

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

INTEL CORPORATION
Petitioner,

v.

PACT XPP SCHWEIZ AG
Patent Owner

Case IPR2020-00537
U.S. Patent 7,928,763

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE
UNDER 37 C.F.R. §42.107**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	STATUTORY DISCLAIMER.....	2
III.	BACKGROUND	3
	A. The '763 Patent	3
	B. Claims at Issue.....	5
	C. Prior Art Cited In The Petition.....	8
	1. Balmer.....	8
	2. Wilkinson.....	12
IV.	 GROUND I, III, AND IV FAIL BECAUSE PETITIONER FAILS TO ESTABLISH THAT THE ALLEGED “BUS SYSTEM” INTERCONNECTS THE IDENTIFIED NON-VOLATILE MEMORY	14
	A. Ground I Fails (CLAIMS 19 AND 49) Because Petitioner Fails To Establish That The “Cross-Bar Switch” in Balmer Interconnects The “Optical Disc 5001” Or The “Hard Drive 5002”	15
	B. Ground III Fails (CLAIMS 19 AND 49) Because Petitioner Fails To Establish That The Alleged “Bus System” Interconnects The “Card Mounted Hard Drives”	24
	C. Ground IV Fails (CLAIMS 19 AND 49) For The Same Reason	28
V.	THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE IT FAILS THE REQUIREMENT UNDER 35 U.S.C. 312.....	28
VI.	PETITIONER FAILS TO PROVE THAT MIYAMORI IS A PRIOR ART PUBLICATION.....	30
VII.	THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED BASED ON THE BOARD’S DISCRETION	35
VIII.	THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED FOR ADDITIONAL REASONS	37
	A. Petitioner’s Service Is Not Appropriate	37

B. The Petition Should Be Denied Because of the Co-pending District Court Case 40

1. The Advanced Stage of the Parallel District Court Proceedings and Significant Investment of Time and Resources by the Parties and District Court Counsels Weighs Against Institution. 40

2. Similar Invalidity Theories and Claims are at Issue in the Parallel District Court Proceeding 42

C. The Petition Is Barred by Intel’s Declaratory Judgement Case Challenging Validity 42

IX. CONCLUSION..... 43

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

CASES

Argentum v. Research Corp.,
Case IPR2016-00204, Paper 19 (May 23, 2016).....33

Blast Motion, Inc. et al v. NewSpin Sports, LLC,
Case IPR2019-00538, Paper 9 at 20 (July 8, 2019)27

Chevron Oronite Co. v. Infineum USA L.P., Case,
IPR2018-00923, Paper 9 at 11 (Nov. 7, 2018)37

Cisco Systems, Inc. v. Chrimar Systems, Inc.,
Case IPR2018-01511, Paper 11 (Jan. 31, 2019).....2, 43

Click-to-Call Techs., LP v. Ingenio, Inc.,
899 F.3d 1321, 1330 (Fed. Cir. 2018)38

Deeper UAB v. Vexilar, Inc.,
Case IPR2018-01310, (Jan. 24, 2019).....2

Deeper UAB v. Vexilar, Inc.,
Case, IPR2018-01310, Paper 7 (Jan. 24, 2019)
(citing *SAS Inst. Inc. v. Iancu*, 138 S. Ct. 1348 (2018)).....36

Google LLC v. At Home Bondholders Liquidating Trust, 722 Fed.Appx.
1044, 1049 (Fed. Cir. 2018) 23, 27

Harmonic Inc. v. Avid Tech., Inc.,
815 F.3d 1356, 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2016) 36, 37

Homeland Housewares, LLC v. Whirlpool Corp.,
865 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2017)27

Hulu, LLC v. Sound View Innovations, LLC,
Case IPR2018-01039, Paper 29 (Dec. 20, 2019)..... 31, 32, 33

In-Depth Geophysical v. ConocoPhillips Company,
Case IPR2019-00849, Paper 14 (Sept. 6, 2019)..... 32, 33

Intelligent Bio-Sys., Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd.,
821 F.3d 1359, (Fed. Cir. 2016) 19, 24, 27, 28

Monsanto Co. v. Syngenta Seeds, Inc.,
503 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2007)7

NHK Spring Co., Ltd. v. Intri-Plex Techs., Inc.,
Case IPR2018-00752, Paper 8 (Sept. 12, 2018).....40

NHK Spring Co., Ltd. v. Intri-Plex Techs., Inc., Case IPR2018-00752, Paper,
8 (Sept. 12, 2018).....37

SAS Inst. Inc. v. Iancu,
138 S. Ct. 1348 (2018).....2

Smart Microwave Sensors GmbH v. Wavetronix LLC,
Case IPR2016-00488, Paper 57..... 6, 34, 35

Vectra Fitness, Inc. v. TNWK Corp.,
162 F.3d 1379 (Fed. Cir. 1998)2

VIZIO, Inc. v. Polaris PowerLED Technologies, LLC, Case IPR2020-00043,
Paper 30 at 6-12 (May 4, 2020).....40

Wi-Lan, Inc. v. Apple, Inc.,
811 F.3d 455 (Fed. Cir. 2016)7

STATUTES

35 U.S.C. § 112.....7

35 U.S.C. § 253(a)2

35 U.S.C. § 312..... 29, 30, 36

35 U.S.C. § 312(a)29

35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(3)..... 19, 24, 27, 28

35 U.S.C. § 314(b)41

35 U.S.C. § 315(a)2, 43

35 U.S.C. 315(a)(1)).43

35 U.S.C. § 315 (b)39

35 U.S.C. 316(a)41

RULES

37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(4)–(5).....19

37 C.F.R. § 42.105(a)..... 38, 39

37 C.F.R. § 42.106(a)(2).....38

37 C.F.R. § 42.106(a)(2),.....39

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.