

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 POLARIS INNOVATIONS LTD.'S  
PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO PETITION FOR  
*INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF UNITED STATES PATENT NO. 6,850,414  
PURSUANT TO 35 U.S.C. § 313, 37 C.F.R. § 42.107**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION .....	1
II.	THE '414 PATENT AND THE ASSERTED REFERENCES. ....	6
	A. The '414 Patent's Goal Is Reducing A Memory Module's Height. ....	6
	B. Simpson Is Directed Towards An Expandable, Flexible PCB With Fillable Sockets, Not Reducing The Height Of A PCB. ....	12
	C. The Intel Specification Is Not Directed Towards PCB Height Or Module Orientation. ....	15
III.	SIMPSON IN VIEW OF THE INTEL SPECIFICATION DOES NOT RENDER THE CLAIMS OBVIOUS. ....	18
	A. A Person Of Ordinary Skill In The Art Would Not Be Motivated To Combine Simpson With The Intel Specification In A Manner That Would Remedy Their Deficiencies. ....	20
	B. Simpson Does Not Render Claim 1 Obvious. ....	23
	1. <i>Simpson's Error Correction Chip Is Not "Identically Designed" With "Identically Designed" Housing Relative To The Memory Modules On The PCB.</i> ....	24
	2. <i>Simpson's Alleged Error Correction Chip Is Not "Connected" To The PCB As Claimed.</i> ....	31
	3. <i>The Petition, Incorrectly Relying On Error "Detection," Fails To Show That Simpson Discloses "One Of Said Semiconductor Memories Being Connected As An Error Correction Chip."</i> ....	32
	C. Eliminating Simpson's Second Row Of Sockets And Modules Is Not Obvious Because It Would Contravene Simpson's Goal (Claim 2). ....	34
	D. Eliminating Simpson's Second Row Of Sockets And Modules Is Not Obvious Because It Would Contravene Simpson's Goal (Claim 3). ....	37
	E. The Petition Fails To Show That Simpson In View Of The Intel Specification Renders Claim 4 Obvious Because It Does Not Show That A POSITA Would Be Able To Fit Two Rows Of Sockets In A PCB With A Height Of 1.0-1.2 Inches. ....	39
IV.	THE INTEL SPECIFICATION DOES NOT RENDER THE CLAIMS OBVIOUS. ....	43
	A. The Board Should Deny Ground 3 Under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d) Because The Intel Specification Is Synonymous With The Prior Art Described In The Patent And Overcome In Prosecution. ....	44

B.	Petitioner’s Intel Specification Arguments Are Founded On Hindsight Bias, And Do Not Articulate Why An Artisan Would Be Motivated To Modify The Reference. ....	49
C.	The Intel Specification Does Not Render Claim 1 Obvious. ....	52
D.	The Intel Specification Does Not Render Claim 2 Obvious. ....	55
E.	The Intel Specification Does Not Render Claim 3 Obvious. ....	55
V.	THE INTEL SPECIFICATION IN VIEW OF SIMPSON DOES NOT RENDER THE CLAIMS OBVIOUS.....	57
VI.	IF THE BOARD DETERMINES INSTITUTION IS APPROPRIATE, IT SHOULD INSTITUTE ONLY ON NON-REDUNDANT GROUNDS. ....	58
VII.	CONCLUSION.....	60

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>COURT DECISIONS</b>	
<i>Cadence Pharms., Inc. v. Exela PharmSci Inc.</i> , 780 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....	42
<i>Genzyme Corp. v. Transkaryotic Therapies, Inc.</i> , 346 F.3d 1094 (Fed. Cir. 2003) .....	42
<i>In re Dembiczak</i> , 175 F.3d 994 (Fed. Cir. 1999) .....	45
<i>In re Fine</i> , 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988) .....	45, 47
<i>Interconnect Planning Corp. v. Feil</i> , 774 F.2d 1132 (Fed. Cir. 1985) .....	45, 48
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (U.S. 2007) .....	18
 <b>ADMINISTRATIVE DECISIONS</b>	
<i>Apple Inc. v. Personalweb Technologies, LLC</i> , IPR2013-00596, Paper 9 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 26, 2014) (per Turner, APJ) .....	52
<i>Baxter Healthcare Corp. v. Millenium Biologix, LLC</i> , IPR2013-00590, Paper 9 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 21, 2014) (per Osinski, APJ) .....	52
<i>Canon Inc. v. Intellectual Ventures I, LLC</i> , IPR2014-00535 to -00537, Paper 9 (P.T.A.B. Sep. 24, 2014) (per Boucher, APJ) .....	52
<i>Globus Med. Inc. v. FlexuSpine, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-01721, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 24, 2016) (Saindon, APJ) .....	31

<i>Heart Failure Techs., LLC v. Cardiokinetix, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00183, Paper 12 (P.T.A.B. Jul. 31, 2013) (per Kamholz, APJ).....	19, 31, 43
<i>HTC Corp. v. E-Watch, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00987, Papers 6, 10 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 9, 2014) (per Clements, APJ) .....	53
<i>Intellectual Ventures Management, LLC v. Xilinx, Inc.</i> , IPR2012-00019, Paper 13 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 12, 2013) (per Arbes, APJ).....	52
<i>OpenTV, Inc. v. Cisco Systems, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00330, Paper 9 (P.T.A.B. Nov. 29, 2013) (per Arbes, APJ).....	19
<i>Safeway, Inc. v. Kroy IP Holdings, LLC</i> , IPR2014-00685, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. Sep. 11, 2014) (per Plenzler, APJ) .....	51
<i>Toyota Motor Corp. v. Am. Vehicular Scis. LLC</i> , IPR2013-00421, Paper 15 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 13, 2014) (per Kim, APJ) .....	53

**STATUTES**

35 U.S.C. § 325(d).....	4, 37, 43
-------------------------	-----------

**REGULATIONS**

37 C.F.R. § 42.1.....	51
-----------------------	----

# 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.