

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,

Petitioner,

v.

SAINT REGIS MOHAWK TRIBE,

Patent Owner.

IPR2018-01605

**PATENT OWNER SAINT REGIS MOHAWK TRIBE'S PRELIMINARY
RESPONSE TO PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF U.S.
PATENT 7,620,800**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. PERTINENT FACTS 3

A. SRC Computers creates the first high performance reconfigurable computer. 3

B. Related Proceedings...... 4

III. THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION UNDER § 314(a). 5

A. The Board should deny institution because SRC is a sole-source supplier for the U.S. Army’s TRACER Program...... 7

B. The Board should deny institution because there are two district court cases involving the same patent and overlapping prior art. 10

C. The Board should deny institution because of the Tribe’s status as a sovereign...... 12

IV. TECHNOLOGY BACKGROUND..... 13

A. Conventional Computer Architecture...... 13

B. Field Programmable Gate Arrays. 14

C. Reconfigurable Computing...... 15

D. The ’800 patent: SRC invents methods for enhancing parallelism and performance in reconfigurable computing systems...... 16

V. PATENT OWNER’S CLAIM CONSTRUCTIONS 18

A. The Board should apply the *Phillips* standard...... 18

B. Terms to be construed...... 19

1. “functional unit” 19

2. “computational loop” 21

3. “form” 23

4. “data driven”.....	25
5. “transforming an algorithm into a data driven calculation that is implemented by said reconfigurable computing system at the at least one reconfigurable processor”	25
6. “pass computed data seamlessly between said computational loops”	27
7. “stream communication”.....	29
VI. MICROSOFT FAILED TO DEMONSTRATE A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF PREVAILING AS TO ANY CHALLENGED CLAIM	31
A. Microsoft has failed to demonstrate that Splash2 anticipates or renders claim 1 obvious because Splash2 does not teach the instantiation of any “computational loops” as required by claim 1.	31
B. Microsoft has failed to show that claim 1 is obvious under Splash2 in view of Gaudiot for the same reasons.	38
C. Microsoft has failed to show that claims 8 and 9 are obvious under Splash2 in view of RaPiD, with or without Gaudiot.....	38
D. Microsoft has failed to show that claim 20 is obvious over Splash2 in view of Jeong, with or without Gaudiot.....	42
VII. CONCLUSION	44
VIII. LIST OF EXHIBITS	46

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES:

<i>Altiris, Inc. v. Symantec Corp.</i> , 318 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	21
<i>Cuozzo Speed Techs. v. Lee</i> , 136 S. Ct. 2131.....	6
<i>Michigan v. Bay Mills Indian Cmty.</i> , 134 S. Ct. 2024 (2014).....	13
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	21, 22
<i>Saint Regis Mohawk Tribe v. Mylan Pharm. Inc.</i> , 896 F.3d 1322 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	13
<i>Seachange Intern’l, Inc. v. C-COR, Inc.</i> , 413 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	26

ADMINISTRATIVE ORDERS:

<i>Apple Inc. v. Uniloc Luxembourg, S.A.</i> , IPR2017-02202, slip op. at 9-10 (PTAB Dec. 13, 2018).....	37
<i>Butamax Advanced Biofuels LLC v. Gevo, Inc.</i> , Case IPR2014-00581, slip op. at 12–13 (PTAB Oct. 14, 2014)	12
<i>General Plastic Indus. Co., Ltd. v. Canon Kabushiki Kaisha</i> , Case IPR2016–01357, Paper 19 at 9-10 (PTAB Sept. 6, 2017)	6, 7, 11
<i>Infobionic, Inc. v. Braemer Manufacturing, LLC</i> , IPR2015-01704, slip op. at 14-15 (PTAB Feb. 16, 2016).....	37
<i>Kinetic Techs. v. Skyworks Solutions, Inc.</i> , No. IPR2014-00529, slip op. at 15-16 (PTAB Sept. 23, 2014).....	37
<i>Masabi Ltd. v. Bytemark, Inc.</i> , IPR2017-01449, slip op. at 43-44 (PTAB Dec. 3, 2018).....	37

<i>Mylan Pharms., Inc. v. Bayer Intellectual Property GMBH</i> , Case IPR2018-01143, slip op. at 12-14 (PTAB Dec. 3, 2018)	11
<i>NHK Spring Co., Ltd v. Intri-Plex Techs., Inc.</i> , Case IPR2018-00752, slip op. at 19-20 (PTAB Sept. 12, 2018).....	11
<i>TRW Automotive US LLC v. Magna Elecs., Inc.</i> , No. IPR2014-00258, slip op. at 10-11 (PTAB Aug. 27, 2014).....	37

STATUTES:

35 U.S.C. § 312	31
35 U.S.C. § 314	6, 9, 11, 44
35 U.S.C. § 316	7

REGULATIONS:

37 C.F.R. § 42.104	31, 40, 43
37 C.F.R. § 42.22	31
37 C.F.R. § 42.24	50
37 C.F.R. § 42.25	49
37 C.F.R. § 42.6	49
37 C.F.R. § 42.65	40

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.