

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

Case IPR No: 2015-01944

Patent No. 5,812,789

Title: VIDEO AND/OR AUDIO DECOMPRESSION AND/OR COMPRESSION
DEVICE THAT SHARES A MEMORY INTERFACE

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
II.	THE `789 PATENT.....	2
III.	THE PROPOSED GROUNDS ARE REDUNDANT	3
IV.	PETITIONER DOES NOT ESTABLISH A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT ANY CHALLENGED CLAIM IS INVALID	7
A.	Lambrecht (claims 1, 3, 5, 11, and 13)	7
1.	Lambrecht does not disclose a shared bus that enables “the decoder to access the memory” and operate in real time.....	8
2.	Lambrecht does not disclose a shared bus that has “a sufficient bandwidth” to enable the decoder to access the memory and operate in real time.....	12
B.	Lambrecht in view of Artieri (claim 4).....	15
C.	Lambrecht in view of Moore (claim 6).....	15
D.	Rathnam in view of Lambrecht (claims 1, 3, 4, 5, and 11)	16
1.	Rathnam does not disclose an arbiter for selectively providing access for the first device and the decoder to the memory (“arbiter limitation”)... 19	
2.	Rathnam does not disclose the bus having a sufficient bandwidth to enable the decoder to access the memory and operate in real time when the first device simultaneously accesses the bus (“real time limitation”).....	21
3.	Combination of Rathnam with Lambrecht does not disclose the real time limitation	22
4.	No motivation to combine Rathnam and Lambrecht.....	23
E.	Rathnam in view of Lambrecht and Moore (claim 6)	30
F.	Rathnam in view of Lambrecht and Slavenburg (claim 13).....	30
V.	CONCLUSION.....	31

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Amkor Tech., Inc. v. Tessera, Inc.</i> , 2013 WL 5653117, IPR2013-00242 (Patent Tr. & App. Bd. Oct. 11, 2013)	10
<i>Berk-Tek LLC v. Belden Tech. Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00057, 2013 WL 5947699 (Patent Tr. & App. Bd. May 14, 2013)	10
<i>C.R Bard, Inc. v. M3 Sys., Inc.</i> , 157 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	27
<i>CONOPCP, Inc. v. The Procter & Gamble Co.</i> , IPR2013-00505, 2014 WL 1253037 (Patent Tr. & App. Bd. Feb. 12, 2014)	10
<i>Epistar, et al. v. Trustees Of Boston University</i> , No. IPR2013-00298, Decision Not To Institute, Paper No. 18 (P.T.A.B. November 15, 2103)	32, 33
<i>Illumina, Inc. v. Trustees of Columbia Univ.</i> , No. IPR2012-00006, Paper 43 (P.T.A.B. May 10, 2013).....	8, 9
<i>In re Fine</i> , 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988)	33, 34, 35
<i>In re Wilson</i> , 424 F.2d 1382 (CCPA 1970).....	26, 27
<i>Kinetic Tech., Inc. v. Skyworks Solutions, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00530, 2014 WL 4925282 (Patent Tr. & App. Bd. Sep. 29, 2014)	28
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007)	27
<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).....	7

<i>Oracle Corp. v. Clouding IP, LLC</i> , IPR2013-00088, 2013 WL 5970180 (Patent Tr. & App. Bd. Jun. 13, 2013).....	10
<i>OSRAM Sylvania, Inc. v. Am Induction Techs., Inc.</i> , 701 F.3d 698 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	33
<i>Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.</i> , 868 F.2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1989)	18
<i>Teleflex, Inc. v. Ficos N. America Corp.</i> , 299 F.3d 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	28
<i>United States v. Adams</i> , 383 U.S. 39 (1966)	32
<i>Verdegal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California</i> , 814 F.2d 628 (Fed. Cir. 1987)	18

Rules

35 U.S.C. § 314(a)	5
37 C.F.R § 42.1(b)	8

I. INTRODUCTION

The patent owner Parthenon Unified Memory Architecture LLC (“Patent Owner”) respectfully requests that the Board deny the Petition for *Inter Partes* review (“Petition”) filed by Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd., and Samsung Electronics America, Inc. (collectively, “Petitioner”) regarding certain claims of U.S. Patent No. 5,812,789 (“789 Patent”) because the Petition fails to demonstrate a reasonable likelihood that the Petitioner would prevail as to at least one of the challenged claims, as required under 35 U.S.C. § 314(a).

The Petition proposes six grounds challenging claims 1, 3-6, 11 and 13 (“challenged claims”). Specifically, the Petitioner contends that certain challenged claims are invalid as anticipated by Lambrecht (Ground A). The Petitioner also contends that certain dependent challenged claims are obvious in view of Lambrecht and Artieri (Ground B) or Moore (Ground C). Additionally, the Petitioner contends that certain challenged claims are obvious in view of Rathnam and Lambrecht (Ground D). Finally, the Petitioner contends that certain dependent challenged claims are obvious in view of Rathnam and Lambrecht further in view of Moore (Ground E) or Slavenburg (Ground F).

Ground A fails at least because Lambrecht does not disclose all limitations of independent claim 1 and, therefore, does not anticipate that claim. By

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.