UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

NVIDIA CORPORATION,
Petitioner

v.

POLARIS INNOVATIONS LIMITED,
Patent Owner

Case No. IPR2017-00382
Patent No. 7,124,325

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES iv

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. BACKGROUND 2

A. Integrated Circuit Memory Technology 2

B. The '325 Patent 5

C. References Cited in the Petition 8

1. Tanaka 8

2. Ikehashi 10

3. Garrett, Hassoun, and Ishikawa 10

III. CLAIM INTERPRETATION 11

A. "Interface Device" 11

1. Claim language 14

2. '325 Patent specification 15

3. Technical dictionaries 17

4. References cited in the petition 18

5. Conclusion 18

B. "Trimming" 20

C. "DRAM" 20

D. "DDRII" 20

E. "Settable Control Element" 21

DOCKET ALARM

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

IV. TRIAL SHOULD NOT BE INSTITUTED ON CHALLENGE 1. 23

A. Challenge 1 Has No Likelihood of Prevailing With Respect to All Claims Because Tanaka and Ikehashi Fail to Disclose Trimming of "Interface Devices." 24

1. Tanaka fails to disclose trimming of an "interface device." 24

2. Ikehashi fails to disclose trimming of an "interface device." 28

B. Challenge 1 Has No Likelihood of Prevailing with Respect to All Claims Because Tanaka and Ikehashi Fail to Disclose a "Settable Control Element." 30

C. Challenge 1 is Fatally Flawed as an Obviousness Challenge. 31

D. Challenge 1 Has No Likelihood of Prevailing with Respect to Claim 11. 37

E. Challenge 1 Has No Likelihood of Prevailing with Respect to Claim 12. 39

F. Challenge 1 Has No Likelihood of Prevailing with Respect to Claim 13. 40

V. TRIAL SHOULD NOT BE INSTITUTED FOR CHALLENGE 2. 40

A. Challenge 2 Has No Likelihood of Prevailing with Respect to Claims 1 and 8-13 41

1. Garrett does not disclose a test apparatus. 41

2. The proposed combination of Garrett and Hassoun 44

a. The proposed combination of Garrett and Hassoun would not have been obvious to one skilled in the art. 45

b. The proposed combination of Garrett and Hassoun would not have resulted in claim 1. 50

DOCKET ALARM

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

B. Challenge 2 is Fatally Flawed as an Obviousness Challenge with Respect to at Least Claims 14, 16, and 17. 54

C. Challenge 2 Has No Likelihood of Prevailing with Respect to Claims 14, 16, and 17. 54

VI. TRIAL SHOULD NOT BE INSTITUTED FOR CHALLENGE 3. 57

A. Challenge 3 Has No Likelihood of Prevailing with Respect to Claim 4. 57

B. Challenge 3 Has No Likelihood of Prevailing with Respect to Claims 2–7, 15, and 18–20. 58

VII. CHALLENGES 2 AND 3 ARE REDUNDANT WITH CHALLENGE 1. 59

VIII. CONCLUSION 62

DOCKET ALARM

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Carl Zeiss GmbH. v. Nikon Corp.,
IPR2013-00363, Paper 17 (PTAB Jan. 30, 2014) 60

CR Bard, Inc. v. Medline Indus., Inc.,
IPR 2015-00511, Paper 9 (PTAB Jul. 15, 2015).....25, 38

Dell, Inc. v. Elecs. & Telecommn'cs Research Inst.,
IPR2014-00152, Paper 12 (PTAB May 16, 2014).....26, 29, 38, 44

Edwards Lifesciences LLC v. Cook Inc.,
582 F.3d 1322 (Fed. Cir. 2009) 19, 22

In re Fine,
837 F.3d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988) 57

Gemalto S.A. v. HTC Corp.,
754 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2014) 19, 23

GPNE Corp. v. Apple Inc.,
No. 2015-1825 (Fed. Cir. Aug. 1, 2016) 20

Harmonic Inc. v. Avid Tech., Inc.,
815 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2016) 61

Honeywell Int'l, Inc. v. ITT Indus., Inc.,
452 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2007) 19, 22

Intelligent Bio-Systems, Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd.,
821 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016) 34

Lam Research Corp. v. Flamm,
IPR2016-00466, Paper 7 (PTAB July 19, 2016).....26, 29, 38, 44

Liberty Mut. Ins. Co. v. Progressive Cas. Ins. Co.,
CBM2012-00003, Paper 7 (PTAB Oct. 25, 2012).....60, 61, 62

Monsanto Co. v. Pioneer Hi-Bred Int'l, Inc.,
IPR2013-00023, Paper 32 (PTAB Apr. 11, 2013) 25, 29, 38, 44

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKET ALARM

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.