

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

MERCEDES-BENZ USA, LLC,

Petitioner,

v.

DAEDALUS PRIME LLC,

Patent Owner.

---

Case No.: IPR2023-01333

U.S. Patent No. 10,049,080

---

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>I.</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENTS..</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>II.</b>	<b>BACKGROUND, THE '080 PATENT, AND CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>A.</b>	<b>Background .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>B.</b>	<b>The '080 Patent .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>C.</b>	<b>The Challenged Claims .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>D.</b>	<b>Claim Construction and the Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art .....</b>	<b>10</b>
	1. Operating System .....	12
<b>E.</b>	<b>The IPR Petition.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>III.</b>	<b>THE PETITION FAILS TO DEMONSTRATE THAT ANY CHALLENGED CLAIM IS UNPATENTABLE .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>A.</b>	<b>Sutardja Fails to Teach or Suggest the Invention Recited in the Challenged Independent Claims .....</b>	<b>17</b>
	1. Sutardja '748.....	17
	2. Sutardja '785.....	19
	3. Sutardja does not teach or suggest an operating system executing on a multi-core processor to monitor a demand for the multi-core processor and control power management hardware based on the demand, as claimed .....	20
<b>B.</b>	<b>Claims Depending from Claims 1, 9, and 17 are Not Obvious in View of Sutardja.....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>C.</b>	<b>The Remaining Challenges that Rely on Sutardja as a Primary Reference Likewise Fail .....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>D.</b>	<b>Mathieson-Sutardja Fails to Teach or Suggest the Invention Recited in the Challenged Independent Claims .....</b>	<b>31</b>

1.	Overview of Mathieson .....	31
2.	Mathieson-Sutardja does not teach or suggest an operating system executing on a multi-core processor to monitor a demand for the multi-core processor and control power management hardware based on the demand, as claimed.....	34
3.	Mathieson-Sutardja does not teach or suggest a first plurality of cores and a second plurality of cores that support a same instruction set, wherein the second plurality of cores consume less power, for a same applied operating frequency and supply voltage, than the first plurality of cores, as claimed.....	38
4.	The Challenged Dependent Claims are Also Not unpatentable in View of Mathieson-Sutardja .....	43
<b>E.</b>	<b>The Remaining Challenges that Rely on Mathieson-Sutardja Likewise Fail.....</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>IV.</b>	<b>CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>44</b>

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### CASES

<i>ACTV, Inc. v. Walt Disney Co.</i> , 346 F.3d 1082 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	11
<i>Arendi S.A.R.L. v. Apple Inc.</i> , 832 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	21
<i>CFMT, Inc. v. Yieldup Intern. Corp.</i> , 349 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	passim
<i>Dynamic Drinkware, LLC v. Nat’l Graphics, Inc.</i> , 800 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	45
<i>Harmonic Inc. v. Avid Tech., Inc.</i> , 815 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	44
<i>Hartness Int’l. Inc. v. Simplimatic Engineering Co.</i> , 819 F.2d 1100 (Fed. Cir. 1987).....	29, 30, 43, 44
<i>In re Gordon</i> , 733 F.2d 900 (Fed. Cir. 1984).....	16
<i>In re Magnum Oil Tools Int’l, Ltd.</i> , 829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	45
<i>In re Peterson</i> , 315 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	16
<i>In re Ratti</i> , 270 F.2d 810 (CCPA 1959) .....	15
<i>In re Warner</i> , 379 F.2d 1011 (CCPA 1967) .....	15
<i>Intelligent Bio-Sys., Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd.</i> , 821 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	15

<i>KSR Int'l v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	15, 16, 20
<i>Nidec Motor Corp. v. Zhongshan Broad Ocean Motor Co. Ltd.</i> , 868 F.3d 1013 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	11
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	10, 11
<i>SAS Inst. Inc. v. Iancu</i> , 138 S. Ct. 1348 (2018).....	14, 15
<i>Takeda Chem. Indus., Ltd. v. Alphapharm Pty, Ltd.</i> , 492 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	20
<i>Vitronics Corp. v. Conceptronic, Inc.</i> , 90 F.3d 1576 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....	11

**REGULATIONS**

37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(4) .....	28, 38
--------------------------------	--------

**OTHER AUTHORITIES**

<i>Changes to the Claim Construction Standard for Interpreting Claims in Trial Proceedings Before the Patent Trial and Appeal Board</i> , 83 Fed. Reg. 51,340 (Oct. 11, 2018) .....	10
--	----

# 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.