

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D.C.

Before The Honorable Charles E. Bullock  
Chief Administrative Law Judge

In the Matter of:

Certain Static Random Access Memories And  
Products Containing Same

Investigation No. 337-TA-792

**COMPLAINANT CYPRESS SEMICONDUCTOR CORPORATION'S RESPONSE TO  
RESPONDENTS' PETITION FOR REVIEW OF THE REMAND INITIAL  
DETERMINATION ON VALIDITY AND ENFORCEABILITY**

Qualcomm Incorporated

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. THE '134 PATENT IS VALID .....	2
A. Background .....	2
B. Respondents "Undisputed Limitations" Argument is Wrong.....	5
C. The Stephens Device's Burst May Be Interrupted .....	8
D. Stephens Cannot Meet the Limitations of Dependent Claims 2, 14 or 15.....	9
E. Respondents Also Rely on "Undisputed Limitations" with Takasugi.....	10
F. Respondents' Speculation About Other Possible Embodiments Does Not Meet Their Burden .....	11
G. Takasugi Fails to Anticipate Dependent Claims 2, 14, or 15 by Clear and Convincing Evidence .....	12
III. THE '937 PATENT IS VALID .....	13
A. Background .....	13
B. Respondents Cannot Rely on Purported "Undisputed Limitations" .....	16
C. The Pawlowski Patent Does Not Use Complementary Clock Edges .....	16
D. The Pawlowski Patent Does Not Have Separate Input and Output Buses .....	19
E. The Supposed Combinations of Pawlowski plus either Kumanoya or Sakaue Fail to Cure the Deficiencies for Claim 12, and Are Technically Improbable .....	20
F. The Suzuki Reference Is Not Enabled .....	22
G. Respondents' Proposed Combination of Suzuki plus either Kumanoya or Sakaue for Claim 12 Fails to Render the Claim Obvious, and Is Technically Improbable .....	25
IV. THE '477 PATENT IS VALID AND ENFORCEABLE.....	26
A. Background .....	26
B. Hronik Goes To A Different Technology And Does Not Anticipate Claim 8.....	30
C. Hronik And Jiang In Combination Do Not Make Claim 9 Obvious .....	32
D. Respondents Misrepresent the Jiang Patent; It Does Not Anticipate Claim 8 .....	33
E. There Was No Inequitable Conduct.....	35
1. The [REDACTED] Was Not Material .....	35
2. There Was No Intent To Deceive .....	40

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**  
(continued)

	<b>Page</b>
V. THE '805 PATENT IS VALID .....	44
A. Background .....	44
B. The Reexamination Proceeding is Irrelevant to This Case and the Request For Judicial Notice Is Untimely .....	47
C. The ALJ Correctly Found That the Diagrams in Respondents' Prior Art Are Silent on Relative Proportions .....	49
D. "Substantially Oblong" Does Not Subsume "Rectangular" .....	52
E. Ishida '041 Discloses the Exact Opposite N-region/P-region Arrangement .....	57
VI. CONCLUSION.....	59

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>CASES</b>	
<i>1<sup>st</sup> Media, LLC v. Elec. Arts, Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	39, 40, 43
<i>Applied Med. Res. Corp. v. United States Surgical Corp.</i> , 147 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....	19
<i>Automted Techs., Inc. v. Microfil, LLC</i> , No. 2006-1620, 2007 U.S. APP. LEXIS 16956 (Fed. Cir. July 16, 2007) .....	52, 53
<i>Aventis Pharma S.A. v. Hospira, Inc.</i> , 675 F.3d 1324 (Fed. Cir. 2012) (“Aventis”).....	39
<i>Cambridge Prods., Ltd. v. Penn Nutrients, Inc.</i> , 962 F.2d 1048 (Fed. Cir. 1992).....	6, 30, 35
<i>Certain Automated Media Library Devices</i> , Inv. No. 337-TA-746, Comm’n Op. ....	7
<i>Finnigan Corp. v. U.S. Int’l Trade Comm’n</i> , 180 F.3d 1354 (Fed. Cir. 1999).....	59
<i>Hartness Int’l, Inc. v. Simplimatic Eng’g Co.</i> , 819 F.2d 1100 (Fed. Cir. 1987).....	57
<i>Hockerson-Halderstadt, Inc. v. Avia Grp. Int’l</i> , 222 F.3d 951 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	49, 50, 54
<i>Hybritech Inc. v. Monoclonal Antibodies, Inc.</i> , 802 F.2d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 1986).....	6
<i>In the Matter of Certain Liquid Crystal Display Devices and Products Containing the Same</i> , Investigation No. 337-TA-631, 2010 ITC LEXIS 2910 (U.S. I.T.C. 2010).....	50
<i>In re Rosuvastatin Calcium Patent Litig.</i> , 703 F.3d 511 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	37, 39
<i>In re Ruskin</i> , 347 F.2d 843 (C.C.P.A. 1965) .....	19
<i>In re Wright</i> , 569 F.2d 1124 (C.C.P.A. 1977) .....	50

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**  
(continued)

<i>Kalman v. Kimberly-Clark Corp.</i> , 713 F.2d 760 (Fed. Cir.1983), cert. denied, 465 U.S. 1026 (1984) .....	19
<i>Kao Corp. v. Unilever U.S., Inc.</i> , 441 F.3d 963 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	59
<i>Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Smith &amp; Nephew, Inc.</i> , 688 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	20, 21
<i>Krippelz v. Ford Motor Co.</i> , 667 F.3d 1261 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	49, 50
<i>Minn. Mining &amp; Mfg. Co. v. Chemque, Inc.</i> , 303 F.3d 1294 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	5
<i>Minn. Mining &amp; Mfg. Co. v. Johnson &amp; Johnson Orthopedics, Inc.</i> , 976 F.2d 1559 (Fed. Cir. 1992).....	16
<i>Nystrom v. TREX Co.</i> , 424 F.3d 1136 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	50
<i>PowerOasis, Inc. v. T-Mobile USA, Inc.</i> , 522 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	6
<i>Ralston Purina Co. v. Far-Mar Co.</i> , 772 F.2d 1570 (Fed. Cir. 1985).....	5, 6
<i>Research Plastics, Inc. v. Fed. Packaging Corp.</i> , 421 F.3d 1290 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	53
<i>Scanner Techs. Corp. v. ICOS Vision Systems Corp.</i> , 528 F.3d 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	6
<i>Structural Rubber Prods. Co. v. Park Rubber Co.</i> , 749 F.2d 707 (Fed. Cir.1984).....	19
<i>Therasense, Inc. v. Becton, Dickinson &amp; Co.</i> , 649 F.3d 1276 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	passim

**OTHER AUTHORITIES**

37 C.F.R. § 1.301 .....	47
-------------------------	----

# 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.