UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.,

Petitioner,

v.

LIMESTONE MEMORY SYSTEMS LLC,

Patent Owner.

Patent No. 6,233,181
Issue Date: May 15, 2001
Filed: Feb. 17, 1999
Inventor: Hideto Hidaka
Title: SEMICONDUCTOR MEMORY DEVICE WITH IMPROVED FLEXIBLE REDUNDANCY SCHEME

Inter Partes Review No. IPR2016-01561

PATENT OWNER'S 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

Page

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. SUMMARY OF THE '181 PATENT 4

A. The Inventions Disclosed in the '181 Patent 4

B. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art 9

C. Claim Interpretation 11

D. Claim 3 Requires More Than A Mere Shared Sense Amplifier Design 12

E. Claim 5 Requires Two Memory Arrays, And Control Circuitry For Driving Memory Blocks Into A Selected State 15

III. OVERVIEW OF THE CITED ART 16

A. Overview of Sukegawa 16

B. Overview of Fujishima 22

C. Overview of Walck 28

IV. THE PETITION FAILS TO ESTABLISH THAT CLAIMS 3 AND 5 ARE OBVIOUS 31

A. Legal Standard 34

B. The Petition Fails To Establish That Claim 3 Is Obvious Over Sukegawa In View Of Fujishima Because It Does Not Provide Adequate Support For Combining The Teachings Of Fujishima With Sukegawa 36

1. None Of The Alleged Motivations Asserted In The Petition Would Cause A Person Having Ordinary

Skill In The Art To Arrive At The Proposed Combination 38

a. Fujishima Does Not Suggest Any Reason For Adopting The Alternate Arrangement Type Shared Sense Amplifier Design—Particularly With Respect To The Claimed Redundancy Scheme 38

b. None of the remaining alleged motivations would cause a person having ordinary skill in the art to arrive at the proposed combination 40

2. Fujishima's Alternate Arrangement Shared Sense Amplifier Design Was Understood To Be Incompatible With The ANY TO ANY Redundancy Scheme 45

3. The Ancillary Art And Dr. Mazumder Himself Taught Away From Applying Inter-Block Word Line Redundancy Schemes 50

a. The Horiguchi IEEE Article Teaches Away From The Proposed Combination 51

b. The Arimoto IEEE Article Would Not Suggest The Proposed Combination 53

c. U.S. Patent No. 5,687,123 ("Hidaka") Would Not Suggest The Proposed Combination 55

d. U.S. Patent No. 5,726,946 ("Yamagata") Would Not Suggest The Proposed Combination 55

e. U.S. Patent No. 6,003,148 ("Yamauchi") Would Not Suggest The Proposed Combination 56

f. U.S. Patent No. 6,075,743 ("Barth") Would Not Suggest The Proposed Combination 57

g. U.S. Patent No. 5,956,285 ("Watanabe") Would Not Suggest The Proposed Combination 57

h. The 1997 Horiguchi IEEE Article Would Not Suggest The Proposed Combination 58

4. Sukegawa Teaches Away From The ANY TO ANY Redundancy Scheme, And Therefore Would Not Motivate A Person Having Ordinary Skill In The Art To Adopt An Inter-Block Redundancy Scheme 60

D. The Petition Fails To Establish That Claim 5 Is Obvious Over Sukegawa and Fujishima In View Of Walck Because The Proposed Combination Does Not Teach All Elements Of The Challenged Claim 62

1. Walck Does Not Disclose The Claimed Control Circuitry For Driving Memory Blocks Into A Selected State 63

2. The Teachings Of Sukegawa, Fujishima, And Walck Would Not Motivate A Person Having Ordinary Skill In The Art To Arrive At The Claimed Memory Device 65

V. CONCLUSION 65

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

Cases

Cisco Sys., Inc. v. C-Cation Techs., LLC,
Case IPR2014-00454 (PTAB Aug. 29, 2014) (Paper 12) 12
Comaper Corp. v. Antec, Inc.,
596 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2010) 43
Graham v. John Deere Co.,
383 U.S. 1 (1966) 34
In re NTP, Inc.,
654 F.3d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2011) 36, 37
InTouch Techs., Inc. v. VGo Comms., Inc.,
751 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2014) 36, 41, 43
KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.,
550 U.S. 398 (2007) 34, 36
Personal Web Techs., LLC v. Apple, Inc.,
848 F.3d 987 (Fed. Cir. 2017) 35, 40, 45
Power Integrations, Inc. v. Fairchild Semiconductor Int'l, Inc.,
711 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2013) 36, 62
Star Scientific, Inc. v. R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.,
655 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2011) 36
Std. Oil Co. v. Am. Cyanamid Co.,
774 F.2d 448 (Fed. Cir. 1985) 34, 35, 42
Vivid Techs. v. Am. Sci. & Eng'g, Inc.,
200 F.3d 795 (Fed. Cir. 1999) 11
Wowza Media Sys., LLC v. Adobe Sys. Inc.,
Case IPR2013-00054 (PTAB Jul. 13, 2013) (Paper 16) 41

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 103 ..... 34, 35
35 U.S.C. § 316 1

Regulations

37 C.F.R. § 42.100 11
37 C.F.R. § 42.6 12

DOCKET ALARM

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.