

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

KINGSTON TECHNOLOGY COMPANY, INC.,

Petitioner

v.

POLARIS INNOVATIONS LTD.,

Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2016-01622  
Patent 6,850,414 B2

---

**PATENT OWNER'S  
REQUEST FOR REHEARING PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d)(2)  
OF JUNE 11, 2018 ORDER  
INSTITUTING REVIEW OF CHALLENGED CLAIM 4  
AND ORDERING THAT CLAIM 4 IS UNPATENTABLE**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b>Page</b>
<b>I. THE BOARD SHOULD HAVE FOUND THAT PETITIONER WAIVED ITS SAS ARGUMENT IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE DIRECTOR’S POSITION ON WAIVER OF SAS ARGUMENTS. ....</b>	<b>1</b>
A. The Procedural History Of The June 11 Order .....	2
B. The Board Erred In Ruling On The SAS Waiver Issue Without Considering The Director’s Position On The SAS Waiver Issue. ....	3
C. Under The Director’s Own Position On When Petitioners’ SAS Challenges Are Waived, Petitioner’s SAS Challenge Was Waived.....	7
D. The Board Should Explain Its Answer To The Waiver Question. ....	11
<b>II. THE BOARD SHOULD HAVE GRANTED PATENT OWNER’S UNOPPOSED REQUEST TO RESPOND TO A TRIAL ON CLAIM 4.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>III. THERE IS GOOD CAUSE TO ADD EXHIBITS TO THE RECORD.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>IV. CONCLUSION AND RELIEF REQUESTED.....</b>	<b>15</b>

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>CASES</b>	
<i>Abbott Labs. v. United States</i> , 573 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	5
<i>Cooper Techs. Co. v. Dudas</i> , 536 F.3d 1330 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	5
<i>Ethicon Endo-Surgery, Inc. v. Covidien LP</i> , 812 F.3d 1023, 1028, <i>reh’g en banc denied</i> , 826 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2016), <i>cert. denied</i> , 137 S. Ct. 625 (2017).....	7
<i>Freytag v. C.I.R.</i> , 501 U.S. 868 (1991).....	9
<i>Hernandez v. Air Force</i> , 498 F.3d 1328 (Fed. Cir. 2007) .....	4
<i>In re Alappat</i> , 33 F.3d 1526 (Fed. Cir. 1994) (en banc).....	5
<i>In re DBC</i> , 545 F.3d 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	9
<i>Motor Vehicle Mfrs. Ass’n v. State Farm Mut. Ins. Co.</i> , 463 U.S. 29 (1983) .....	12
<i>PersonalWeb Techs., LLC v. Apple, Inc.</i> , 848 F.3d 987 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	12
<i>PGS Geophysical AS v. Director</i> , 891 F.3d 1354, 2018 WL 2727663, 2018 U.S. App. LEXIS 15418 (Fed. Cir. 2018). .....	2, 3, 4, 7
<i>PGS Geophysical AS v. Iancu</i> , No. 16-2470 (Fed. Cir. May 4, 2018) (per curiam) (nonprecedential), <i>later proceeding</i> , 801 F.3d 1354 (Fed. Cir. 2018) .....	6
<i>SAS Institute, Inc. v. Iancu</i> , 584 U.S. ____, 138 S. Ct. 1348 (2018).....	1, 2, 3, 10, 11, 15
<i>Service v. Dulles</i> , 354 U.S. 363 (1957).....	4
<i>Splane v. West</i> , 216 F.3d 1058 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	5
<i>Synopsys, Inc. v. Mentor Graphics Corp.</i> , 814 F.3d 1309 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	14
<i>United States v. L.A. Tucker Truck Lines, Inc.</i> , 344 U.S. 33 (1952) .....	9

