Paper No. 1

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SK HYNIX INC., SK HYNIX AMERICA INC., and SK HYNIX MEMORY SOLUTIONS INC.,

Petitioners,

v.

NETLIST, INC.
Patent Owner

Patent No. 8,301,833

Issued: October 30, 2012

Filed: September 29, 2008

Inventors: Chi-She Chen, Jeffrey C. Solomon, Scott Milton, Jayesh Bhakta

Title: Non-Volatile Memory Module

Inter Partes Review No. IPR2017-00649

ETITION FOR *INTER DADTES* DEVIEW OF H.S. DATENT

PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 8,301,833 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 311-319 AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.1-.80 & 42.100-.123



TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	COMPLIANCE WITH REQUIREMENTS FOR A PETITION FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW1			
	A.	Certification the 833 Patent May Be Contested by Petitioners	1	
	В.	Fee for Inter Partes Review (§ 42.15(a))		
	C.	Mandatory Notices (37 CFR § 42.8(b))	1	
	D.	Proof of Service (§§ 42.6(e) and 42.105(a))	2	
II.	IDE	NTIFICATION OF CLAIMS BEING CHALLENGED	2	
III.	RELEVANT INFORMATION CONCERNING THE CONTESTED PATENT			
	A.	Effective Filing Date of the 833 Patent	4	
	В.	Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art	4	
	C.	The 833 Patent	5	
		1. Technical Overview	5	
		2. Relevant Prosecution History	6	
	D.	Construction of Terms Used in the Claims	8	
		1. "Operable at a Clock Frequency"	8	
IV.	OV	ERVIEW OF THE PRINCIPAL PRIOR ART	8	
	A.	U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2007/0136523 to Bonella (Ex. 1005)	8	
		1. Overview of Bonella	9	
		2. DRAM Write Buffer	11	
		3. Configurable Power Consumption	12	
	B.	U.S. Patent No. 6,026,465 to Mills (Ex. 1007)	13	
	C.	U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0212651 to Ashmore (Ex. 1008)	14	
V.	PRECISE REASONS FOR RELIEF REQUESTED1			
	A.	Claims 1-30 Are Obvious Over Bonella and Mills	14	



Petition for Inter Partes Review of U.S. Patent No. 8,301,833

VI.	CON	ICLUSION	59
		Claim 17 Is Obvious Over Bonella, Mills, with or without Ashmore, and Maeda	
	E. F.	Claim 16 Is Obvious Over Bonella, Mills, with or without Ashmore, and Klein	56
		3. Claims 10 and 26 Are Unpatentable	55
		2. Claims 9 and 25 Are Unpatentable	
		1. Claims 8 and 24 Are Unpatentable	53
	D.	Claims 8-10 and 24-26 Are Obvious Over Bonella, Mills, with or without Ashmore, and Windows 2000	53
	C.	Claims 7 and 23 Are Obvious Over Bonella, Mills, with or without Ashmore, and Larson	50
	B.	Claims 1-30 Are Obvious Over Bonella, Mills, and Ashmore	48
		16. Claim 17 Is Unpatentable	47
		15. Claim 16 Is Unpatentable	46
		14. Claims 14 and 30 Are Unpatentable	45
		13. Claims 13 and 29 Are Unpatentable	43
		12. Claims 12 and 28 Are Unpatentable	
		11. Claims 11 and 27 Are Unpatentable	
		10. Claims 10 and 26 Are Unpatentable	
		9. Claims 9 and 25 Are Unpatentable	
		8. Claims 8 and 24 Are Unpatentable	
		7. Claims 7 and 23 Are Unpatentable	
		6. Claims 6 and 22 Are Unpatentable	
		5. Claims 5 and 21 Are Unpatentable	
		3. Claims 3 and 19 Are Unpatentable4. Claims 4 and 20 Are Unpatentable	
		 Claims 2 and 18 Are Unpatentable Claims 3 and 19 Are Unpatentable 	
		1. Claims 1 and 15 Are Unpatentable	
		1 Claims 1 and 15 Ara Unnatantable	1.4



Petition for Inter Partes Review of U.S. Patent No. 8,301,833

Attachment A. Proof of Service of the Petition

Attachment B. List of Evidence and Exhibits Relied Upon in Petition



I. COMPLIANCE WITH REQUIREMENTS FOR A PETITION FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW

A. Certification the 833 Patent May Be Contested by Petitioners

Petitioners certify they are not barred or estopped from requesting *inter* partes review of U.S. Patent No. 8,301,833 ("the 833 Patent") (Ex. 1001). No Petitioner, nor any party in privity with a Petitioner, has filed a civil action challenging the validity of any claim of the 833 Patent. The 833 Patent has not been the subject of a prior *inter partes* review by any Petitioner or a privy of a Petitioner.

Petitioners also certify this petition for *inter partes* review is filed within one year of the date of service of a complaint alleging infringement of a patent – no complaint alleging infringement of the 833 Patent has been served on any Petitioner. Petitioners therefore certify this patent is available for *inter partes* review.

B. Fee for Inter Partes Review (§ 42.15(a))

The Director is authorized to charge the fee specified by 37 CFR § 42.15(a) to Deposit Account No. 50-1597.

C. Mandatory Notices (37 CFR § 42.8(b))

The real parties of interest of this petition are the Petitioners: SK hynix Inc., SK hynix America Inc. and SK hynix memory solutions Inc.



DOCKET

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.

