd. Feb. 13, 2014) .....	6
<i>Oracle Corp. v. Clouding IP, LLC</i> , IPR2013-00088, 2013 WL 5970180 (Patent Tr. & App. Bd. Jun. 13, 2013).....	7
<i>OSRAM Sylvania, Inc. v. Am Induction Techs., Inc.</i> , 701 F.3d 698 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	43
<i>Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.</i> , 868 F.2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1989) .....	29
<i>Teleflex, Inc. v. Ficos N. America Corp.</i> , 299 F.3d 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2002) .....	38
<i>Therasense, Inc. v. Becton, Dickinson &amp; Co.</i> , 593 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2010) .....	20
<i>Trintec Indus., Inc. v. Top- U.S.A. Corp.</i> , 295 F.3d 1292 (Fed. Cir. 2002) .....	17

# 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.