

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

KINGSTON TECHNOLOGY COMPANY, INC.
Petitioner

v.

SPEX TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
Patent Owner

Case IPR: IPR2018-01003
U.S. Patent No. 6,088,802

Date: May 2, 2018

PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF
U.S. PATENT NO. 6,088,802

Mail Stop **Patent Board**
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION AND RELIEF REQUESTED	1
II. GROUNDS FOR STANDING.....	1
III. PROPOSED GROUNDS OF UNPATENTABILITY	1
A. Statutory Grounds for Challenge	2
B. Prior Art Offered for the Present Unpatentability Challenges	2
IV. BACKGROUND	3
A. Description of the '802 Patent	3
B. Technological Background.....	4
V. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	4
VI. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	5
A. “defined interaction” (all Claims) and “interaction with a host computing device in a defined way” (Claims 38–39).....	5
B. “peripheral device” (all Claims)	6
C. “security means for enabling one or more security operations to be performed on data” (Claims 1–2, 6–7, 11–12, 23–25) and “means for performing the one or more security operations” (Claim 39).....	7
D. “target means for enabling a defined interaction with a host computing device” (Claims 1–2, 6–7, 11–12, 23–25)	8
E. “means for enabling communication between the security means and the target means” (Claims 1–2, 6–7, 11–12, 23–25).....	9
F. “means for enabling communication with a host computing device” (Claims 1–2, 6–7, 11–12, 23–25).....	9

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	<u>Page</u>
G. “means for operably connecting the security means and/or the target means to the host computing device in response to an instruction from the host computing device” (Claims 1–2, 6–7).....	10
H. “means for mediating communication of data between the host computing device and the target means so that the communicated data must first pass through the security means” (Claims 1–2, 11–12, 23).....	11
I. “means for providing to a host computing device, in response to a request from the host computing device for information regarding the type of the peripheral device, information regarding the function of the target means” (Claims 6–7, 23–25).....	11
J. “means for non-volatilely storing data” (Claims 2, 12, 25)	12
VII. THE PRIOR ART RENDERS OBVIOUS CLAIMS 1–2, 6–7, 11–12, 23–25, 38–39 OF THE ’802 PATENT.....	12
A. Cited Prior Art	13
1. Harari.....	13
2. PCMCIA System Architecture: 16-Bit PC Cards (1995).....	16
3. Wang	19
4. Dumas	21
B. Ground 1: Claims 1–2, 6–7, 11–12, 23–25, and 38–39 are Rendered Obvious by Harari in View of PCMCIA System Architecture	22
1. Motivation to Combine Harari and PCMCIA System Architecture.....	24
2. Independent Claim 1	25
3. Dependent Claim 2	42
4. Independent Claim 6	43
5. Dependent Claim 7	49
6. Independent Claim 11	50
7. Dependent Claim 12	50
8. Independent Claim 23	50

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	<u>Page</u>
9. Independent Claim 24	51
10. Dependent Claim 25	51
11. Independent Claim 38	51
12. Independent Claim 39	53
C. Ground 2: Claims 1–2, 11–12, 23, and 39 are Rendered Obvious by Harari in View of Wang	56
1. Motivation to Combine Harari, Wang, and PCMCIA System Architecture	56
2. Wang Discloses Means for Mediating Communication of Data Between the Host Computing Device and the Target Means So That the Communicated Data Must First Pass Through the Security Means (Elements [1F], [11E], [23E], [39C])	57
D. Grounds 3-4: Claims 1–2, 11–12, 23, and 39 are Rendered Obvious for the Same Reasons as Grounds 1-2 when Considered Further in View of Dumas.	61
1. Motivation to Combine Dumas with Harari, PCMCIA System Architecture, and Wang	62
2. Dumas Discloses Mediating Communication of Data Between the Host Computing Device and the Target Means So That the Communicated Data Must First Pass Through the Security Means (Elements [1F], [11E], [23E], and [39C])	63
VIII. MANDATORY NOTICES	64
IX. CONCLUSION.....	67

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Phillips v. AWH Corp.,
415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc)8

In Re Rambus Inc.,
694 F.3d 42 (Fed. Cir. 2012)8

Randall Mfg. v. Rea,
733 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2013) 15

SPEX Techs., Inc. v. Western Digital Corp.,
Case No. 8:16-cv-01799 (C.D. Cal.)67

Williamson v. Citrix Online, LLC,
792 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2015)8

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 102(b)3

35 U.S.C. § 102(e)2

35 U.S.C. § 103 15

35 U.S.C. § 311(c) 1

Regulations

37 C.F.R. § 42.6(e)..... 1

37 C.F.R. § 42.10(b)68

37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b)8

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.