

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,

Petitioner,

v.

DIRECTSTREAM, LLC,

Patent Owner.

Cases IPR2018-01605, IPR2018-01606, IPR2018-01607
Patent 7,620,800 B2

**PATENT OWNER DIRECTSTREAM, LLC'S RESPONSE
UNDER 37 CFR §42.120**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. TECHNICAL BACKGROUND OF THE '800 PATENT 3

 A. Need for Cost-Effective HPC 4

 B. Direct Streams's HPC Advancements 9

 1. Architectural Innovations 10

 2. Invention of MAP Technology 11

 3. DirectStream's Continued Improvement 12

 4. DirectStream's Continued Success 14

 C. The '800 Patent: SRC Invents Methods for Enhancing Parallelism
 and Performance in Reconfigurable Computing Systems. 16

III. PETITIONER'S EXPERT TESTIMONY IS CONCLUSORY AND IS
NOT RELIABLE TO EXPLAIN THE TEACHINGS OF THE PRIOR
ART OR SUPPORT A FINDING OF OBVIOUSNESS 18

 A. Dr. Stone Fails to Understand the Teachings of the Patent and the
 Prior Art 18

 B. Dr. Stone's Opinions are Grounded in Hindsight Bias 19

 C. Dr. Stone Fails to Provide Facts and Data to Support His Opinions 22

IV. PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART 29

V. DIRECTSTREAM'S CLAIM CONSTRUCTIONS 30

 A. "seamless" vs. "systolic" and "data driven" 34

 1. "pass computed data seamlessly between said computational
 loops" 35

 2. Systolic and Data Driven 43

 B. "stream communication" 45

1. Petitioner’s Construction is Deeply Flawed and Illogical Under BRI.....	45
2. DirectStream’s Construction is Reasonable and Consistent with the Plain and Ordinary Meaning.....	47
C. “computational loop” ... [wherein only functional units needed to solve the calculation are instantiated]	65
VI. THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE PATENTABLE OVER THE PRIOR ART.....	69
A. Petitioner’s Burden of Proof to Invalidate the Patent.....	69
1. Anticipation.....	69
2. Obviousness.....	71
B. The Challenged Claims are Patentable over Splash2.	73
1. The Prior Art Does Not Disclose Stream Communication.....	73
a) Splash2 Does Not Disclose Stream Communication.....	73
b) Based on its Petition, Petitioner Cannot Now Argue Splash2 Discloses Stream Communication, as Properly Construed.....	74
c) Petitioner’s Other Prior Art Do Not Disclose Stream.	75
2. The Prior Art Does Not Disclose Two Computational Loops.....	76
a) Splash2 Does Not Disclose Two Computational Loops.	76
b) Splash2 Also Does Not Disclose Forming the Two Computational Loops in the FPGAs.....	83
c) Petitioner’s Other Prior Art Do Not Disclose Two Computational Loops.	85

3. The Prior Art Does Not Unambiguously Disclose Seamlessly Passing Computed Data Between Computational Loops.....	91
a) Splash2 Does Not Unambiguously Disclose Seamlessly Passing Computed Data Between Computational Loops.	91
b) Using Petitioner’s Own Construction, Splash2 Would Still Fail to Invalidate the ’800 Patent.....	95
c) RaPiD Confirms the Prior Art Teaches Using Memory Between Processing Elements to Store Results.....	100
d) Roccatano also Cannot Disclose “Seamless” Because it Requires Multiple Processors.	101
e) Petitioner’s Other Prior Art Just as Ambiguous as Splash2.....	102
C. Claims are not rendered obvious by Combining Prior Art.....	104
1. Prior Art Combinations Still Missing Claim Elements.....	105
2. A POSITA Would Not Have Been Motivated to Combine the Prior Art	106
3. Petitioner and its Expert Failed to Consider Whether it Would Be Feasible to Modify the Teachings of the Prior Art to Combine with Each Other	108
4. Petitioner and its Expert Improperly Rely on Hindsight Reasoning to Combine Prior Art	114
D. The Objective Indicia in this Case Indicate Nonobviousness	116
VII. CONCLUSION	120

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES:

<i>ActiveVideo Networks v. Verizon Comm.</i> , 694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	23, 28
<i>Am. Piledriving Equip., Inc. v. Geoquip, Inc.</i> , 637 F.3d 1324 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	65
<i>Asia Vital Components Co., Ltd. v. Asetek Danmark A/S</i> , 377 F. Supp.3d 990 (N.D. Cal. 2019)	20, 82, 85
<i>Brookhill-Wilk I, LLC v. Intuitive Surgical, Inc.</i> , 334 F.3d 1294 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	33
<i>CAE Screenplates, Inc. v. Heinrich Fiedler GmbH & Co.</i> , 224 F.3d 1308 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	35
<i>Chef America, Inc. v. Lamb-Weston, Inc.</i> , 358 F.3d 1371, 69 USPQ2d 1857 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	34
<i>Chemical Separation Tech., Inc. v. U.S.</i> , 51 F. Cl. 771 (Fed. Cl. 2002)	20, 82, 85
<i>Crocs, Inc. v. International Trade Commission</i> , 598 F.3d 1294 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	117
<i>Forest Labs, LLC v. Sigmapharm Labs., LLC</i> , 918 F.3d 928 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	71
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	72, 116
<i>Grp. One, Ltd. v. Hallmark Cards, Inc.</i> , 407 F.3d 1297 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	29
<i>Helmsderfer v. Bobrick Washroom Equipment, Inc.</i> , 527 F.3d 1379 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	2

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.