

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

TEXAS INSTRUMENTS INCORPORATED,

Petitioner,

v.

ADVANCED SILICON TECHNOLOGIES, LLC

Patent Owner

Case No. To Be Assigned

Patent No. 8,933,945

**DECLARATION OF RICHARD GOODIN
IN SUPPORT PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW
OF U.S. PATENT NO. 8,933,945: CLAIMS 1-11 AND 21**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Background and Qualifications	2
II.	State of the art and known technology pertaining to three-dimensional graphics rendering techniques as of November 2002	6
III.	Overview of the '945 Patent.....	12
	A. Background of the '945 Patent.....	12
	B. The solution – and purported invention – of the '945 Patent is tile-based, screen partitioning	14
	C. The prosecution history of the '945 Patent demonstrates tile-based, screen partitioning was known.....	18
	1. U.S. Patent No. 5,794,016 (“Kelleher”)	18
	2. U.S. Patent No. 6,864,896 (“Perego”)	19
	3. The '945 Patent issued because the Board determined that the examiner did not address how Perego discloses a memory shared among the pipelines	20
IV.	Level of Ordinary Skill.....	21
V.	Claim Construction.....	21
	A. “repeating tile pattern”	22
	B. “N×M number of pixels”	23
VI.	Summary of the Applied Prior Art References	25
	A. The Balmer Patent.....	25
	B. The Narayanaswami Patent.....	28
	1. Implementing Narayanaswami on Balmer	33
	C. Foley.....	35

Petition for Inter Partes Review of U.S. Patent No. 8,933,945
Declaration of Richard Goodin

D.	The Furtner Patent	36
E.	The Kelleher Patent	36
VII.	The Challenged Claims	37
A.	Claims 1, 9, 10 and 21 using the combination of Balmer and Narayanaswami	37
1.	Rationale for combining Balmer and Narayanaswami	37
2.	Claim 1 Preamble - “A graphics processing circuit:”	41
3.	Claim 1 [1a] - “at least two graphics pipelines on a same chip”	42
4.	Claim 1 [1b] - “operative to process data in a corresponding set of tiles of a repeating tile pattern corresponding to screen locations,”	45
5.	Claim 1 [1c] - “a respective one of the at least two graphics pipelines operative to process data in a dedicated tile; and”	48
6.	Claim 1 [1d] - “a memory controller on the chip in communication with the at least two graphics pipelines, operative to transfer pixel data between each of a first pipeline and a second pipeline and a memory shared among the at least two graphics pipelines;”	49
7.	Claim 1 [1e] - “wherein the repeating tile pattern includes a horizontally and vertically repeating pattern of square regions.”	51
8.	Claim 9 - “The graphics processing circuit of claim 1, wherein each tile of the set of tiles further comprises a 16×16 pixel array.	53
9.	Claim 10 - “The graphics processing circuit of claim 1, wherein a second of the at least two graphics pipelines processes the data only in a second set of tiles in the repeating tile pattern.”	54

Petition for Inter Partes Review of U.S. Patent No. 8,933,945
Declaration of Richard Goodin

10.	Claim 21 [Preamble] - “A graphics processing circuit:”	54
11.	Claim 21 [21a] - “at least two graphics pipelines on a chip”	55
12.	Claim 21 [21b] - “operative to process data in a corresponding set of tiles of a repeating tile pattern corresponding to screen locations,”	55
13.	Claim 21 [21c] - “a respective one of the at least two graphics pipelines operative to process data in a dedicated tile,”	55
14.	Claim 21 [21d] - “wherein the repeating tile pattern includes a horizontally and vertically repeating pattern of square regions;”	55
15.	Claim 21 [21e] - “wherein the horizontally and vertically repeating pattern of regions include NxM number of pixels; and	56
16.	Claim 21 [21f] - “a memory controller on the chip, coupled to the at least two graphics pipelines on the chip and operative to transfer pixel data between each of the two graphics pipelines and a memory shared among the at least two graphics pipelines.”	57
B.	Claims 2 and 3 using the combination of Balmer, Narayanaswami and Furtner.....	58
1.	Rationale for Combining Balmer, Narayanaswami, and Furtner.....	58
2.	Claim 2 - “The graphics processing circuit of claim 1, wherein the square regions comprise a two dimensional partitioning of memory.”	59
3.	Claim 3 - “The graphics processing circuit of claim 2, wherein the memory is a frame buffer.”	60
C.	Claims 4-8 and 11 using the combination of Balmer, Narayanaswami and Foley	61

Petition for Inter Partes Review of U.S. Patent No. 8,933,945
Declaration of Richard Goodin

1.	Rationale for Combining Balmer, Narayanaswami, and Foley.....	61
2.	Claim 4 [4a] - “The graphics processing circuit of claim 1, wherein each of the at least two graphics pipelines further includes front end circuitry operative to receive vertex data and generate pixel data corresponding to a primitive to be rendered”	62
3.	Claim 4 [4b] - “and back end circuitry, coupled to the front end circuitry, operative to receive and process a portion of the pixel data.”	64
4.	Claim 5 [5a] - “The graphics processing circuit of claim 4, wherein each of the at least two graphics pipelines further includes a scan converter, coupled to the back end circuitry, operative to determine the portion of the pixel data to be processed by the back end circuitry.”	66
5.	Claim 6 - “The graphics processing circuit of claim 4, wherein the at least two graphics pipelines separately receive the pixel data from the front end circuitry.”	68
6.	Claim 7 - “The graphics processing circuit of claim 6, wherein a first of the at least two graphics pipelines processes the pixel data only in a first set of tiles in the repeating tile pattern.”	70
7.	Claim 8 [8a] - “The graphics processing circuit of claim 7, wherein the first of the at least two graphics pipelines further includes a scan converter, coupled to the front end circuitry and the back end circuitry, operative to provide position coordinates of the pixels within the first set of tiles to be processed by the back end circuitry,”	71
8.	Claim 8 [8b] - “the scan converter including a pixel identification line for receiving tile identification data indicating which of the set of tiles is to be processed by the back end circuitry.”	73

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.