

**PUBLIC VERSION**

**UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION  
Washington, D.C.**

**In the Matter of**

**CERTAIN CONSUMER ELECTRONICS AND DISPLAY  
DEVICES WITH GRAPHICS PROCESSING AND  
GRAPHICS PROCESSING UNITS THEREIN**

**Inv. No. 337-TA-932**

**INITIAL DETERMINATION ON VIOLATION OF SECTION 337**

Administrative Law Judge Thomas B. Pender

(October 09, 2015)

Pursuant to the Notice of Investigation and Rule 210.42(a) of the Rules of Practice and Procedure of the United States International Trade Commission, this is my Initial Determination in the matter of *Certain Consumer Electronics And Display Devices With Graphics Processing And Graphics Processing Units Therein*, Investigation No. 337-TA-932.

*PUBLIC VERSION*

Table of Contents

I. INTRODUCTION ..... 5

    A. The Parties ..... 3

        1. Complainant ..... 3

        2. Respondents ..... 3

    B. Products at Issue ..... 4

II. JURISDICTION ..... 6

    A. Subject Matter Jurisdiction ..... 6

    B. Personal Jurisdiction ..... 6

    C. In Rem Jurisdiction ..... 7

III. RELEVANT LAW ..... 7

    A. Infringement ..... 7

        1. Claim Construction ..... 7

        2. Direct Infringement ..... 8

            a. Literal Infringement ..... 8

            b. Doctrine of Equivalents ..... 9

        3. Indirect Infringement ..... 9

    B. Invalidity ..... 10

        1. Anticipation ..... 11

        2. Obviousness ..... 11

        3. Written Description and Enablement ..... 13

    C. Domestic Industry – Technical Prong ..... 14

IV. U.S. PATENT NO. 7,209,140 ..... 15

    A. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art ..... 17

    B. Claim Construction ..... 17

        1. Order No. 20: Construing Terms of the Asserted Patents ..... 17

        2. Agreed Construction - “programmable by the user” ..... 17

        3. Disputed Constructions ..... 18

            a. “graphics data”/“operations on the graphics data” ..... 18

            b. “hardware graphics accelerator” ..... 23

            c. “reciprocal instruction” ..... 29

    C. Infringement ..... 34

    D. Domestic Industry – Technical Prong ..... 37

    E. Invalidity ..... 38

**PUBLIC VERSION**

1.	Anticipation – 35 U.S.C. 102.....	38
2.	Obviousness – 35 U.S.C. 103 .....	43
	a. Renderman on Horizon860 .....	43
	b. “C” Language on TMS34082 .....	45
3.	Inventorship – 35 U.S.C. 102(f).....	52
V.	U.S. PATENT NO. 6,690,372 .....	59
	A. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	60
	B. Claim Construction .....	60
	1. Order No. 20: Construing Terms of the Patent - “shading calculation” ...	60
	2. Disputed Term - “texture look-up module coupled to the shading module” (Claim 23) .....	61
	C. Infringement.....	71
	1. Claim 23 .....	71
	a. Sufficiency of NVIDIA’s infringement evidence.....	72
	b. Do the Accused Products have a “shading module” and a “texture look-up module” coupled to a “shading module”? .....	74
	c. Conclusion .....	81
	2. Claim 24.....	82
	D. Domestic Industry – Technical Prong.....	86
	E. Invalidity .....	87
	1. Anticipation.....	87
	a. “McCool” .....	87
	b. U.S. Patent No. 6,236,413.....	101
	c. “Ackerman” .....	108
	2. Obviousness .....	114
VI.	U.S. PATENT NO. 7,038,685 .....	114
	A. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	115
	B. Claim Construction .....	117
	1. Agreed construction - “dynamically controlling...” .....	117
	2. Disputed construction - “graphics processor” .....	117
	C. Infringement.....	123
	1. Claim 1 .....	123
	a. Mali GPUs .....	123
	b. Adreno GPUs .....	132
	2. Claim 15.....	137

*PUBLIC VERSION*

a.	Mali GPUs .....	137
b.	Adreno GPUs .....	137
D.	Domestic Industry - Technical Prong .....	138
E.	Invalidity .....	138
1.	Anticipation (35 U.S.C. § 102) – The ATI Unified Shader .....	138
a.	Conception .....	140
b.	Reduction to Practice .....	145
c.	Conclusion .....	149
2.	Obviousness – 35 U.S.C. 103 .....	149
a.	Selzer in view of Van Hook .....	157
b.	Amanatides in view of Van Hook .....	160
VII.	DOMESTIC INDUSTRY .....	162
VIII.	CONCLUSIONS OF LAW .....	164
IX.	INITIAL DETERMINATION AND ORDER .....	165

**PUBLIC VERSION**

**Table of Abbreviations**

CDX	Complainant's Demonstrative Exhibit
CIB	Complainant's Initial Post-Hearing Brief
CRB	Complainant's Reply Post-Hearing Brief
CX	Complainant's Exhibit
Dep.	Deposition
JX	Joint Exhibit
RDX	Respondent's Demonstrative Exhibit
RIB	Respondent's Initial Post-Hearing Brief
RRB	Respondent's Reply Post-Hearing Brief
RX	Respondent's Exhibit
Tr.	Transcript
DWS	Direct Witness Statement (Including Revised Direct Witness Statements)
RWS	Rebuttal Witness Statement

**I. INTRODUCTION**

Complainant NVIDIA Corporation ("NVIDIA") filed a complaint on September 4, 2014 alleging a violation of Section 337 based on infringement of seven patents: (i) U.S. Patent No. 6,198,488 ("the '488 patent"); (ii) U.S. Patent No. 6,992,667 ("the '667 patent"); (iii) U.S. Patent No. 7,209,140 ("the '140 patent"); (iv) U.S. Patent No. 6,690,372 ("the '372 patent"); (v) U.S. Patent No. 7,038,685 ("the '685 patent"); (vi) U.S. Patent No. 7,015,913 ("the '913 patent"); and (vii) U.S. Patent No. 6,697,063 ("the '063 patent"). (Compl. ¶ 5). On October 10, 2014, the Commission instituted an investigation, by publication of a notice in the *Federal Register*, to determine:

# 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.