

Case IPR2020-01492  
U.S. Patent No. 6,651,134

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

QUALCOMM INCORPORATED,  
Petitioner

v.

MONTEREY RESEARCH, LLC,  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2020-01492

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

---

**PATENT OWNER SURREPLY**

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**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
I. Introduction .....	1
II. Schaefer Does Not Disclose “Wherein Said Generation Of Said Predetermined Number Of Internal Address Signals Is Non-interruptible” .....	2
A. Schaefer Prohibition On User Commands During The PRECHARGE Command Operation Period Does Not Disclose Non-Interruptibility Of Bursts .....	3
B. Schaefer’s Plain Language Is Clear That Issuing Another Command Is Only Prohibited During The PRECHARGE Time (t <sub>RP</sub> ).....	4
C. PO’s Interpretation Is Consistent with Schaefer’s Plain Language.....	7
D. A POSITA Would Have Understood Schaefer’s Disclosure Of Circuitry For Reducing Time Between Bursts To Apply to The AUTO-PRECHARGE Command .....	13
E. Schaefer Discloses Burst Termination Commands For a Fixed-Length Burst With AUTO-PRECHARGE.....	15
1. Fixed Length Bursts of 2, 4, And 8 Cycles Can Be Interrupted.....	18
2. Mr. Murphy Admitted That Fixed Bursts Without AUTO-PRECHARGE Can Be Terminated.....	18
III. Mr. Murphy’s Declaration Should Be Given Little Or No Weight .....	19
A. Dr. Brogioli Was A POSITA At The Time Of Filing Of The ’134 Patent.....	19
IV. Conclusion.....	20

**PATENT OWNER'S EXHIBIT LIST**

<b>Exhibit No.</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>
2001	Monterey's First Amended Complaint in <i>Monterey Research, LLC v. Advanced Micro Devices, Inc.</i> , C.A. No. 19-cv-2149-CFC, Dkt. 16 (D. Del. Feb. 5, 2020)
2002	Scheduling Order in <i>Monterey Research, LLC v. Qualcomm Inc. et al</i> , C.A. No. 19-2083-NIQA-LAS (D. Del. Oct. 1, 2020); <i>Monterey Research, LLC v. Nanya Tech. Corp. et al</i> , C.A. No. 19-2090-NIQA-LAS (D. Del. Oct. 1, 2020); <i>Monterey Research, LLC v. Advanced Micro Devices, Inc.</i> , C.A. No. 19-cv-2149-NIQA-LAS (D. Del. Oct. 1, 2020); <i>Monterey Research, LLC v. STMicroelectronics N.V. et al</i> , C.A. No. 20-0089-NIQA-LAS (D. Del. Oct. 1, 2020); <i>Monterey Research, LLC v. Marvell Tech. Grp. Ltd., et al</i> , C.A. No. 20-0158-NIQA-LAS (D. Del. Oct. 1, 2020)
2003	Qualcomm's Answer, Counterclaims and Defenses to the First Amended Complaint in <i>Monterey Research, LLC v. Qualcomm Inc. et al</i> , C.A. No. 19-2083-NIQA-LAS, Dkt. 22 (D. Del. Feb. 28, 2020)
2004	December 29, 2020 Email fr. USPTO Trials
2005	Declaration In Support Of Patent Owner Monterey Research, LLC's Unopposed Motion For Admission <i>Pro Hac Vice</i> Of Michael A. Wueste
2006	Declaration Of Michael C. Brogioli, Ph.D.
2007	Curriculum Vitae Of Michael C. Brogioli, Ph.D.
2008	Declaration of Robert Murphy In Support of Defendant GSI Technology, Inc.'s Responsive Claim Construction Brief in <i>Cypress Semiconductor Corp. v. GSI Tech., Inc.</i> , Case Nos. 3:13-cv-02013, 4:13-cv-03757 (N.D. Cal. May 20, 2014)
2009	May 18, 2021 Deposition Transcript of Robert Murphy

All citations to specific pages of exhibits follow the pagination added to those exhibits per 37 C.F.R. § 42.63(d)(2)(i).

All emphases are added unless otherwise indicated.

This paper includes color illustrations and should be viewed in color.

## I. Introduction

Neither Petitioner's ("Qualcomm's") original Petition evidence nor the new Reply evidence demonstrate that U.S. Patent No. 5,600,605 to Schaefer ("Schaefer") discloses a memory that provides a non-interruptible burst, as required by all challenged claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,651,134 ("the '134 Patent"-Ex-1001).

Even Mr. Murphy, Qualcomm's expert, admits that Schaefer discloses *interrupting bursts* before a burst has been completed using a variety of burst termination options. For example, Mr. Murphy admitted that Schaefer discloses a BURST TERMINATE command, a PRECHARGE command, or a new READ or WRITE command. *See e.g.*, Ex-2009, 118:14-22.

Because Qualcomm cannot dispute Schaefer's explicit teaching of multiple options for interrupting a burst before completion, Qualcomm instead manufactures a scenario based on Schaefer's AUTO-PRECHARGE command according to which Schaefer prevents interruptions of a burst during the entire length of the burst.

But, as was explained in the Patent Owner's Response ("POR") and is further explained herein, Qualcomm continues to misread or mischaracterize Schaefer, which discloses prohibiting user commands *only during the time necessary to perform and complete a precharge operation* and to argue that the prohibition on issuing user commands applies to the entire burst transfers as well. But Schaefer's disclosure is clear—and Qualcomm runs away from it. Schaefer explicitly defines

when the precharge operation is initiated and until when the used is prohibited from issuing another command, i.e., until the precharge time is completed:

The AUTO-PRECHARGE command insures that *the precharge is initiated at the earliest, valid stage within a burst cycle*. The user is not allowed to issue another command until the precharged time ( $t_{RP}$ ) is completed.

Ex-1017, 7:40-44.

That is, the prohibition of issuing another command is limited to the precharged time ( $t_{RP}$ ). Accordingly, before the precharge has been initiated, *the user can issue another command*, which would interrupt the existing burst. Neither Qualcomm nor Mr. Murphy dispute that the issuance of another command would interrupt the existing burst. Because Qualcomm cannot get away from this reality, the Reply resorts in mischaracterizations of Monterey's arguments, Dr. Brogioli's testimony, and Schaefer's disclosures, in an apparent attempt to create distraction and confusion. But these attempts cannot and should not derail the focus from Schaefer's explicit disclosure that bursts are interruptible, except only during precharge.

## **II. Schaefer Does Not Disclose “Wherein Said Generation Of Said Predetermined Number Of Internal Address Signals Is Non-interruptible”**

Schaefer does not disclose the “wherein said generation of said predetermined number of internal address signals is non-interruptible” limitation recited by

# 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.