UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

INTEL CORPORATION,
Petitioner,

v.

FG SRC LLC,
Patent Owner.

IPR2020-01449
Patent No. 7,149,867

PATENT OWNER FG SRC LLC'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO PETITION FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,149,867

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. RELATED PROCEEDINGS 1

III. SRC BACKGROUND 1

IV. THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION UNDER § 314(a). 2

A. All of the *Fintiv* Factors Favor Denial of Institution. 3

B. Efficiency and Integrity of the System Are Best Served by Denying Institution. 7

V. TECHNOLOGY BACKGROUND 9

A. Reconfigurable Processors and FPGAs 9

B. Memory Hierarchies 10

C. Prefetching 11

VI. THE '867 PATENT 12

A. The Invention Of The '867 Patent. 13

B. Prefetching 16

C. The '867 Patent Discloses The Exact Technology Of *Chien*, *Zhang*, And *Gupta* In Its "Relevant Background" Discussion. 17

VII. THE ASSERTED PRIOR ART REFERENCES 19

A. *Chien* (Ex. 1005) 20

B. *Zhang* (Ex. 1003) 22

C. *Gupta* (Ex. 1004) 24

VIII. PETITIONER HAS FAILED TO MEET ITS BURDEN IN ESTABLISHING *ZHANG*, *GUPTA*, AND *CHIEN* AS PRINTED PUBLICATIONS. 26

A. Legal Standards for Establishing Printed Publication. 26

DOCKET ALARM

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

B. Petitioner Has Not Met The Standards For Establishing *Zhang*, *Gupta* and *Chien* as Printed Publications. 27

1. Petitioner's Conference Distribution Theory 28
2. Petitioner's IEEE Xplore Website Theory. 30
3. Petitioner's Online Library Records Theory. 32
4. Each of Petitioner's Grounds Therefore Fails. 35

IX. PATENT OWNER'S CLAIM CONSTRUCTIONS 36

A. Agreed Terms 36

B. Terms to be construed. 37

1. "retrieves only computational data required by the algorithm from a second memory… and places the retrieved computational data in the first memory" 37
2. "read and write only data required for computations by the algorithm between the data prefetch unit and the common memory" 38

X. PETITIONER HAS FAILED TO DEMONSTRATE A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF PREVAILING AS TO ANY CHALLENGED CLAIM. 38

A. Ground 1: Claims 1-2, 4-8 And 13-19 Are Not Obvious Over *Zhang* And *Gupta* 38

1. The combination does not render obvious a "reconfigurable processor that instantiates an algorithm as hardware." 39
2. The combination does not render obvious a "data prefetch unit." 42
3. The combination does not render obvious a data prefetch unit "wherein the data prefetch unit retrieves only computational data required by the algorithm." 43
4. The combination does not render obvious a first memory and a data prefetch unit "wherein at least the *first memory* and *data prefetch unit* are configured to conform to needs of the algorithm." 46
5. The combination does not render obvious a data prefetch unit "configured to match format and location of data in the second memory." 51

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

6. The combination does not render obvious a memory controller that "transmits only portions of data desired by the data prefetch unit and discards other portions of data prior to transmission of the data to the data prefetch unit." 51
7. The combination does not render obvious a "reconfigurable processor" as required by claim 13. 52
8. The combination does not render obvious a reconfigurable processor "wherein the computational unit and the data access unit, and the data prefetch unit are configured to conform to needs of an algorithm implemented on the computational unit and transfer only data necessary for computations by the computational unit" as required by claim 13..... 53

B. Ground 2: Claims 3 And 9-12 Are Not Obvious Over *Zhang*, *Gupta*, And *Chien*. 54

1. The combination does not render obvious a "reconfigurable processor[] that can instantiate an algorithm as hardware."..... 54
2. The combination does not render obvious a "data prefetch unit." 55
3. The combination does not render obvious "a data prefetch unit to read and write only data required for computations by the algorithm." 56
4. The combination does not render obvious a data prefetch unit configured to "match format and location of data in the common memory." 57
5. The combination does not render obvious a memory controller that "transmits to the prefetch unit only data desired by the data prefetch unit as required by the algorithm." 57
6. The combination does not render obvious a "reconfigurable processor [that] also includes a computational unit" as required by claim 11..... 58

XI. SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS OF NON-OBVIOUSNESS..... 58

XII. CONCLUSION 61

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES:

Acceleration Bay, LLC v. Activision Blizzard, Inc.,
908 F.3d 765 (Fed. Cir. 2018) 27, 28, 31

Acme Scale Co. v. LTS Scale Co., LLC,
615 F. App'x 673 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....21

Continental Intermodal Group - Trucking LLC v. Sand Revolution LLC,
No. 7-18-cv-00147-ADA (W.D. Tex.) 3

Cuozzo Speed Techs. v. Lee,
136 S. Ct. 2131 2

Elan Pharm., Inc. v. Mayo Found. For Med. Educ. & Research,
346 F.3d 1051 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....21

Intelligent Bio-Systems, Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd.,
821 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....35

Jazz Pharm., Inc. v. Amneal Pharm., LLC,
895 F.3d 1347 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....26

Kerr Machine Co. d/b/a Kerr Pumps v. Vulcan Industrial Holdings, LLC,
6-20-cv-00200-ADA (W.D. Tex.).....3, 4, 5

MultiMedia Content Mgmt LLC v. Dish Network L.L.C.,
6-18-cv-00207-ADA (W.D. Tex.).....3

Phillips v. AWH Corp.,
415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (*en banc*) 36

Samsung Elec. Co. v. Infobridge Pte. Ltd.,
929 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....*passim*

SRI Int'l, Inc. v. Internet Sec. Sys., Inc.,
511 F.3d 1186 (Fed. Cir. 2008) 26

Solas OLED v. Dell Techs. Inc.,
6-19-cv-00514-ADA, Text Order dated Jun. 23, 2020 (W.D. Tex.).....3

Solas OLED v. Dell Techs. Inc.,
6-19-cv-00515-ADA, Text Order dated Jun. 23, 2020 (W.D. Tex.).....3

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKET ALARM

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.