

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLIED MATERIALS, INC.,
Petitioner

v.

OCEAN SEMICONDUCTOR LLC,
Patent Owner

Case IPR2020-01348
Patent No. 6,836,691

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.107

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. INTRODUCTION	1
II. APPLICABLE LEGAL PRINCIPLES	3
A. Discretionary Denial Under 35 U.S.C. § 314(a)	3
B. Petitioner’s Pre-Institution Burden of Proof	5
III. EACH OF THE SIX <i>FINTIV I</i> FACTORS WEIGHS STRONGLY IN FAVOR OF DENYING REVIEW UNDER SECTION 314	6
A. Eight District Court Litigations Are Pending Between Patent Owner and Third Parties That Involve the ’691 Patent	8
B. <i>Fintiv I</i> Factor 1 Favors Discretionary Denial: No Stay Motion Is Pending in EDTX and WDTX and No Evidence Exists that One May Be Entered	9
C. <i>Fintiv I</i> Factor 2 Favors Discretionary Denial: The Trial Dates in EDTX and WDTX Litigations Are Months Before the Board’s Projected Statutory Deadline For An FWD	14
D. <i>Fintiv I</i> Factor 3 Strongly Favors Discretionary Denial: There Has Been Immense Investment in the Parallel Proceedings by the Court and Non-Party Defendants	16
1. Patent Owner and Non-Party Defendants Have Expended Substantial Resources in the Parallel Proceedings	17
E. <i>Fintiv I</i> Factor 4 Strongly Favors Discretionary Denial: There Is Complete Overlap Between Issues Raised in the Petition and in the Parallel Proceedings, Including Asserted Claims, Asserted Prior Art References, and Identical Invalidity Arguments, With Non-Party Defendants Committing to Raising These Same Grounds, References, and Arguments in Parallel Proceedings	23
1. There Is Complete Overlap As to Claims and Prior Art References Raised in the Petition and in the Parallel Proceedings	24
2. There Is Complete Overlap As to Asserted Grounds and Arguments	26
3. The Non-Party Defendants in the Parallel District Court Proceedings Are Committed to Asserting the Same Prior Art References or Grounds as in This Petition	26
F. <i>Fintiv I</i> Factor 5 Favors Discretionary Denial: Petitioner Has Failed to Explain Why Addressing the Same or Substantially the Same Validity Issues In This IPR Would Not Be Duplicative of Those Involved in the Parallel District Court Proceedings	28

G. <i>Fintiv I</i> Factor 6: Other Circumstances Further Favor Non-Institution, Including the Numerous Additional Prior Art References Raised in the Parallel District Court Actions.....	29
H. Balancing the Six <i>Fintiv I</i> Factors Weighs Heavily in Favor of Denying the Petition on a Discretionary Basis	31
IV. PETITIONER FAILS TO SHOW A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT IT WOULD PREVAIL IN PROVING THE OBVIOUSNESS OF ANY CHALLENGED CLAIM.....	31
A. Petitioner Engages in Impermissible Hindsight Reconstruction by Offering Conclusory Statements in Its Effort to Show That a POSITA Would Have Known to Achieve the Desired Result of the Invention Claimed in the '691 Patent	33
B. Dr. Hatalis' Declaration Is Insufficient to Support the Petition Because It, Too, Relies on Conclusory Statements to Offer Legal Conclusions.....	40
V. CONCLUSION	42

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc.</i> , IPR2020-00019, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 20, 2020).....	4, 7, 14, 29
<i>Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc.</i> , IPR2020-00019, Paper 15 (P.T.A.B. May 13, 2020).....	5, 15, 24
<i>Cisco Sys., Inc. v. Ramot at Tel Aviv Univ. Ltd.</i> , IPR2020-00122 (P.T.A.B. May 15, 2020)	20
<i>Code200, UAB v. Luminati Networks Ltd.</i> , IPR2020-01358, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 2, 2021)	28
<i>Continental Intermodal Group - Trucking LLC v. Sand Revolution LLC et al.</i> , No. 7-18-cv-00147 (W.D. Tex. July. 22, 2020) (text order).....	12
<i>Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee</i> , 136 S. Ct. 2131 (2016).....	3
<i>Dynamic Drinkware, LLC v. Nat'l Graphics, Inc.</i> , 800 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	5
<i>Fitbit, Inc. v. Koninklijke Philips, N.V.</i> , IPR2020- 00771 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 19, 2020).....	15
<i>General Plastic Indus. Co. v. Canon Kabushiki Kaisha</i> , IPR2016-01357, Paper 19 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 6, 2017)	4
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966)	6
<i>Harmonic Inc. v. Avid Tech., Inc.</i> , 815 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	3
<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	32
<i>In re Magnum Oil Tools Int'l, Ltd.</i> , 829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	5
<i>In re Vulcan Indus. Holdings, LLC</i> , 830 F. App'x 318 (Fed. Cir. 2020).....	11
<i>Intel Corp. v. VLSI Tech. LLC</i> , IPR2020-00582 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 1, 2020).....	15

<i>Intelligent Bio-Systems, Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge, Ltd.</i> , 821 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	31
<i>Kerr Machine Co. d/b/a Kerr Pumps v. Vulcan Industrial Holdings, LLC</i> , No. 6-20-cv-00200-ADA (W. D. Tex. Aug. 2, 2020) (text order).....	11
<i>Kerr Machine Co. v. Vulcan Indus. Holdings, LLC</i> , Case No. 6:20-CV-00200-ADA, Dkt. No. 76 (W.D. Tex. Apr. 7, 2021)	10, 11, 12
<i>Kirsch Research & Dev. v. Iko Indus.</i> , No. 6:20-cv-00317-ADA, 2021 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 191684 (W.D. Tex. Oct. 4, 2021)	10
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007)	5, 32
<i>Mylan Lab. Ltd. v. Janssen Pharm. NV</i> , IPR2020-00440 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 16, 2020)	6
<i>Mylan Labs. Ltd. v. Janssen Pharmaceutica, N.V.</i> , 989 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2021).....	29
<i>Netflix, Inc. v. Uniloc 2017 LLC</i> , IPR2020-00008, Paper 13 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 13, 2020)	15
<i>Next Caller Inc. v. TRUSTID, Inc.</i> , IPR2019-00961, Paper 10 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 16, 2019).....	15
<i>Next Caller Inc. v. TRUSTID, Inc.</i> , IPR2019-00962, Paper 10 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 16, 2019).....	15
<i>NHK Spring Co., Ltd. v. Intri-Plex Techs., Inc.</i> , IPR2018- 00752, Paper 8 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 12, 2018)	4, 24
<i>Nintendo Co., Ltd. v. Gamevice, Inc.</i> , IPR2020-01197 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 12, 2021)	15
<i>PAR Pharm., Inc. v. TWI Pharm., Inc.</i> , 773 F.3d 1186 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	31
<i>Purdue Pharma L.P. v. Depomed, Inc.</i> , 643 F. App’x 960 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	32
<i>Rohm & Haas Co. v. Brotech Corp.</i> , 127 F.3d 1089 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	40
<i>SAS Inst., Inc. v. Iancu</i> , 138 S. Ct. 1348 (2018).....	3

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.