

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

INTEL CORPORATION,
Petitioner

v.

PACT XPP SCHWEIZ AG,
Patent Owner

**DECLARATION OF DR. PINAKI MAZUMDER UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.68
IN SUPPORT OF PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF
U.S. PATENT NO. 8,471,593**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. Introduction.....	1
II. Background and Qualifications	3
1. Educational Background.....	3
2. Career Background	5
3. Relevant Publications.....	9
4. Patents	13
III. Understanding of Patent Law	15
IV. Background.....	18
A. Background of the Field Relevant to the '593 Patent	18
1. Processors Generally.....	18
2. Multiprocessor Systems	22
3. Interconnects for Multiprocessor Systems.....	24
B. Summary of the '593 Patent.....	34
1. The Alleged Problem in the Art.....	34
C. Summary of the Prosecution History	36
V. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Pertinent Art.....	38
VI. Background on Prior Art References	39
A. Balmer	39
B. Budzinski.....	41
C. Gilbertson	45
D. Hennessy	46

VII. Claims 1-2, 4-11, 14-17, 19-27 Are Obvious In View Of Balmer in combination with Hennessy.....	48
A. Challenged Claims	48
1. Independent Claims 1 and 16.....	48
2. Dependent Claims 2 and 17	71
3. Dependent Claims 4 and 19	72
4. Dependent Claims 5 and 20	76
5. Dependent Claims 6 and 21	79
6. Dependent Claims 7 and 22	83
7. Dependent Claims 8 and 23	83
8. Dependent Claims 9 and 24	87
9. Dependent Claims 10 and 25	89
10. Dependent Claims 11 and 26	91
11. Dependent Claim 14	92
12. Dependent Claim 15	95
13. Dependent Claim 27	97
VIII. Claims 1-2, 4-11, 14-17, 19-27 Are Obvious In View Of Budzinski in combination with Hennessy.....	99
A. Challenged Claims	99
1. Independent Claims 1 and 16.....	99
2. Dependent Claims 2 and 17	124
3. Dependent Claims 4 and 19	128
4. Dependent Claims 5 and 20	129
5. Dependent Claims 6 and 21	131

6.	Dependent Claims 7 and 22	132
7.	Dependent Claims 8 and 23	133
8.	Dependent Claims 9 and 24	134
9.	Dependent Claims 10 and 25	136
10.	Dependent Claims 11 and 26	138
11.	Dependent Claim 14	139
12.	Dependent Claim 15	141
13.	Dependent Claim 27	143
IX.	Claims 1-2, 4-11, 14-17, 19-27 Are Obvious In View Of Budzinski in combination with Gilbertson and Hennessy.....	144
A.	Challenged Claims	144
1.	Independent Claims 1 and 16.....	145
2.	Dependent Claims 2, 4-11, 14-15, 17, 19-27.....	149
X.	Secondary Considerations of Non-Obviousness	150
XI.	Conclusion	150

I, Pinaki Mazumder, Ph.D., do hereby declare as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. I have been retained as an expert witness on behalf of Intel Corporation (“Intel”) for the above-captioned Petition for *Inter Partes* Review (“IPR”) of U.S. Patent No. 8,471,593 (“’593 patent”). I am being compensated for my time in connection with this IPR at my standard consulting rate of \$400 per hour. My compensation is not affected by the outcome of this matter.
2. I have been asked to provide my opinions regarding whether claims 1-2, 4-11, 14-17, and 19-27 of the ’593 patent (“the Challenged Claims”) are invalid as obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art (“POSITA”) at the time of the alleged invention.
3. In preparing my Declaration, I reviewed the ’593 patent, the file history of the patent, prior art references, technical references and other publications from the time of the alleged invention.
4. The patent application that resulted in the ’593 Patent, Application No. 13/289,296, was filed on November 4, 2011. Ex. 1003 (’593 Patent), Cover, Cert. of Correction. The ’593 patent claiming priority, through multiple divisional and continuation patents, to U.S. Patent Application No. 60/238,855, filed on October 6, 2000. *Id.*

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.