

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 IPR2019-01526
U.S. Patent No. 6,895,519

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|--|------|
| I. THE '519 PATENT CLAIMS A NOVEL SYSTEM LSI | 1 |
| II. ASSERTED REFERENCES | 5 |
| A. Ober | 5 |
| 1. Ober's Microcontroller | 7 |
| 1. Ober's Decentralized Power Control Architecture | 13 |
| B. Nakazato | 17 |
| III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION | 20 |
| A. The Preamble of Claim 1 Of the '519 Patent Is Limiting | 21 |
| B. The "Plurality Of Ordinary Operation Modes" Operate At Different Clock Frequencies Supplied To The CPU | 22 |
| IV. GROUND 1: THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE NOT OBVIOUS OVER OBER AND NAKAZATO | 26 |
| A. Ober Does Not Disclose "A Plurality Of Ordinary Operation Modes." | 27 |
| B. The Combination of Ober and Nakazato Does Not Disclose "A First Memory Storing A Clock Control Library For Controlling Clock Frequency Transitions Between Said Ordinary Operation Modes." | 36 |
| C. There Is No Reasonable Expectation Of Success Writing To The Unused Bits In Ober's SFR 62 To Supply Low Speed Clocks To The CPU During RUN Mode | 43 |
| 1. Reading Or Writing To Unused Register Bits Is Either Ignored Or Causes Unpredictable Behavior | 44 |
| 2. Ober's Power Management State Machine Might Behave Unpredictably Outside The Scope Of Its Defined States | 46 |
| D. There Is No Motivation To Combine Ober And Nakazato | 48 |
| 1. Modifying Ober's Microcontroller Would Change Its Principle Of Operation | 49 |

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

| | Page |
|--|-------------|
| 2. Modifying Ober’s RUN Mode To Use A Divided Clock Would Render Ober’s Microcontroller Inoperable For Its Intended Purpose..... | 51 |
| 3. Ober Teaches Away From A Combination With Nakazato..... | 54 |
| 4. Ober’s SFR 62 Already Configures The System Clock..... | 61 |
| E. The Institution Decision Relied Upon A New Theory Not Asserted by Petitioner | 61 |
| V. GROUND 2: CLAIMS 2-6 ARE NOT OBVIOUS OVER OBER IN VIEW OF NAKAZATO, COOPER, AND WINDOWS ACPI..... | 63 |
| A. The Combination Of Ober, Nakazato, Cooper, and Windows ACPI Does Not Render Claims 2-6 Obvious..... | 63 |
| B. Exhibit 1005 Is Not A Printed Publication | 64 |
| VI. GROUND 3: CLAIMS 8 AND 9 ARE NOT OBVIOUS OVER OBER IN VIEW OF NAKAZATO AND DOBLAR | 67 |
| VII. INTER PARTES REVIEW IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL..... | 69 |
| A. Inter Partes Review Violates The Appointments Clause..... | 69 |
| B. Inter Partes Review Violates The Takings And Due Process Clauses..... | 70 |
| VIII. CONCLUSION..... | 70 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

| | Page(s) |
|---|----------------|
| Federal Cases | |
| <i>Arthrex, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.</i> , 941 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2019) | 69, 70 |
| <i>Bicon, Inc. v. Straumann Co.</i> , 441 F.3d 945 (Fed. Cir. 2006) | 21, 22 |
| <i>Celgene Corp. v. Peter</i> , 931 F. 3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2019) | 70 |
| <i>In re Cronyn</i> , 890 F.2d 1158 (Fed. Cir. 1989) | 66 |
| <i>Edmond v. United States</i> , 520 U.S. 651 (1997)..... | 69 |
| <i>Free Enter. Fund v. Pub. Co. Accounting Oversight Bd.</i> , 561 U.S. 477 (2010)..... | 69 |
| <i>Freytag v. Commissioner</i> , 501 U.S. 868 (1991)..... | 69 |
| <i>In re Gordon</i> , 733 F.2d 900 (Fed. Cir. 1984) | 52 |
| <i>Hulu, LLC v. Sound View Innovations, Inc.</i> , IPR2018-01039, Paper No. 29 (PTAB Dec. 20, 2019) | 64 |
| <i>Infineon Techs. AG et al. v. Atmel Corp.</i> , No. 11-307-RGA, Dkt No. 174 (D. Del. Dec. 4, 2012) | <i>passim</i> |
| <i>InTouch Techs., Inc. v. VGo Communs., Inc.</i> , 751 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2014) | 48 |
| <i>Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.</i> , 688 F. 3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2012) | 68 |
| <i>Koninklijke Philips NV v. Google LLC</i> , 948 F. 3d 1330 (Fed. Cir. 2020) | 62 |

| | |
|--|--------|
| <i>Kyocera Wireless Corp. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n</i> , 545 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2008) | 64 |
| <i>Lucia v. SEC</i> , 138 S. Ct. 2044 (2018)..... | 69 |
| <i>Masias v. Sec’y of HHS</i> , 634 F.3d 1283 (Fed. Cir. 2011) | 69 |
| <i>Polaris Indus. v. Arctic Cat, Inc.</i> , 882 F.3d 1056 (Fed. Cir. 2018) | 55 |
| <i>In re Ratti</i> , 270 F.2d 810 (CCPA 1959) | 49, 50 |
| <i>SRI Int’l, Inc. v. Internet Sec. Sys., Inc.</i> , 511 F.3d 1186 (Fed. Cir. 2008) | 65 |
| <i>In re Stepan Co.</i> , 868 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2017) | 44 |
| <i>Thryv, Inc. v. Click-To-Call Techs., LP</i> , 140 S. Ct. 1367 (2020)..... | 62 |
| <i>TQ Delta, LLC v. Cisco Sys.</i> , 942 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2019) | 49, 64 |
| <i>W.L. Gore & Assoc., Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.</i> , 721 F.2d 1540 (Fed. Cir. 1983) | 37, 40 |
| <i>Wellman, Inc. v. Eastman Chem. Co.</i> , 642 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2011) | 20 |
| <i>In re Wessler</i> , 353 F.2d 238 (C.C.P.A. 1965) | 68 |
| Federal Statutes | |
| 5 U.S.C. § 706..... | 62 |
| 35 U.S.C. §102..... | 64 |
| 35 U.S.C. § 319..... | 62 |

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.