

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 IPR2017-00974
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

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. ALL FACTORS FAVOR DENIAL OF THIS QUINTESSENTIAL “SECOND BITE AT THE APPLE.”	5
A. Petitioner Previously Filed A First Petition Against The Same Claim Of The Same Patent (Third Factor).....	9
B. This Petition Was Delayed To Take Advantage Of The Preliminary Response And The Non-Institution Decision (Fifth And Seventh Factors).....	10
C. Petitioner Knew, Or Should Have Known, Of The Art Asserted (Fourth And Sixth Factors).	12
D. The Second Petition Relies On Substantially The Same Arguments Previously Presented To The Office (Eighth Factor).....	18
E. Permitting This Petition Would Waste Board Resources And Prevent A “Just, Speedy And Inexpensive Resolution” (First And Second Factors).	20
F. Petition’s Arguments Neglect To Discuss And Are Contrary To Board Policy And Law.....	22
III. THE SECOND PETITION FAILS FOR THE SAME REASONS AS THE FIRST PETITION.	27
A. As Before, Petitioner’s First Ground Fails To Explain How Simpson Could Meet Claim 4’s Height Requirements.	28
1. <i>Unlike The ’414 Patent, Simpson Is Not Concerned With PCB Height And Merely Coincidentally Discloses Only Parts Of The ’414 Patent’s Claim 4.</i>	33

2. *As In The First Petition, The Second Petition Fails To Show How Simpson Could Be Modified To Meet Claim 4's Height Limitations.* 37

B. Petitioner's Second Ground Fails Because The Petition Does Not Explain Why An Artisan Would Modify Bechtolsheim's All Horizontally Oriented Memory Chips.47

IV. CONCLUSION52

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
<i>Gardner v. TEC Sys.</i> , 725 F.2d 1338 (Fed. Cir. 1984)	47
<i>Harmonic Inc. v. Avid Tech., Inc.</i> , 815 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	6
<i>In re Chaganti</i> , 554 Fed. Appx. 917 (Fed. Cir. 2014) (nonprecedential)	51
<i>In re Dembiczak</i> , 175 F.3d 994 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	50
<i>In re Fine</i> , 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988)	51
<i>In re Rose</i> , 220 F.2d 459 (C.C.P.A. Mar. 22, 1955)	46
<i>In re Yount</i> , 171 F.2d 317 (C.C.P.A. Dec. 7, 1948).....	46
<i>Interconnect Planning Corp. v. Feil</i> , 774 F.2d 1132 (Fed. Cir. 1985)	51
ADMINISTRATIVE DECISIONS	
<i>Akamai Techs. v. Limelight Networks, Inc.</i> , IPR2017-000358, Paper 9 (PTAB May 2, 2017)	9, 12, 24, 25
<i>Alarm.com v. Vivint, Inc.</i> , IPR2016-01110, Paper 11 (PTAB Nov. 28, 2016).....	passim
<i>Conopco, Inc. v. Proctor & Gamble Co.</i> , IPR2014-00506, Paper 25 (PTAB Dec. 10, 2014)	12, 16, 42

<i>Kingston Technology Company, Inc. v. Polaris Innovations, Ltd.</i> , IPR2016-01622, Paper 16 (PTAB Apr. 6, 2017)	6, 39, 40
<i>Kingston Technology Company, Inc. v. Polaris Innovations, Ltd.</i> , IPR2016-01622, Paper 7 (PTAB Feb. 15, 2017).....	passim
<i>LG Electronics Inc. v. Core Wireless Licensing S.A.R.L.</i> , IPR2016- 00986, Paper 12 (PTAB Aug. 22, 2016).....	passim
<i>Medtronic, Inc. v. Barry</i> , IPR2015-00780, Paper 1 (PTAB Feb. 20, 2015).....	26
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. IpLearn-Focus LLC</i> , IPR2015-00095, Paper 33 (PTAB Apr. 11, 2016)	42
<i>NVIDIA Corp. v. Samsung Elec. Co.</i> , IPR2016-00134, Paper 9 (PTAB May 4, 2016)	8
<i>Samsung Elec. Co. v. Rembrandt Wireless Techs., LP</i> , IPR2015-00114, Paper 14 (PTAB Jan. 28, 2015)	21
<i>Toyota Motor Corp. v. Cellport Systems</i> , IPR2015-01423, Paper 7 (PTAB Oct. 28, 2015).....	10, 13, 16
<i>Unified Patents, Inc. v. PersonalWeb Techs., LLC</i> , IPR2014-00702, Paper 13 (PTAB July 24, 2014)	8
<i>Xactware v. Eagle View</i> , IPR2017-00025, Paper 9 (PTAB Apr. 13, 2017)	7, 9, 12, 25
<i>ZTE Corp. v. ContentGuard Holdings, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00454, Paper 12 (PTAB Sept. 25, 2013).....	23
STATUTES	
35 U.S.C. § 314(a)	passim
35 U.S.C. § 316(a)(11).....	7, 21
35 U.S.C. § 325(d)	7, 25, 27

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.