

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

APPLE INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

PARTHENON UNIFIED MEMORY ARCHITECTURE LLC,  
Patent Owner.

---

Cases

IPR2016-01114 (Patent 7,777,753)  
IPR2016-01118 (Patent 7,321,368)  
IPR2016-01134 (Patent 7,542,045)<sup>1</sup>

---

Before MICHAEL R. ZECHER, JAMES B. ARPIN,  
SUSAN L. C. MITCHELL, and MATTHEW R. CLEMENTS,  
*Administrative Patent Judges.*

CLEMENTS, *Administrative Patent Judge.*

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE  
Conduct of the Proceedings  
*37 C.F.R. § 42.5(a)*

---

<sup>1</sup> This Order addresses an issue that is identical in all three cases. We, therefore, exercise our discretion to issue one Order to be filed in each case. The parties, however, are not authorized to use this style heading in any subsequent papers.

IPR2016-01114 (Patent 7,777,753)

IPR2016-01118 (Patent 7,321,368)

IPR2016-01134 (Patent 7,542,045)

## I. INTRODUCTION

In December 2016, we instituted an *inter partes* review of certain claims (“the instituted claims”) of the patents at issue in each of the above-named proceedings in early December. IPR2016-01114, Paper 7; IPR2016-01118, Paper 8; IPR2016-01134, Paper 7. In January 2017, we issued Final Written Decisions in earlier-filed proceedings involving the same patents in which many of the instituted claims were held unpatentable. *HTC Corporation v. Parthenon Unified Memory Architecture LLC*, Case IPR2015-01500 (PTAB Jan. 4, 2017) (Paper 54) (“1500 FWD”); *HTC Corporation v. Parthenon Unified Memory Architecture LLC*, Case IPR2015-01501 (PTAB Jan. 4, 2017) (Paper 53) (“1501 FWD”); *HTC Corporation v. Parthenon Unified Memory Architecture LLC*, Case IPR2015-01502 (PTAB Jan. 4, 2017) (Paper 52) (“1502 FWD”). Neither party to the earlier-filed proceedings filed a Request for Rehearing in any of those proceedings. As a result, we now order the parties in these proceedings to show cause why we should not terminate these proceedings as to the claims held unpatentable in those Final Written Decisions.

## II. BACKGROUND

### A. *The ’368 patent*

On December 5, 2016, we instituted an *inter partes* review of certain claims of U.S. Patent 7,321,368 B2 (“the ’368 patent”) on the following grounds:

IPR2016-01114 (Patent 7,777,753)

IPR2016-01118 (Patent 7,321,368)

IPR2016-01134 (Patent 7,542,045)

1. Claims 1, 7, 13, 15, 18, 20, 24, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Bowes,<sup>2</sup> Datasheet,<sup>3</sup> and Artieri<sup>4</sup>; and
2. Claims 17 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Bowes, Datasheet, Artieri, and Gove<sup>5</sup>.

IPR2016-01118, Paper 8, 23.

On January 4, 2017, we issued a Final Written Decision in IPR2015-01500, in which we found claims 1–3, 5, 7, 13–15, 17–21, and 23–25 of the '368 patent to be unpatentable based on the following grounds:

1. Claims 1, 5, 7, 13, 15, 18, 20, 24, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Bowes and MPEG<sup>6</sup>; and
2. Claims 17, 19, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Bowes, MPEG, and Rathnam<sup>7</sup>; and
3. Claims 2, 3, 14, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Bowes, MPEG, and Stearns<sup>8</sup>.

---

<sup>2</sup> U.S. Patent No. 5,546,547.

<sup>3</sup> AT&T DSP3210 Digital Signal Processor, The Multimedia Solution, Data Sheet, March 1993.

<sup>4</sup> EP 0 626 653 A1.

<sup>5</sup> Robert J. Gove, "The MVP: A Highly-Integrated Video Compression Chip," Proceedings of the IEEE Data Compression Conference (DCC '94), pp. 215–224 (March 29–31, 1994).

<sup>6</sup> International Organization for Standardization, "ISO/IEC 11172-2: Information technology—Coding of moving pictures and associated audio for digital storage media at up to about 1,5 Mbit/s—Part 2: Video," (1st ed. Aug. 1, 1993).

<sup>7</sup> S. Rathnam et al., "An Architectural Overview of the Programmable Multimedia Processor, TM-1," PROC. COMPCON, IEEE Computer Society Press, Los Alamitos, CA, 1996, pp. 319–326 (1996).

<sup>8</sup> U.S. Patent No. 5,774,676.

IPR2016-01114 (Patent 7,777,753)

IPR2016-01118 (Patent 7,321,368)

IPR2016-01134 (Patent 7,542,045)

1500 FWD 7, 28. Neither party to IPR2015-01500 filed a request for rehearing within thirty days of entry of that decision. 37 C.F.R. § 42.71.

As a result, all of the claims instituted upon in IPR2016-01118 have been held unpatentable in IPR2015-01500. *See* IPR2016-01118, Paper 8, 3 n.1 (“If we issue a Final Written Decision in [IPR2015-01500], the panel shall determine whether it is appropriate to maintain this proceeding against all or some of the claims, upon which review is instituted, or to terminate this proceeding and vacate this Decision on Institution.”).

### *B. The '753 patent*

On December 7, 2016, we instituted an *inter partes* review of certain claims of U.S. Patent 7,777,753 B2 (“the '753 patent”) on the following grounds:

1. Claims 1 and 2 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Bowes, Datasheet, Artieri, and Arimilli<sup>9</sup>;
2. Claim 4 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Bowes, Datasheet, Artieri, Arimilli, and Shanley<sup>10</sup>;
3. Claim 7 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Bowes, Datasheet, Artieri, and Christiansen<sup>11</sup>;
4. Claims 8 and 10 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Bowes, Datasheet, Artieri, Christiansen, and Arimilli;

---

<sup>9</sup> U.S. Patent No. 6,029,217.

<sup>10</sup> T. Shanley *et al.*, “PCI System Architecture,” Addison-Wesley Publ’g Co. (3rd ed. Feb. 1995).

<sup>11</sup> U.S. Patent No. 5,787,264.

IPR2016-01114 (Patent 7,777,753)

IPR2016-01118 (Patent 7,321,368)

IPR2016-01134 (Patent 7,542,045)

5. Claim 9 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Bowes, Datasheet, Artieri, Christiansen, and Shanley; and
6. Claim 12 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Bowes, Datasheet, Artieri, Christiansen, and Gove.

IPR2016-01114, Paper 7, 42.

On January 4, 2017, we issued a Final Written Decision in IPR2015-01501, in which we found claims 1–4 of the '753 patent to be unpatentable based on the following grounds:

1. Claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Bowes and MPEG; and
2. Claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Bowes, MPEG, and Stearns; and
3. Claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Bowes, MPEG, MPEG, and Shanley.

1501 FWD 3, 37. Neither party to IPR2015-01501 filed a request for rehearing within thirty days of entry of that decision. 37 C.F.R. § 42.71.

As a result, some of the claims instituted upon in IPR2016-01114 (i.e., claims 1–4) have been held unpatentable, but others (i.e., claims 7–10 and 12) have not been held unpatentable. *See* IPR2016-01114, Paper 7, 3 n.1 (“Upon issuance of a Final Written Decision in [IPR2015-01501], the panel shall determine whether it is appropriate to maintain this proceeding against all or some of the claims, upon which review is instituted, or to terminate this proceeding and vacate this Decision on Institution.”).

# 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.