

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

MICRON TECHNOLOGY, INC.

Petitioner,

v.

LIMESTONE MEMORY SYSTEMS LLC

Patent Owner

Patent No. 5,894,441

Issue Date: Apr. 13, 1999

Filed: Mar. 31, 1998

Inventor: Shigeyuki Nakazawa

Title: SEMICONDUCTOR MEMORY DEVICE WITH REDUNDANCY  
CIRCUIT

*Inter Partes* Review No. IPR2016-00094

---

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

Mail Stop PATENT BOARD  
Patent Trial and Appeal Board  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

**Table of Contents**

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. SUMMARY OF THE ‘441 PATENT .....	2
<b>A. The Inventions Disclosed in the ‘441 Patent</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>B. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>C. Claim Interpretation</b> .....	<b>7</b>
1. “transfer gate” .....	8
III. CLAIMS 1–3 AND 5 ARE NOT AT ISSUE IN THE RELATED DISTRICT COURT LITIGATION.....	9
IV. THE PETITION FAILS TO ESTABLISH A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT MICRON WILL PREVAIL AS TO ANY OF THE GROUNDS ASSERTED AGAINST CLAIMS 6–15 OF THE ‘441 PATENT.....	10
<b>A. Legal Standard</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>B. Summary of McAdams (U.S. Patent No. 5,270,975)</b> .....	<b>14</b>
<b>C. Summary of Minami (Japanese Unexamined Patent Application Publication H06-52696)</b> .....	<b>22</b>
<b>D. The Petition Fails To Establish That Claims 6 Through 15 Are Obvious Over McAdams In View Of Minami, Because The Petition Does Not Establish Reason To Combine McAdams And Minami</b> .....	<b>25</b>
1. The Petition Ignores Fundamental Differences Between McAdams And Minami: Adding Minami’s Structure to McAdams Unnecessarily Adds Structure to Duplicate Function Already Built Into McAdams .....	25

2.	The Petition's Alleged Reasons to Modify McAdams with Minami Fail to Provide a Rational Unpinning for the Combination.....	29
V.	THE PETITION FAILS TO ESTABLISH THAT CLAIMS 8 AND 10 ARE OBVIOUS OVER MCADAMS IN VIEW OF MINAMI, BECAUSE THE PROPOSED COMBINATION WOULD RENDER MCADAMS INOPERATIVE.....	33
VI.	CONCLUSION.....	35

## Table of Authorities

### Cases

<i>Activevideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Commc’ns, Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	13
<i>Am. Acad. of Sci. Tech. Ctr., In re</i> , 367 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2004) .....	7
<i>Bass, In re</i> , 314 F.3d 575 (Fed. Cir. 2002) .....	7
<i>CCS Fitness, Inc. v. Brunswick Corp.</i> , 288 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2002) .....	7
<i>Cisco Sys., Inc. v. C-Cation Techs., LLC</i> , IPR2014-00454, Paper 12 (Aug. 29, 2014).....	12, 13, 29
<i>Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC, In re</i> , 778 F.3d 1271 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....	7
<i>Dow Chem. Co., In re</i> , 837 F.2d 469 (Fed. Cir. 1988) .....	12
<i>FCA US LLC v. Jacobs Vehicle Sys.</i> , IPR2015-01234, Paper 9 (Oct. 23, 2015).....	10
<i>Gordon, In re</i> , 733 F.2d 900 (Fed. Cir. 1984) .....	13
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966) .....	12
<i>ICON Health and Fitness, Inc., In re</i> , 496 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2007) .....	30
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007) .....	11, 13
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Secure Web Conference Corp.</i> , IPR2014-00745 Paper 12 (Sep. 29, 2014).....	30
<i>NTP, Inc., In re</i> , 654 F.3d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....	14, 32, 35
<i>Rambus, Inc., In re</i> , 753 F.3d 1253 (Fed. Cir. 2014) .....	7
<i>Star Scientific, Inc. v. R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.</i> , 655 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....	14
<i>Translogic Tech., Inc., In re</i> , 504 F.3d 1249 (Fed. Cir. 2007) .....	7
<i>Travelocity.com L.P. et al. v. Cronos Technologies, LLC</i> , CBM2014-00082 paper 12 (Oct. 16, 2014) .....	11

*Urbanski, In re,*

Case No. 2015-1272 (Fed. Cir. Jan. 8, 2016)..... 13, 14

**Statutes**

35 U.S.C. § 103 .....11

35 U.S.C. § 253 .....10

35 U.S.C. § 313 .....1

**Regulations**

37 C.F.R. § 1.321 .....10

37 C.F.R. § 42.100 .....7

37 C.F.R. § 42.107 ..... 1, 10

37 C.F.R. § 42.108 ..... 2, 11

37 C.F.R. § 42.73 .....10

**Other Authorities**

Office Trial Practice Guide,

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.