

Case IPR2020-00985
U.S. Patent No. 6,651,134

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ADVANCED MICRO DEVICES, INC.,
Petitioner

v.

MONTEREY RESEARCH, LLC,
Patent Owner

Case IPR2020-00985

U.S. Patent No. 6,651,134

PATENT OWNER RESPONSE

Mail Stop Patent Board
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. Introduction.....	1
II. Overview Of The '134 Patent.....	3
A. Technical Background.....	4
1. SRAM/DRAM	4
2. On-Chip Memories	5
3. Input/Output Devices	5
4. Burst Memory Access.....	6
B. Advantages Of The '134 Patent.	7
1. Advantages Over The Prior Art	10
III. AMD's Prior Art References Differ From The Teachings Of The '134 Patent.	11
A. Wada Is Directed To Preventing Interruptions In Between Bursts.....	11
B. Barrett Is Directed To Improving High Speed Mass Data Communications Between Input/Output (I/O) Devices Over A Bus.....	12
1. Technical Background Of Burst Transfer Communications Between I/O Devices In Computing Systems.	16
IV. Person Of Ordinary Skill In The Art.	20
V. Claim Construction.....	21
A. All Challenged Claims: "non-interruptible"	21
B. Claim 16: "means for reading data ... / means for generating a predetermined number of said internal address signals in	

	response to (i) an external address signal, (ii) a clock signal and (iii) one or more control signals”	21
VI.	Ground 1a: Claims 1-3, 8, 12-13, and 16-17 Are Not Anticipated By Wada.	22
	A. Wada Does Not Disclose “ <i>generating a predetermined number of said internal address signals</i> ”	23
	1. Wada’s Conventional Embodiment Does Not Generate A Predetermined Number Of Internal Address Signals.	24
	2. Wada’s Second Embodiment Does Not Generate A Predetermined Number Of Internal Address Signals.	25
	B. Wada Does Not Disclose “ <i>wherein said generation of said predetermined number of internal address signals is non-interruptible</i> ”	27
	1. The Burst Procedure In Wada’s Conventional And Second Embodiments May Be Terminated By Failing To Maintain The External Advance Signal.	28
	2. Wada Does Not Disclose Preventing Interruptions Within A Burst.	32
VII.	Ground 2: Claims 1-4, 8, 12-14, and 16-17 Are Not Obvious Over Wada.	32
VIII.	Ground 2a: Claims 1-4, 8, 12-14, and 16-17 Are Not Obvious Over Wada In Combination With Barrett. ¶	33
	A. The Combination Of Wada And Barrett Does Not Render Obvious “ <i>generating a predetermined number of said internal address signals</i> ”	34
	B. The Combination Of Wada And Barrett Does Not Render Obvious “ <i>wherein said generation of said predetermined number of internal address signals is non-interruptible</i> ”	35
	C. A POSITA Would Not Have Been Motivated To Combine Wada And Barrett To Arrive At The Challenged Claims.	36

1.	Wada And Barrett Describe Different Bursts.	37
2.	Wada And Barrett Are Directed To Different Operational Procedures.	38
3.	Wada And Barrett’s Different Systems Operate At Different Speeds And Scales Of Data.	42
4.	Wada And Barrett’s Different Systems Operate According To Different Timing Requirements.	43
5.	Combining Wada And Barrett Would Destroy A Key Objective Of Each Reference.	46
6.	Wada And Barrett Are Not Directed To The Same Purpose.	47
7.	AMD Has Not Provided A Reason Why A POSITA Would Have Combined Elements From Wada And Barrett In The Way The Invention Of The ’134 Patent Does.	47
D.	A POSITA Would Not Have Had A Reasonable Expectation Of Success In Combining Wada And Barrett.	48
IX.	Claims 4-7, 18-20 Are Not Obvious Over Wada Alone, Wada In Combination With Barrett, Or In Combination With The Asserted Secondary References.	50
A.	Claims 4-7 and 18-20 Are Not Obvious Over Wada In Combination With Fujioka (Ground 3).	50
B.	Claims 9-11, 14-15, And 21 Are Not Obvious Over Wada In Combination With Reeves or Lysinger.	51
C.	Claims 4-7 and 18-20 Are Not Obvious Over Wada In Combination With Barrett And Fujioka (Ground 3a).	52
D.	Claims 9-11, 14-15, And 21 Are Not Obvious Over Wada In Combination With Barrett and Reeves or Lysinger.	52

X. Objective Indicia Of Non-Obviousness Further Demonstrate That The Challenged Claims Are Not Obvious Over Wada, Alone Or In Combination With The Secondary References.53

 A. A Nexus Exists Between The Claimed Invention Of The '134 Patent And Non-Interruptible DDR SDRAM Technology.....54

 1. Claim 158

 a. Element 1p: A circuit comprising.....58

 b. Element 1a: a memory comprising a plurality of storage elements each configured to read and write data in response to an internal address signal; and.....58

 c. Element 1b: a logic circuit configured to generate a predetermined number of said internal address signals in response to (i) an external address signal, (ii) a clock signal and (iii) one or more control signals, wherein said generation of said predetermined number of internal address signals is non-interruptible.60

 2. Claims 16 and 17.....63

 B. The Claimed Invention Of The '134 Patent Solves A Long-Felt Need.....64

 C. The Secondary Considerations Of Non-Obviousness Provide An Independent Basis For Confirming The Patentability Of All Claims.....67

XI. Conclusion67

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.