

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ADVANCED MICRO DEVICES, INC.

Petitioner

v.

AQUILA INNOVATIONS INC.

Patent Owner

Case IPR2019-01525
Patent 6,239,614 B1

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. TECHNICAL BACKGROUND	3
III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.	7
A. “Unit Cell.”	10
B. “A Unit Cell Array Comprised Of Said First And Second Unit Cells Laid In Array Form.”	12
C. “A Power Switch.”	13
D. “A Power Switch Disposed Around Said Unit Cell Array And Comprised Of A Plurality Of Third MOS Transistors”	14
E. “A Plurality Of Input/Output Circuits Disposed Around Said Unit Cell Array”	15
F. “Parts Of Said Power Switch Disposed Within Said Unit Cell Array”	16
IV. INTRODUCTION TO THE REFERENCES PETITIONER ASSERTS IN GROUNDS 1 & 2.....	17
V. GROUND 1: PETITIONER HAS NOT PROVEN CLAIMS 1-3 OF THE '614 PATENT ARE UNPATENTABLE BECAUSE ONE OF ORDINARY SKILL WOULD NOT COMBINE URANO AND MUTOH021	19
A. Petitioner Does Not Establish That Arranging Power Switch Cells To “Encircl[e] The Unit Cell” Was An Improvement Over Urano’s “Both Ends Vertically” Arrangement.	21
B. Petitioner Does Not Establish That An “Encircle” Arrangement Was A Known Technique That Would Improve Urano’s “Both Ends Vertically” Arrangement.	22

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

Page

C.	A Person Of Ordinary Skill In The Art Would Not Have Recognized That An “At All Ends Vertically And Horizontally” Arrangement Would Predictably Improve Urano’s “Both Ends Vertically” Arrangement.	25
D.	Petitioner Fails To Demonstrate That Urano and Mutoh021 Could Be Readily Or Predictably Combined.....	30
E.	Petitioner’s Proposed Combination Is Above The Level Of Ordinary Skill In The Art.	33
VI.	GROUND 2: PETITIONER HAS NOT PROVEN CLAIMS 1-3 OF THE ’614 PATENT ARE UNPATENTABLE BECAUSE ONE OF ORDINARY SKILL WOULD NOT COMBINE MUTOH AND MUTOH021.....	35
A.	Petitioner Does Not Establish That Arranging Power Switch Cells “On All Sides Of The Unit Cell Array” Was An Improvement Over Mutoh’s “Both Sides Of” Arrangement.	37
B.	Petitioner Does Not Establish That An “At All Ends Vertically And Horizontally” Arrangement Was A Know Technique That Would Improve Mutoh’s “Both Sides Of” Arrangement.	38
C.	A Person Of Ordinary Skill In The Art Would Not Have Recognized That An “At All Ends Vertically And Horizontally” Arrangement Would Predictably Improve Mutoh’s “Both Sides Of” Arrangement.	39
D.	Petitioner Does Not Establish That Mutoh and Mutoh021 Could Be Readily Or Predictably Combined.....	45
E.	Petitioner’s Proposed Combination Is Above The Level Of Ordinary Skill In The Art.	47

..

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
VII. THE PETITION FAILS TO ESTABLISH THE UNPATENTABILITY OF ANY CLAIM CHALLENGED IN GROUND 3 BECAUSE IT FAILS TO SHOW THAT CLAIMS 4-5 ARE OBVIOUS OVER DOUSEKI IN VIEW OF RAMUS.....	50
A. Petitioner Fails To Establish A Motivation To Combine Douseki And Ramus.....	50
VIII. <i>INTER PARTES</i> REVIEW IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL.	51
A. <i>Inter Partes</i> Review Violates The Appointments Clause.	51
B. <i>Inter Partes</i> Review Violates The Takings And Due Process Clauses.....	52
IX. CONCLUSION.....	53

...

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Federal Cases	
<i>Abbott Labs. v. Sandoz, Inc.</i> , 566 F.3d 1282 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	12
<i>ActiveVideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Communs., Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Arthrex, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.</i> , 941 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2019)	51, 52
<i>Broadcom Corp. v. Emulex Corp.</i> , 732 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	21, 37
<i>Celgene Corp. v. Peter</i> , 931 F. 3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2019)	53
<i>Cias, Inc. v. All. Gaming Corp.</i> , 504 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	16
<i>Edmond v. United States</i> , 520 U.S. 651 (1997).....	51, 52
<i>Epistar Corp. v. ITC</i> , 566 F.3d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	11
<i>Free Enter. Fund v. Pub. Co. Accounting Oversight Bd.</i> , 561 U.S. 477 (2010).....	51, 52
<i>Freytag v. Commissioner</i> , 501 U.S. 868 (1991).....	51, 52
<i>In re Fritch</i> , 972 F.2d 1260 (Fed. Cir. 1992)	21
<i>Harmonic Inc. v. Avid Tech., Inc.</i> , 815 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	1
<i>Hill-Rom Servs. v. Stryker Corp.</i> , 755 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	13

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.