*United States v. Olano*, 507 U.S. 725 (1993) .....9

*Woodford v. Ngo*, 548 U.S. 81 (2006) .....9

## **STATUTES**

35 U.S.C. § 2(b)(2)(A) .....5

35 U.S.C. § 3(a) .....4

35 U.S.C. § 316(a)(4).....5

35 U.S.C. § 316(a)(8).....12

5 U.S.C. § 557(c)(3)(A) .....12

## **REGULATIONS AND RULEMAKING**

37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d)(2).....11

37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d) .....1

37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d)(2).....1

Patent Trial and Appeal Board S.O.P. #2 (rev. 9) § VI-B .....13

Trial Practice Guide, 77 FR 48,756 (Aug. 14, 2012) .....15

## **OTHER AUTHORITIES**

Joint Comments Of Appellant And Intervenor Iancu Regarding Effect  
Of *SAS Institute v. Iancu* On Disposition Of Appeal, PGS  
Geophysical AS v. Iancu, 891 F.3d 1354 (Fed. Cir. 2018) (No. 16-2470) .....6

Response For Intervenor—Director of USPTO, *Polaris Indus. Inc. v.  
Arctic Cat, Inc.*, 2018 U.S. App. LEXIS 15443 (Fed. Cir. 2018)  
(No. 16-2470) (nonprecedential) .....7

Supp. Br. For Intervenor—Director of USPTO, *PGS Geophysical AS v.  
Iancu*, 891 F.3d 1354 (Fed. Cir. 2018) (No. 16-2470) .....6

## EXHIBIT LIST

Exhibit 2001	Cara Garretson. "More DRAM vendors involved in Justice Department probe." IDG News Service July 21, 2002. Computer World, Inc. November 21, 2016
Exhibit 2002	"Error Correction Code in SoC FPGA-Based Memory Systems." <i>Altera Corporation</i> April 2012.
Exhibit 2003	"133 MHz PC SDRAM 64-Bit Non-ECC/Parity 144 Pin UNBUFFERED SO-DIMM SPECIFICATION." <i>Intel</i> , Revision 1.0C. August 2000
Exhibit 2004	"PC SDRAM Serial Presence Detect (SPD) Specification." <i>Intel</i> , Revision 1.2B. November 1999.
Exhibit 2005	Declaration of Nathan Nobu Lowenstein in support of Motion for Admission <i>Pro Hac Vice</i>
Exhibit 2006	Institution Decision, <i>Amerigen Pharms. Ltd. v. Shire LLC</i> , IPR2015-02009, Paper 8 (PTAB Apr. 18, 2016)
Exhibit 2007	Patent Owner's Motion To Amend, <i>Amerigen Pharms. Ltd. v. Shire LLC</i> , IPR2015-02009, Paper 14 (PTAB Jul. 18, 2016)
Exhibit 2008	Petitioner's Opposition To Motion To Amend, <i>Amerigen Pharms. v. Shire LLC</i> , IPR2015-02009, Paper 17 (PTAB Oct. 18, 2016)
Exhibit 2009	Reply To Petitioner's Opposition, <i>Amerigen Pharms. Ltd. v. Shire LLC</i> , IPR2015-02009, Paper 21 (PTAB Nov. 17, 2016)
Exhibit 2010	Petitioner's Request For Oral Argument, <i>Amerigen Pharms. Ltd. v. Shire LLC</i> , IPR2015-02009, Paper 27 (PTAB Dec. 9, 2017)
Exhibit 2011	Final Written Decision, <i>Amerigen Pharms. Ltd. v. Shire LLC</i> , IPR2015-02009, Paper 38 (PTAB Mar. 31, 2017)
Exhibit 2012	Deposition Transcript Of Vivek Subramanian (Apr. 19, 2017)
Exhibit 2013	Exh. 1 To Deposition Transcript Of Subramanian (Apr. 19, 2017)
Exhibit 2014	Transcript of October 5, 2017 Conference Call
Exhibit 2015	[expunged]
<b>Exhibit 2016</b> [NEW]	Joint Comments Of Appellant PGS Geophysical And Intervenor Andrei Iancu Regarding Effect Of <i>SAS Institute v. Iancu</i> On Disposition Of Appeal, <i>PGS Geophysical AS v. Iancu</i> , 891 F.3d 1354 (Fed. Cir. 2018) (No. 16-2470)
<b>Exhibit 2017</b> [NEW]	<i>PGS Geophysical AS v. Iancu</i> , No. 16-2470 (Fed. Cir. May 4, 2018) (nonprecedential order) (per curiam)

# 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.