

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 IPR2016-01623  
Patent 7,315,454

---

**PATENT OWNER POLARIS INNOVATIONS LTD.'S  
RESPONSE TO PETITION FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW  
OF UNITED STATES PATENT NO. 7,315,454  
PURSUANT TO 35 U.S.C. §311 AND 37 C.F.R. §42.107**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b>Pages</b>
<b>I. INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>II. THE '454 PATENT CONFIRMS THAT CHIP PLACEMENT IS NOT A "TILE FITTING PROBLEM." .....</b>	<b>4</b>
A. The '454 Patent's "Crystallized Objective" Includes Keeping Conductor Track Lengths Identical And/Or As Short As Possible. ....	5
B. DiGiacomo Makes Clear That Chip Placement Is Not A "Tile Fitting Problem." .....	7
<b>III. GROUND 1: KIEHL ALONE DOES NOT RENDER ANY OF CLAIMS 1-3, 5 OR 7 OBVIOUS.....</b>	<b>10</b>
A. Kiehl Does Not Render Obvious The Key Limitation That Chips In A Row Be Arranged In An "Alternating Sequence Of Opposite Orientations." .....	11
1. Modifying Kiehl Would Involve Entirely Rebuilding Kiehl's Module Including Moving Nearly Every Component On The Board And Rewiring The Entire Module. ....	13
2. Petitioner Has Not Shown A POSITA Would Be Motivated To Modify Kiehl. ....	18
3. Kiehl Teaches Away From Any Modification. ....	20
4. Petitioner's "Rearrangement" And "Design Choice" Theories Fail Because Petitioner Fails To Prove That Its Radical Revamping Of Kiehl Would Not Affect "The Operation Of The Device." .....	25
5. "Common Sense" Cannot Substitute This Key Limitation. ....	28

B.	Kiehl’s Chips Are Not “Aligned In The Second Lateral Direction.” .....	30
1.	Petitioner Cannot Rely On The Layout Of A Module That It Just Dismantled. ....	30
2.	Claim Construction: “Aligned In The Second Lateral Direction” Should Be Interpreted To Mean “Lying One Above Another.” .....	32
3.	Petitioner’s Ground Under Kiehl Alone Should Be Rejected Because Kiehl’s Chips Are Not “Aligned” .....	36
<b>IV.</b>	<b>GROUND 2: KIEHL IN COMBINATION WITH BRIDGE DOES NOT RENDER THE PATENT OBVIOUS. ....</b>	<b>37</b>
A.	Bridge Is Not Analogous Art. ....	38
B.	Petitioner Fails To Show Why An Artisan Would Combine Bridge With Kiehl “In The Normal Course Of Research And Development.” .....	46
C.	Even If Bridge Were Combined With Kiehl, Petitioner Has Not Explained Why A POSITA Would Utilize The Pinwheel Design. ....	50
<b>V.</b>	<b>GROUND 3: KIEHL IN VIEW OF BRIDGE AND BHAKTA DOES NOT RENDER CLAIMS 4 AND 7 OBVIOUS. ....</b>	<b>52</b>
A.	An Artisan Would Not Combine Kiehl Or Bridge With Bhakta. ....	53
B.	Bhakta Fails To Disclose The Claimed Rows Of Chips “Connected In A Series” (Claim 4).....	59
C.	Petitioner Has Failed To Prove That Claim 7 Is Obvious Over Kiehl And/Or Bhakta. ....	64
<b>VI.</b>	<b>SECONDARY INDICIA OF NONOBVIOUSNESS. ....</b>	<b>68</b>
<b>VII.</b>	<b>CONCLUSION.....</b>	<b>71</b>

**Table of Authorities**

	<b>Pages</b>
<b>CASES</b>	
<i>Apple Inc. v. ITC</i> , 725 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	68
<i>Arendi S.A.R.L. v. Apple Inc.</i> , 832 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	29
<i>Belden Inc. v. Berk-Tek LLC</i> , 805 F.3d 1064 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	18
<i>Circuit Check, Inc. v. QXQ Inc.</i> , 795 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	38, 39, 46
<i>In re Clay</i> , 966 F.2d 656 (Fed. Cir. 1992).....	40, 45
<i>In re ICON Health &amp; Fitness</i> , 496 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	45
<i>In re Japikse</i> , 181 F.2d 1019 (CCPA 1950) .....	26
<i>In re Klein</i> , 647 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	39
<i>In re Kuhle</i> , 526 F. 2d 553 (CCPA 1975) .....	26
<i>In re Natural Alternatives, LLC</i> , 659 Fed. Appx. 608 (Fed. Cir. 2016) (nonprecedential).....	69
<i>In re Paulsen</i> , 30 F.3d 1475 (Fed. Cir. 1994).....	45

<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	46
<i>K-Tec, Inc. v. Vita-Mix Corp.</i> , 696 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	38
<i>Leo Pharm. Prods. v. Rea</i> , 726 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	68
<i>Mintz v. Dietz &amp; Watson, Inc.</i> , 679 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	68
<i>Panduit Corp. v. Dennison Mfg. Co.</i> , 810 F.2d 1561 (Fed. Cir. 1987).....	9
<i>Rolls Royce PLC v. United Techs Corp.</i> , 603 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	14
<i>Unigene Labs., Inc. v. Apotex, Inc.</i> , 655 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	46
<b>ADMINISTRATIVE DECISIONS</b>	
<i>Asetek Danmark A/S v. Coolit Systems, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-01276, Paper 17 (PTAB Dec. 8, 2016) .....	26
<i>Intri-Plex Techs., Inc. v. Saint-Gobain Performance Plastics Rencol Ltd.</i> , IPR2014-00309, Paper 83 (PTAB Mar. 23, 2015) .....	69
<i>Omron Oilfield &amp; Marine, Inc. v. MD/Totco</i> , IPR2013-00265, Paper 11 (PTAB Oct. 31, 2013) .....	69
<i>Parrot SA v. Drone Techs.</i> , IPR2014-00732, Paper 29 (PTAB Oct. 20, 2015).....	38
<i>Phigenix, Inc. v. Immunogen, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00676, Paper 39 (PTAB Oct. 27, 2015) .....	69

# 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.