

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

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THE PETITION NEVER MAPS THE CLAIMS TO THE ALLEGED PRIOR ART UNDER ITS PROPOSED CONSTRUCTIONS.....	2
A. Petitioner Never Applies Its Claim Construction Of “Unit Cells” To The References	3
B. Petitioner Asks The Board To Apply A Claim Construction That It Expressly States Is Wrong.....	5
III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	6
A. “Unit Cell.”	7
B. “A Unit Cell Array Comprised Of Said First And Second Unit Cells Laid In Array Form.”	9
IV. THE PETITION FAILS TO ESTABLISH THAT CLAIMS 1-3 ARE OBVIOUS OVER URANO IN VIEW OF MUTOH021.....	10
A. The Petition Fails To Establish A Motivation To Combine Urano With Mutoh021	10
B. Petitioner Fails To Establish Unpatentability Under Its Construction Of The Term “Unit Cells.”	14
V. THE PETITION FAILS TO ESTABLISH THAT CLAIMS 1-3 ARE OBVIOUS OVER MUTOH IN VIEW OF MUTOH021	16
A. The Petition Fails To Establish A Motivation To Combine Mutoh And Mutoh021	17
B. Petitioner Fails To Establish Unpatentability Under Its Construction Of The Term “Unit Cells.”	20
C. The Petition Fails To Show That Mutoh Discloses “A Unit Cell Array Comprised Of Said First And Second Unit Cells Laid In Array Form.”	22

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
VI. THE PETITION FAILS TO ESTABLISH THAT CLAIMS 4-5 ARE OBVIOUS OVER DOUSEKI IN VIEW OF RAMUS	23
A. Petitioner Fails To Establish A Motivation To Combine Douseki And Ramus.....	24
B. Petitioner Fails To Establish Unpatentability Of Claims 4-5 Under Its Construction Of The Term “Unit Cells.”	25
VII. THE BOARD LACKS AUTHORITY TO RULE ON THE PATENTABILITY OF THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS OF THE ’614 PATENT.....	26
VIII. CONCLUSION.....	28

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Federal Cases	
<i>Abbott Labs. v. Sandoz, Inc.</i> , 566 F.3d 1282 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	8
<i>ActiveVideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Communs., Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	14
<i>Apotex Inc. v. Wyeth LLC</i> , IPR2014-00115, Paper 94, slip op. (Apr. 20, 2015).....	12
<i>Arthrex, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.</i> , 2019 U.S. App. LEXIS 32613 (Fed. Cir. Oct. 31, 2019)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Belden Inc. v. Berk-Tek LLC</i> , 805 F.3d 1064 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	10, 18
<i>Dome Patent L.P. v. Lee</i> , 799 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	11
<i>Duo Security Inc. v. Strikeforce Tech., Inc.</i> , Case IPR2017-01064 (PTAB Oct. 16, 2017)	7
<i>Edmond v. United States</i> , 520 U.S. 651 (1997).....	26, 27
<i>Eiko Global, LLC v. Blackbird Tech LLC</i> , Case IPR2017-00980 (PTAB Sept. 1, 2017).....	7
<i>Epistar Corp. v. ITC</i> , 566 F.3d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	8
<i>Free Enter. Fund v. Pub. Co. Accounting Oversight Bd.</i> , 561 U.S. 477 (2010).....	26
<i>Freytag v. Commissioner</i> , 501 U.S. 868 (1991).....	26, 27
<i>Google Inc. v. InfoGation Corp.</i> , Case IPR2017-00819 (PTAB Sept. 11, 2017).....	7

<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)	9
<i>Hologic v. Enzo</i> , 2018 Pat. App. LEXIS 5855, *8 (PTAB April 18, 2018)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Intelligent Bio-Systems, Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge, Ltd.</i> , 821 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	11
<i>In re Kubin</i> , 561 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	19
<i>Lucia v. SEC</i> , 138 S. Ct. 2044 (2018).....	26, 27
<i>In re Magnum Oil Tools Int’l, Ltd.</i> , 829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	1
<i>Masias v. Sec’y of HHS</i> , 634 F.3d 1283 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	26, 27
<i>In re NuVasive, Inc.</i> , 842 F.3d 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	17
<i>Pacing Techs., LLC v. Garmin Int’l, Inc.</i> , 778 F.3d 1021 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	8
<i>PersonalWeb Techs., LLC v. Apple, Inc.</i> , 848 F.3d 987 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	14, 18
<i>Schlumberger Tech. Corp. v. EnerPol, LLC</i> , Case IPR2018-00077 (PTAB Apr. 25, 2018).....	7
<i>In re Stepan Co.</i> , 868 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	19
<i>Stryker Corp. v. Karl Storz Endoscopy America, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00764, Paper 13, slip op. (Sept. 2, 2015).....	25

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.