

UNITED STATES AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,
Petitioner,

v.

DIRECTSTREAM, LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case No. IPR2018-01605, -01606 and -01607
U.S. Patent No. 7,620,800 B2

PETITIONER'S REPLY TO PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. DIRECTSTREAM IMPROPERLY INCORPORATES BY REFERENCE.....	1
III. DIRECTSTREAM MISCHARACTERIZES THE TECHNICAL BACKGROUND OF THE 800 PATENT	2
IV. DR. STONE’S TESTIMONY IS DETAILED AND RELIABLE.....	3
A. Dr. Stone Addressed The Inventions Described and Claimed in The 800 Patent	3
B. Dr. Stone Based His Analysis On The Prior Art, Not Hindsight.....	5
C. The Petition and Dr. Stone Provided Detail Bases and Factual Underpinnings For the Obviousness Analysis	8
D. Splash2 Instantiated Looping In Its Reconfigurable Hardware	15
V. DIRECTSTREAM’S CLAIM CONSTRUCTIONS SHOULD BE REJECTED	19
A. The Board Correctly Construed “Pass Computed Data Seamlessly” 20	
B. The Board Correctly Construed “Systolic”	26
C. The Board Correctly Construed “Stream Communication”	26
D. The Board Correctly Construed “Computational Loop”	31
VI. THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE UNPATENTABLE.....	33
A. The Challenged Claims are Unpatentable over Splash2.....	33
1. Splash2 Discloses Stream Communication	33
2. Splash2 Discloses The Claimed Computational Loops.....	34
3. RaPiD Discloses The Claimed Computational Loops.....	36
4. The Prior Art Unambiguously Discloses Seamlessly Passing Computed Data Between Computational Loops	40
B. DirectStream Fails to Overcome The Obvious Combinations Set Forth in The Petition	45
1. The Combination of Splash2 and Gaudiot Would Have Been Obvious	47

2. The Combination of Splash2 and Jeong Would Have Been Obvious	48
C. The Objective Indicia in this Case Indicate Nonobviousness.....	48
VII. CONCLUSION	51

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Amgen Inc. v. Hoechst Marion Roussel, Inc.</i> , 314 F.3d 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	12
<i>Apple Inc., v. Contentguard Holdings, Inc.</i> , No. IPR2015-00445, 2015 WL 4264955 (PTAB July 9, 2015).....	36
<i>Caterpillar v. Wirtgen</i> , IPR2017-02186, Paper 10 (PTAB May 1, 2019)	6, 10, 11
<i>Cisco Sys., Inc. v. C-Cation Techs., LLC</i> , IPR2014-00454, Paper 12 (PTAB Aug. 29, 2014).....	2
<i>Custom Accessories v. Jeffrey-Allan Indus.</i> , 807 F. 2d 955 (Fed. Cir. 1986)	8, 9, 11
<i>Icon Health & Fitness, Inc. v. Strava, Inc.</i> , 849 F.3d 1034 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	55
<i>Intercontinental Great Brands LLC v. Kellogg N. Am. Co.</i> , 869 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	56, 57
<i>Ex Parte Jud</i> , Appeal 2006-001061 (BPAI Jan. 20, 2007)	8
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	7
<i>Limelight Networks Inc. v. Mass. Inst. Tech.</i> , IPR2017-00249, Paper 9, (PTAB May 18, 2017)	2, 5, 6
<i>In re McLaughlin</i> , 443 F.2d 1392 (CCPA 1971)	6
<i>In re Merck & Co., Inc.</i> , 800 F.2d 1091 (Fed. Cir. 1986)	41, 51, 52

IPR2018-01605, -01606, -01607
(U.S. Patent No. 7,620,800)

<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	20, 36
<i>Pitney Bowes, Inc. v. Hewlett-Packard Co.</i> , 182 F.3d 1298 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	34
<i>Polaris Indus., Inc. v. Arctic Cat, Inc.</i> , 882 F.3d 1056 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	56
<i>Regents of Univ. of New Mexico v. Knight</i> , 321 F.3d 1111 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	53
<i>Robocast, Inc., v. Apple Inc.</i> , 39 F.Supp.3d 552 (D. Del. 2014).....	12
<i>Securus Techs. Inc. v. Glob. Tel*Link Corp.</i> , 701 F. App'x 971 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	30
<i>Specialty Composites v. Cabot Corp.</i> , 845 F.2d 981 (Fed. Cir. 1988)	23
<i>VirnetX, Inc. et al. v. Apple Inc.</i> , No. 2019-01050, (Fed. Cir., Nov. 23, 2019).	33
Other Authorities	
37 C.F.R. § 42.6(e).....	65
37 C.F.R. § 42.24	63, 64

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.