

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd., and  
Samsung Electronics America, Inc.  
Petitioners

v.

Parthenon Unified Memory Architecture LLC  
Patent Owner

---

*INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 5,812,789  
Case IPR No.: *To Be Assigned*

---

PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 5,812,789  
UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 311-19 AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.100 *et seq.*

---

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. INTRODUCTION ..... 1

II. MANDATORY NOTICES UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b) ..... 1

III. PAYMENT OF FEES UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.15(a) ..... 3

IV. GROUNDS FOR STANDING..... 3

V. IDENTIFICATION OF CHALLENGES UNDER 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.22 AND 42.104(b) ..... 3

    A. Statutory Grounds of Challenge ..... 3

    B. The Proposed Grounds are Not Redundant..... 5

VI. THE '789 PATENT ..... 5

VII. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION ..... 6

    A. Claim Terms To Be Construed..... 7

        1. “video decoder” ..... 7

        2. “real time” ..... 8

    B. Expiration of the '789 Patent ..... 9

VIII. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART ..... 10

IX. SPECIFIC GROUNDS OF CHALLENGE..... 10

    A. Ground A: *Lambrecht* anticipates claims 1, 3, 5, 11, and 13. .... 10

        1. Claim 1 ..... 10

        2. Claim 3 ..... 19

        3. Claim 5 ..... 20

        4. Claim 11 ..... 21

        5. Claim 13 ..... 22

    B. Ground B: *Lambrecht* in view of *Artieri* renders obvious claim 4 ..... 24

        1. Claim 4 ..... 24

    C. Ground C: *Lambrecht* in view of *Moore* renders obvious claim 6 ..... 26

Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Pat. No. 5,812,789

1.	Claim 6.....	26
D.	Ground D: <i>Rathnam</i> in view of <i>Lambrecht</i> renders obvious claims 1, 3, 4, 5, and 11 .....	27
1.	Claim 1 .....	27
2.	Claim 3 .....	38
3.	Claim 4 .....	39
4.	Claim 5 .....	40
5.	Claim 11 .....	41
E.	Ground E: <i>Rathnam</i> in view of <i>Lambrecht</i> and <i>Moore</i> renders obvious claim 6.....	42
1.	Claim 6.....	42
F.	Ground F: <i>Rathnam</i> in view of <i>Lambrecht</i> and <i>Slavenburg</i> renders obvious claim 13. ....	44
1.	Claim 13.....	44
X.	CONCLUSION.....	48

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Federal Cases</b>	
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc) .....	10
<i>Parthenon Unified Memory Architecture LLC v. Apple, Inc.</i> , No. 2:15-cv-00621-JRG-RSP (E.D. Tex.).....	2
<i>Parthenon Unified Memory Architecture LLC v. HTC Corp. et al.</i> , No. 2:14-cv-00690-RSP (E.D. Tex.) .....	2
<i>Parthenon Unified Memory Architecture LLC v. Huawei Techs. Co., Ltd. et al.</i> , No. 2:14-cv-00687-JRG-RSP (E.D. Tex.).....	1
<i>Parthenon Unified Memory Architecture LLC v. LG Elecs., Inc. et al.</i> , No. 2:14-cv-00691-JRG-RSP (E.D. Tex.).....	2
<i>Parthenon Unified Memory Architecture LLC v. Motorola Mobility, Inc.</i> , No. 2:14-cv-00689-JRG-RSP (E.D. Tex.).....	1
<i>Parthenon Unified Memory Architecture LLC v. Qualcomm Inc. et al.</i> , No. 2:14-cv-00930-JRG-RSP (E.D. Tex.).....	2
<i>Parthenon Unified Memory Architecture LLC v. Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd. et al.</i> , No. 2:14-cv-00902-JRG-RSP (E.D. Tex.).....	2
<i>Parthenon Unified Memory Architecture LLC v. ZTE Corp. et al.</i> , No. 2:15-cv-00225-JRG-RSP (E.D. Tex.).....	2
<i>In re Rambus, Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 42 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	9

<i>STMicroelectronics, Inc. v. Motorola Inc. et al.</i> , No. 4:03-cv-00276-LED (E.D. Tex.).....	2
<i>Toyota Motor Corp. v. Hagenbuch</i> , IPR2013-00483, Paper No. 37 (Dec. 5, 2014).....	10
<i>In re Translogic Tech., Inc.</i> , 504 F.3d 1249 (Fed. Cir. 2007) .....	7
<i>In re Yamamoto</i> , 740 F.2d 1569 (Fed. Cir. 1984) .....	7
<i>In re Zletz</i> , 13 USPQ2d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 1989) .....	6
<b>Federal Statutes</b>	
35 U.S.C. 102(a) .....	4
35 U.S.C. 102(b) .....	5
35 U.S.C. 102(e) .....	3, 4, 5
35 U.S.C. § 103 .....	<i>passim</i>
35 U.S.C. § 112 .....	6
35 U.S.C. § 311 .....	48
<b>Regulations</b>	
37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b) .....	1
37 C.F.R. § 42.15(a).....	3
37 C.F.R. § 42.22 .....	3
37 C.F.R. § 42.101 .....	48
37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a).....	3
37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b) .....	3
77 Fed. Reg. 48,756 (Aug. 14, 2012) .....	7

# 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.