UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLIED MATERIALS, INC., Petitioner

v.

OCEAN SEMICONDUCTOR LLC,

Patent Owner

IPR2021-01342 Patent No. 6,968,248

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

Under 35 U.S.C. § 42.120

Mail Stop PATENT BOARD
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
Submitted Electronically via PTAB E2E



TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION1
II. APPLICABLE LEGAL PRINCIPLES
A. Obviousness Under 35 U.S.C. § 103
III. THE PETITION'S SOLE ASSERTED GROUND OF UNPATENTABILITY FAILS: CLAIMS 1-22 OF THE '248 PATENT ARE NOT OBVIOUS OVER SCHULZE IN VIEW OF GUPTA
A. Overview of the '248 Patent
B. Claim Construction
C. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art
D. Neither Schulze nor Gupta Teaches or Discloses the Claimed "Software Scheduling Agent" as Recited in Claims 1 and 14 of the '248 Patent
1. Schulze Does Not Disclose an Integrated, Automated Process Flow8
2. Schulze Does Not Disclose a Software Scheduling Agent
3. Gupta Does Not Teach or Disclose a Software Scheduling Agent16
E. Gupta Does Not Disclose an Integrated, Globally-Reactive Scheduling System and, Thus, Does Not Teach a Central Limitation of Claims 1 and 14 of the '248 Patent
F. There Was No Reason for a POSITA To Combine Schulze and Gupta at the Time of the '248 Patent
G. Claims 2-13 and 16-22 All Depend From Claims 1 and 14 and, Thus, Schulze and Gupta Do Not Teach Central Limitations of These Claims As Well
IV CONCLUSION



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page	e(s)
Cases	
Apple Inc. v. Contentguard Holdings, Inc., IPR2015-00442, Paper 9 (PTAB July 13, 2015)	3, 4
Comaper Corp v. Antec, Inc., 596 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	15
Graham v. John Deere Co., 383 U.S. 1 (1966)	3
In re Anova Hearing Labs, Inc., 809 Fed. Appx. 840 (Fed. Cir. 2020)	31
<i>In re Bigio</i> , 381 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	15
In re Magnum Oil Tools Int'l., 829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	3
In re NTP, Inc., 654 F.3d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	5
In re Omeprazole Patent Litig. v. Apotex Corp., 536 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	4
In re Stepan Co., 868 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	4
In re Suitco Surface, Inc., 603 F.3d 1255 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	22
Innogenetics, N.V. v. Abbott Labs, 512 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	31
InTouch Techs., Inc. v. VGo Communs., Inc., 751 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	4
KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. 398 (2007)	5



Optimumpath, LLC v. Belkin Int'l, Inc., No. C 09-01398 CW, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 41634 (N.D. Cal. April 12, 2011)	25
Ortho-McNeil Pharm. v. Mylan Labs,	23
520 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	4
<i>P&G v. Teva Pharms. USA, Inc.</i> , 566 F.3d 989 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	4
Unigene Labs., Inc. v. Apotex, Inc., 655 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	3
Wyers v. Master Lock Co., 616 F.3d 1231 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	15
Zscaler, Inc. v. Symantec Corporation et al., IPR2018-00806 (PTAB Oct. 4, 2018)	25
Regulations	
37 C F R & 42 120	1



LIST OF EXHIBITS RELIED ON

Exhibit	Description
2001	Ocean Semiconductor LLC v. MediaTek Inc., et al., No. 6:20-cv-1210-
	ADA, D.I. 32, Scheduling Order
2002	Ocean Semiconductor LLC v. NVIDIA Corporation, No. 6:20-cv-1211-
	ADA, D.I. 32, Scheduling Order
2003	Ocean Semiconductor LLC v. NXP USA, Inc., No. 6:20-cv-1212-ADA,
	D.I. 34, Scheduling Order
2004	Ocean Semiconductor LLC v. Renesas Electronics Corp. et al., No.
	6:20-cv-1213-ADA, D.I. 43, Scheduling Order
2005	Ocean Semiconductor LLC v. Silicon Labs Inc., No. 6:20-cv-1214-
	ADA, D.I. 31, Scheduling Order
2006	Ocean Semiconductor LLC v. STMicroelectronics Inc., No. 6:20-cv-
	1250-ADA, D.I. 34, Scheduling Order
2007	Ocean Semiconductor LLC v. Western Digital Techs Inc., No. 6:20-cv-
	1216-ADA, D.I. 34, Scheduling Order
2008	Ocean Semiconductor LLC v. Huawei Device USA Inc., No. 4:20-cv-
	991-ALM, D.I. 22, Scheduling Order
2009	Ocean Semiconductor LLC v. Western Digital Techs Inc., No. 6:20-cv-
	1216-ADA, D.I. 1, Complaint
2010	Ocean Semiconductor LLC v. STMicroelectronics Inc., No. 6:20-cv-
	1250-ADA, D.I. 1, Complaint
2011	Ocean Semiconductor LLC v. Silicon Labs Inc., No. 6:20-cv-1214-
	ADA, D.I. 1, Complaint
2012	Ocean Semiconductor LLC v. Renesas Electronics Corp. et al., No.
	6:20-cv-1213-ADA, D.I. 1, Complaint
2013	Ocean Semiconductor LLC v. NXP USA, Inc., No. 6:20-cv-1212-ADA,
• • • • •	D.I. 1, Complaint
2014	Ocean Semiconductor LLC v. NVIDIA Corporation, No. 6:20-cv-1211-
2015	ADA, D.I. 1, Complaint
2015	Ocean Semiconductor LLC v. MediaTek Inc., et al., No. 6:20-cv-1210-
2016	ADA, D.I. 1, Complaint
2016	Ocean Semiconductor LLC v. Huawei Device USA Inc., No. 4:20-cv-
2017	991-ALM, D.I. 1, Complaint
2017	Ocean Semiconductor LLC v. Huawei Device USA Inc., No. 4:20-cv-
2010	991-ALM, D.I. 27, Order
2018	Ocean Semiconductor LLC v. MediaTek Inc., et al., No. 6:20-cv-1210-
	ADA, Notice of Electronic Filing, D.I. 20



DOCKET A L A R M

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.

