

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

APPLE INC.  
Petitioner

v.

LONGITUDE FLASH MEMORY SYSTEMS S.A.R.L.  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2015-01949  
Patent 7,818,490

---

**PATENT OWNER LONGITUDE FLASH MEMORY SYSTEMS S.A.R.L.  
AND EXCLUSIVE LICENSEE LONGITUDE LICENSING LTD.'S  
PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

## **Table of Contents**

I.	Introduction .....	1
II.	Background.....	2
A.	About U.S. Patent No. 7,818,490 (the “‘490 patent”) .....	2
B.	Petitioner’s Grounds of Challenge .....	9
III.	Claim Construction.....	11
A.	Petitioner’s Proposed Construction Is Unsupported .....	11
IV.	The Petitioner Does Not Demonstrate That It Is More Likely Than Not to Prevail On Any Challenged Claim on the ‘490 Patent.....	13
A.	Petitioner Improperly Circumvents the Board’s Page Limit Rule.....	13
B.	Petitioner Fails to Demonstrate That Niijima Anticipates Claims 34-38, 40, 41, 43-45, 50-57, and 59-64 or Renders Those Claims Obvious in View of the Knowledge of a Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art (Ground 1) .....	17
1.	Petitioner Improperly Conflates Multiple Embodiments in Niijima .....	18
2.	The Petitioner Fails To Demonstrate That Niijima in View of the Knowledge of a Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art Discloses Programming Individual Ones of a Second Plurality of Pages in a Second Block with Updated Data as Required by Independent Claims 34 and 52.....	22
3.	The Petitioner Fails To Demonstrate That Niijima in View of the Knowledge of a Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art Discloses “programming the updated version of the original data in those of the second plurality of pages that have different offset positions within the second block than the offset positions of the first plurality of pages within said at least the first block,” As Recited In Independent Claims 34 and 52 .....	25
4.	The Petitioner Fails To Demonstrate That Niijima in View of the Knowledge of a Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art Discloses the “organizing” Required By Claims 34-36 and 52-54.....	28
5.	The Petitioner Fails To Demonstrate That Niijima in View of the Knowledge of a Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art Discloses	

	“programming the individual pages with an indication of a relative time of programming the data therein,” As Recited In Claim 37 .....	32
6.	The Petitioner Fails To Demonstrate That Nijima in View of the Knowledge of a Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art Discloses That The Logical Addresses Include a Logical Block Number and a Logical Page Offset, As Required By Claims 40, 56, 60, and 62.....	34
7.	The Petitioner Fails To Demonstrate That Nijima in View of the Knowledge of a Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art Discloses Programming Logical Addresses Within Pages In Which the Pages of Updated or Original Data Are Programmed, As Required By Claims 41 and 57 .....	36
8.	The Petitioner Fails To Demonstrate That Nijima in View of the Knowledge of a Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art Discloses “wherein organizing pages of the read data comprises writing the pages of read data into a volatile memory within the memory system,” As Recited In Claims 45, 51, and 64 .....	38
C.	The Petitioner Fails To Demonstrate That Nijima in View of Wells Renders Obvious Claims 42 and 58 (Ground 2).....	40
1.	The Petitioner Fails To Demonstrate That Nijima in View of Wells Discloses That “units are physically separate groupings of blocks of charge storage elements in which programming operations may be performed independently,” As Recited In Claims 42 and 58.....	40
2.	The Petitioner Fails To Demonstrate That Nijima in View of Wells Discloses “linking the first and third blocks together as a metablock,” As Recited In Claims 42 and 58.....	42
D.	The Petitioner Fails To Demonstrate That Nijima and the Admitted Prior Art or Cappelletti Renders Obvious Claims 46 and 47 (Ground 3) .....	43
E.	Grounds 4 and 5 .....	45
F.	The Petitioner Fails To Demonstrate That Nijima and Wells, and the Knowledge of One of Ordinary Skill in the Art, Hazen, or Dipert, Render Obvious Claims 42 and 58 (Ground 6) .....	45
G.	Reservation of Argument Regarding Other Deficiencies .....	46

V. Conclusion .....	47
---------------------	----

## **Table of Authorities**

### **Cases**

<i>Continental Can Co. v. Monsanto Co.</i> , 948 F.2d 1264 (Fed. Cir. 1991) .....	27
<i>Corning Incorporated v. DSM IP Assets B.V.</i> , IPR 2013-00048, paper 94 (PTAB 5/9/2014) .....	28
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966) .....	18
<i>In re Oelrich</i> , 666 F.2d 578 (CCPA 1981) .....	27
<i>In re Rijckaert</i> , 9 F.3d 1531 (Fed. Cir. 1993) .....	27
<i>In re Translogic Tech., Inc.</i> , 504 F.3d 1249 (Fed. Cir. 2007) .....	11
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007) .....	18
<i>MEHL/Biophile Int’l Corp. v. Milgraum</i> , 192 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 1999) .....	27
<i>Net MoneyIN, Inc. v. VeriSign, Inc.</i> , 545 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....	17, 19, 20
<i>Nvidia Corp. v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd.</i> , IPR2015-01318, paper 8 (PTAB 12/7/2015) .....	19, 20
<i>OSRAM Sylvania, Inc. v. Am. Induction Techs., Inc.</i> , 701 F.3d 698 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	18
<i>SanDisk Corp. v. Kingston Tech. Co.</i> , 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 27696 (W.D. Wis. Mar. 15, 2011) .....	vii, 21
<i>SanDisk Corp. v. Kingston Tech. Co.</i> , 695 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	33
<i>Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California</i> , 814 F.2d 628 (Fed. Cir. 1987) .....	17
<i>VMware, Inc. v. Electronics and Telecommunications Research Institute</i> , IPR2014-00901, paper 7 (PTAB 7/14/2014) .....	14

### **Statutes**

35 U.S.C. § 102(b) .....	9
35 U.S.C. § 103(a) .....	10
35 U.S.C. § 314(a) .....	1, 13, 47

### **Other Authorities**

M.P.E.P. § 2112 (IV) .....	26
M.P.E.P. § 2131 .....	17
Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48756 (Aug. 14, 2012) .....	11

# 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.