

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

Intel Corporation  
Petitioner

v.

Qualcomm Incorporated  
Patent Owner

---

IPR2018-01153  
U.S. Patent No. 8,698,558

---

**PETITIONER'S REPLY**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Claim Construction.....	3
A.	PO’s Proposed Construction Is Wrong .....	3
1.	PO’s Proposed Construction Contradicts The Plain Claim Language .....	3
2.	PO’s Proposed Construction Would Exclude Disclosed Embodiments .....	6
3.	PO’s Remaining Arguments Have No Merit.....	8
III.	Grounds.....	9
A.	The Petition Demonstrates Motivation to Combine Chu with Choi 2010 .....	10
1.	Motivation Comes From The References Themselves.....	10
2.	Petition Explains How To Modify Chu In View Of Choi 2010.....	16
B.	PO Is Wrong That Petition Fails To Demonstrate a Motivation to Combine Chu and Choi 2010 with Myers .....	17
1.	PO Is Wrong That Choi 2010 Teaches Away From “Selective Boost” .....	17
2.	A POSA Would Have Modified Chu and Choi 2010 To Apply Myers’ Power Selection Functionality .....	20
C.	Claim 3 Is Unpatentable .....	24

## I. INTRODUCTION

Patent Owner's Response ("POR") confirms that the challenged claims of the '558 patent are invalid. Indeed, the POR does not challenge Petitioner's mapping of the limitations to the cited references. Instead, the Patent Owner ("PO") tries to avoid the prior art by advancing an improper claim construction, and by wrongly suggesting that the prior art references would not have been combined.

*First*, PO seeks to re-write the elements of its claims in the guise of claim construction. But its proffered construction contradicts the surrounding claim language, would exclude disclosed embodiments, and is inconsistent with the specification's teaching – as PO's own expert, Dr. Arthur Kelley, admitted in deposition. *See* Ex. 1128 [Kelley Transcript], 35:15-36:1; 37:5-16; 37:20-38:11; 133:4-135:9; *EPOS Techs. Ltd. v. Pegasus Techs. Ltd.*, 766 F.3d 1338, 1347 (Fed. Cir. 2014) (rejecting construction that reads out embodiments); *Dow Chem. Co. v. Sumitomo Chem. Co.*, 257 F.3d 1364, 1378 (same).

*Second*, PO's critique that the motivation to combine Chu with Choi 2010 does not appear "within the references themselves" (POR, 30) is wrong both legally and factually. On the law, there is no requirement that motive must be found within the four corners of the references being combined. This has been clear since *KSR* rejected such "[r]igid preventative rules that deny factfinders

recourse to common sense,” holding them “neither necessary under our case law nor consistent with it.” *KSR Intl. Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, 550 U.S. 398, 421 (2007). Consistent with *KSR*, the Petition demonstrated the common knowledge of a person of ordinary skill in the art (“POSA”) using secondary references that show how the advantages of modifying a system like Chu to include a boost converter like Choi 2010 were very well-known. PO’s argument is also factually incorrect. As the Petition demonstrated (Petition, 67-71), motivation to modify Chu comes directly from Choi 2010’s express teaching of the advantages of adding a boost converter to a system like Chu’s – advantages to which PO’s expert admitted in deposition. *See* Ex. 1128, 105:20-106:4; 155:7-156:6.

**Third**, PO’s suggestion that, contrary to the Board’s institution decision (Decision (“DI”), 22-24), a POSA would lack motivation to combine Chu and Choi 2010 with Myers ignores Myers’ express teaching on the benefits of implementing so-called “selective boost” in power management circuits. Teaching that Dr. Kelley conceded at deposition. (Ex. 1128, 100:6-9; 101:6-13; 152:21-153:4; 264:21-265:12; 281:6-282:2.)

For these reasons, as set forth more fully below, PO’s arguments should be rejected and the challenged claims found unpatentable.

## II. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION

### A. PO's Proposed Construction Is Wrong

PO contends that the term “[a PMOS] transistor [having]...a source that receives the boosted supply voltage or the first supply voltage” should be construed such that “the PMOS transistor must be able to receive, selectively, either the boosted supply voltage or the first supply voltage (referred to herein as a “selective boost”).” (POR, 9.) According to PO, a PMOS transistor that received only the first voltage or only the boosted voltage would not meet this limitation. This proposed construction is far from the broadest reasonable construction of “or,” is contrary to the plain meaning, and would exclude disclosed embodiments. It should be rejected.

#### 1. PO's Proposed Construction Contradicts The Plain Claim Language

Claim 6 recites “a P-channel metal oxide semiconductor (PMOS) transistor [having]...a source receiving the boosted supply voltage or the first supply voltage.” Ex. 1101, 11:41-62. As Dr. Kelley conceded, the term “or” is a conjunction that identifies two alternatives: this “or” that. (Ex. 1128, 130:10-18 (“Q. I’m asking at the Schoolhouse Rock level, or is a conjunction that joins two alternatives, correct? A. Well, if we’re going to import Schoolhouse Rock into the deposition, in that context, yes, it is.”).) Under its plain English meaning, the requirement for an amplifier that operates based on “the first supply voltage *or* the

# 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.