

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

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF
U.S. PATENT NO. 8,933,945 CHALLENGING CLAIMS 1-11 AND 21
UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 311-319 AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.100 *et seq.***

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. MANDATORY NOTICES (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(A)(1)).....1

A. Real Party-In-Interest (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1))1

B. Related Matters (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2)).....1

C. Lead and Backup Counsel (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3)).....2

D. Service Information (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3)).....2

II. FEES (37 C.F.R. § 42.103).....2

III. REQUIREMENTS FOR IPR UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.104.....3

A. Grounds for Standing (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a))3

B. Prior Art Publications Relied Upon3

C. Claims and Statutory Grounds (37 C.F.R. §§ 42.104(b)(1) & (b)(2))3

IV. OVERVIEW OF THE '945 PATENT4

A. Background of the '945 Patent.....4

B. The solution – and purported invention – of the '945 Patent is tile-based, screen partitioning6

C. The prosecution history of the '945 Patent demonstrates tile-based, screen partitioning was known.....9

1. U.S. Patent No. 5,794,016 (“Kelleher”)9

2. U.S. Patent No. 6,864,896 (“Perego”)10

3. The '945 Patent issued because the Board determined that the examiner did not address how Perego discloses a memory shared among the pipelines11

V. PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART12

VI.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION (37 C.F.R. §42.104 (B)(3))	13
A.	“repeating tile pattern”	13
B.	“N×M number of pixels”	14
VII.	SUMMARY OF THE REFERENCES APPLIED IN THIS PETITION	15
A.	The Balmer Patent	15
B.	The Narayanaswami Patent	19
C.	Foley	23
D.	The Furtner Patent	24
E.	The Kelleher Patent	24
VIII.	THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE UNPATENTABLE	25
A.	Ground I: Claims 1, 9, 10, and 21 are obvious in view of the combination of Balmer and Narayanaswami	26
1.	Rationale for combining Balmer and Narayanaswami	26
2.	Claim 1 Preamble - “A graphics processing circuit:”	30
3.	Claim 1 [1a] - “at least two graphics pipelines on a same chip”	30
4.	Claim 1 [1b] - “operative to process data in a corresponding set of tiles of a repeating tile pattern corresponding to screen locations,”	33
5.	Claim 1 [1c] - “a respective one of the at least two graphics pipelines operative to process data in a dedicated tile; and”	36
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;”	37

7.	Claim 1 [1e] - “wherein the repeating tile pattern includes a horizontally and vertically repeating pattern of square regions.”	39
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.”	40
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.”	41
10.	Claim 21 Preamble - “A graphics processing circuit:”	42
11.	Claim 21 [21a] – “at least two graphics pipelines on a chip”	42
12.	Claim 21 [21b] - “operative to process data in a corresponding set of tiles of a repeating tile pattern corresponding to screen locations,”	42
13.	Claim 21 [21c] - “a respective one of the at least two graphics pipelines operative to process data in a dedicated tile,”	42
14.	Claim 21 [21d] - “wherein the repeating tile pattern includes a horizontally and vertically repeating pattern of regions;”	42
15.	Claim 21 [21e] - “wherein the horizontally and vertically repeating pattern of regions include N×M number of pixels; and”	43
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.”	44
B.	Ground II: Claim 2 and 3 are obvious in view of the combination of Balmer, Narayanaswami, and Furtner	44

1.	Rationale for combining Balmer, Narayanaswami, and Furtner	44
2.	Claim 2 - “The graphics processing circuit of claim 1, wherein the square regions comprise a two dimensional partitioning of memory.”	45
3.	Claim 3 - “The graphics processing circuit of claim 2, wherein the memory is a frame buffer.”	47
C.	Ground III: Claims 4-8 and 11 are obvious in view of the combination of Balmer, Narayanaswami, and Foley	48
1.	Rationale for combining Balmer, Narayanaswami, and Foley.....	48
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”	49
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.”	51
4.	Claim 5 - “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.”	53
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.”	56
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.”	58

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.