

Case IPR2021-00167
U.S. Patent No. 6,651,134

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

NANYA TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION,
NANYA TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION, U.S.A.,
and NANYA TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION DELAWARE,
Petitioner

v.

MONTEREY RESEARCH, LLC,
Patent Owner

Case IPR2021-00167

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

PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY 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. Background.....	3
A. Overview Of The '134 Patent.	3
III. Claim Construction.....	14
A. All Challenged Claims: “Non-Interruptible.”	14
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”.	15
IV. Summary Of Prior Art References	18
A. Zagar.....	19
1. Zagar Is Directed To Providing Continuous Sequential Access To A Memory Array.....	19
B. Takasugi	22
1. Takasugi Is Directed To Preventing Interruptions In Between Bursts.	22
C. Wada.....	25
1. Wada Is Directed To Preventing Interruptions In Between Bursts.	25
D. Zagar, Takasugi, and Wada Are Substantially The Same As, And Cumulative To, Cowles.....	26
V. Nanya Did Not Establish A Reasonable Likelihood Of Prevailing Against Any Claim In Ground 1.....	32
A. Zagar Does Not Disclose “ <i>wherein said generation of said predetermined number of internal address signals is non- interruptible</i> ”	32

1.	Zagar Is Directed To Providing Continuous Data Access Between Bursts, Not Non-Interruptible Bursts.....	32
2.	Zagar Discloses Terminating Bursts.....	33
B.	Zagar Does Not Teach The Means-Plus-Function Limitations Of Claim 16.	34
VI.	Nanya Did Not Establish A Reasonable Likelihood Of Prevailing Against Any Claim In Ground 2.....	36
A.	Nanya’s Proposed Combination Of Zagar And Fujioka Does Not Meet Every Limitation Of Any Challenged Claim.	36
VII.	Nanya Did Not Establish A Reasonable Likelihood Of Prevailing Against Any Claim In Ground 3.....	36
A.	Nanya’s Proposed Combination Of Zagar And Lysinger Does Not Meet Every Limitation Of Any Challenged Claim.	36
VIII.	Nanya Did Not Establish A Reasonable Likelihood Of Prevailing Against Any Claim In Ground 4.....	37
A.	Takasugi Does Not Disclose “ <i>a memory comprising a plurality of storage elements each configured to read and write data in response to an internal address signal.</i> ”	37
B.	Takasugi Does Not Disclose “ <i>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</i> ”	39
C.	Takasugi Does Not Disclose “ <i>wherein said generation of said predetermined number of internal address signals is non- interruptible</i> ”	41
1.	Takasugi Discloses Terminating Bursts	41
2.	Takasugi Is Directed To Preventing Interruptions Between Bursts.	43
D.	Takasugi Does Not Teach The Means-Plus-Function Limitations Of Claim 16.	44

IX.	Nanya Did Not Establish A Reasonable Likelihood Of Prevailing Against Any Claim In Ground 5.....	45
A.	Nanya’s Proposed Combination Of Takasugi And Fujiokia Does Not Meet Every Limitation Of Any Challenged Claim.....	45
X.	Nanya Did Not Establish A Reasonable Likelihood Of Prevailing Against Any Claim In Ground 6.....	45
A.	Nanya’s Proposed Combination Of Takasugi And Zagar Does Not Meet Every Limitation Of Any Challenged Claim.	45
XI.	Nanya Did Not Establish A Reasonable Likelihood Of Prevailing Against Any Claim In Ground 7.....	46
A.	Wada Does Not Disclose “ <i>wherein said generation of said predetermined number of internal address signals is non- interruptible</i> ”	46
1.	The Board Has Already Found That Wada Does Not Anticipate The Challenged Claims.	46
2.	Wada Is Directed To Preventing Interruptions In Between Bursts, Not Making A Burst Non-Interruptible.....	47
3.	The Burst Procedure In Wada’s Conventional And Second Embodiments May Be Terminated By Failing To Maintain The External Advance Signal.....	48
B.	Wada Does Not Teach The Means-Plus-Function Limitations Of Claim 16.	49
XII.	Nanya Did Not Establish A Reasonable Likelihood Of Prevailing Against Any Claim In Ground 8.....	50
A.	Nanya’s Proposed Combination Of Wada And Takasugi Does Not Meet Every Limitation Of Any Challenged Claim.	50
XIII.	Nanya Did Not Establish A Reasonable Likelihood Of Prevailing Against Any Claim In Ground 9.....	51
A.	Nanya’s Proposed Combination Of Wada And Zagar Does Not Meet Every Limitation Of Any Challenged Claim.	51

XIV. Nanya Did Not Establish A Reasonable Likelihood Of Prevailing Against Any Claim In Ground 10.....51

 A. Nanya’s Proposed Combination Of Wada, Zagar, and Fujioka Does Not Meet Every Limitation Of Any Challenged Claim.....51

XV. The Board Should Exercise Its Discretion To Deny Institution Of Nanya’s Petition.....52

 A. The *General Plastic* Factors Favor Denial Of Institution.....53

 1. *Factor 1: whether the same petitioner previously filed a petition directed to the same claims of the same patent.*55

 2. *Factor 2: whether at the time of filing of the first petition the petitioner knew of the prior art asserted in the second petition or should have known of it.*.....57

 3. *Factor 3: whether at the time of filing of the second petition the petitioner already received the patent owner’s preliminary response to the first petition or received the Board’s decision on whether to institute review in the first petition.*58

 4. *Factors 4 and 5: the length of time that elapsed between the time the petitioner learned of the prior art asserted in the second petition and the filing of the second petition; and whether the petitioner provides adequate explanation for the time elapsed between the filings of multiple petitions directed to the same claims of the same patent.*.....59

 5. *Factors 6 and 7: the finite resources of the Board; and the requirement under 35 U.S.C. § 316(a)(11) to issue a final determination not later than 1 year after the date on which the Director notices institution of review.*.....60

 B. The *Advanced Bionics* Factors Favor Denial Of Institution.61

 1. *Factor (a), (b), (c), and (d): Similarities and material differences in asserted art and prior art involved during examination; cumulative nature of art, extent art*

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.