

**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 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. RELATED MATTERS.....	2
III. THE BOARD SHOULD EXERCISE ITS DISCRETION TO DENY THE PETITION BECAUSE IT IS REDUNDANT TO THE PRIOR MTI PETITION.....	5
IV. SUMMARY OF THE ‘181 PATENT .....	11
A. The Inventions Disclosed in the ‘181 Patent.....	11
B. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art .....	17
C. Claim Interpretation .....	18
V. THE PETITION FAILS TO ESTABLISH A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT APPLE WILL PREVAIL ON EITHER GROUND.....	19
A. Legal Standard.....	20
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.....	22
1. Sukegawa Does Not Disclose Sense Amplifier Bands Located Between Memory Blocks, And Sukegawa Does Not Contemplate Alternative Configurations In Which Sense Amplifier Bands Could Be Located Between Memory Blocks.....	23
2. Fujishima Does Not Teach Any Method For Implementing Redundant Memory Cells.....	26
3. Fujishima Teaches A Complicated Shared Sense Amplifier Scheme Incompatible With Sukegawa’s “Any To Any” Wordline Redundancy .....	27

4. Ancillary References Cited By The Petition Teach Away From The Proposed Combination.....	28
C. Alleged Motivations to Combine Sukegawa With Fujishima, As Asserted In The Petition, Are Facially Deficient .....	35
D. The Petition Fails To Establish That Claim 5 Is Obvious Over Sukegawa and Fujishima In View Of Walck Because The Combination of Walck, Fujishima, And Sukegawa Does Not Teach All Elements Of The Challenged Claim .....	44
VI. CONCLUSION.....	44

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page</u>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Cisco Sys., Inc. v. C-Cation Techs., LLC</i> , Case IPR2014-00454 (PTAB Aug. 29, 2014) (Paper 12) .....	19
<i>Comaper Corp. v. Antec, Inc.</i> , 596 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2010) .....	40
<i>Conopco, Inc. v. Procter &amp; Gamble Co.</i> , Case IPR2014-00506 (PTAB Dec. 10, 2014) (Paper 25) .....	7, 9
<i>Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee</i> , 136 S.Ct. 2131 (2016) .....	11, 18
<i>Google, Inc. v. SimpleAir, Inc.</i> , Case CBM2014-00170 (PTAB Jan. 22, 2015) (Paper 13) .....	7, 10
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966) .....	20
<i>In re NTP, Inc.</i> , 654 F.3d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....	21, 36, 44
<i>Intelligent Bio-Systems, Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd.</i> , Case IPR2013-00324 (PTAB Nov. 21, 2013) (Paper 19) .....	5
<i>InTouch Techs., Inc. v. VGo Comms., Inc.</i> , 751 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2014) .....	passim
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007) .....	20, 22
<i>Medtronic, Inc. v. Robert Bosch Healthcare Sys.</i> , 839 F.3d 1382, 2016 U.S. App. LEXIS 18855 (Fed. Cir. Oct. 20, 2016) .....	11
<i>Power Integrations, Inc. v. Fairchild Semiconductor Int'l, Inc.</i> , 711 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....	22, 43
<i>Schrader-Bridgeport Int'l v. Wasica Fin. Gmbh</i> , Case IPR2015-00272 (PTAB Jun. 1, 2015) (Paper 17) .....	6
<i>Star Scientific, Inc. v. R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.</i> , 655 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....	21
<i>Std. Oil Co. v. Am. Cyanamid Co.</i> , 774 F.2d 448 (Fed. Cir. 1985) .....	20, 21, 38
<i>Travelocity.com L.P. et al. v. Cronos Techs., LLC</i> , Case CBM2014-00082 (PTAB Oct. 16, 2014) (Paper 12) .....	20
<i>UBE Maxwell Co., Ltd. v. Celgard, LLC</i> , Case IPR2015-01511 (PTAB Jan. 7, 2016) (Paper 10) .....	6, 7, 10

*Unilever, Inc. v. Procter & Gamble Co.*,  
Case IPR2014-00506 (PTAB July 7, 2014) (Paper 17) .....6, 9

*Vivid Techs. v. Am. Sci. & Eng’g, Inc.*,  
200 F.3d 795 (Fed. Cir. 1999) .....18

*Wowza Media Sys., LLC v. Adobe Sys. Inc.*,  
Case IPR2013-00054 (PTAB Jul. 13, 2013) (Paper 16) .....38

*ZTE Corp. v. ContentGuard Holdings Inc.*,  
Case IPR2013-00454 (PTAB Sep. 25, 2013) (Paper 12).....7

**Statutes**

35 U.S.C. § 103 ..... 20, 21

35 U.S.C. § 313 .....1

35 U.S.C. § 315 .....3

35 U.S.C. § 325 .....5, 7

**Regulations**

37 C.F.R. § 42.100 .....18

37 C.F.R. § 42.107 .....1

37 C.F.R. § 42.108 ..... 2, 20, 44

37 C.F.R. § 42.6 .....19

**Other Authorities**

H.R. Rep. No. 112-98, pt. 1, at 48 (2011).....5

Office Trial Practice Guide,  
77 Fed. Reg. 48,756 (Aug. 14, 2012) .....18

# 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.