

EXHIBIT 1

IPR2016-01060
U.S. Patent No. 8,933,945 B2

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

UNIFIED PATENTS INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

ADVANCED SILICON TECHNOLOGIES LLC
Patent Owner

Case IPR2016-01060
U.S. Patent No. 8,933,945 B2

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE
PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.107(a)**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
I. Introduction & Summary of Arguments.....	1
II. The '945 Patent Discloses Improved Graphics Pipelines	3
III. Unified's Petition.....	7
A. The Challenged Claims	8
B. The Asserted References.....	10
1. Narayanaswami.....	10
2. Perego.....	13
3. Seiler	15
IV. The Correct Claim Construction of Material Disputed Terms.....	17
A. The Controlling Claim Construction Standard	17
B. The Only Material Claim Construction Issue Facing the Board Is The Correct Construction of "memory controller"	19
1. The correct construction of "memory controller"	19
2. Unified provides no construction for "memory controller" and no support for its application of "memory controller" to Seiler.....	20
a. Unified neither alleges nor proves that its implicit construction is the ordinary meaning of the claimed "memory controller"	21
b. Unified neither alleges nor proves that its implicit construction is some purported special definition of the claimed "memory controller".....	22
C. The Remaining Claim Construction Dispute Is Not Material and Should Not Be Decided By the Board.....	25
V. All Challenged Claims: Seiler Cannot Cure The Admitted Deficiencies Of Perego And Narayanaswami	25
A. Seiler Does Not Disclose The Claimed Memory Controller	26
B. Unified Has Failed To Identify Evidence Sufficient To Meet Its Burden Of Proving That It Would Have Been Obvious To Combine Seiler With Either Perego Or Narayanaswami.....	28

1.	Ground I: Unified Has Not Shown That It Would Have Been Obvious To Combine Seiler With Perego	29
2.	Ground II: Unified Has Not Shown That It Would Have Been Obvious To Combine Seiler With Narayanaswami	31
a.	Unified identifies no explanation for how a person of ordinary skill would have combined Seiler and Narayanaswami	33
b.	Unified fails to establish a reasonable likelihood of proving why a person of ordinary skill would have combined Narayanaswami and Seiler	35
VI.	All Challenged Claims: Unified Has Failed To Meet Its Burden Of Identifying A Pipeline “operative to process data in a dedicated tile”	37
1.	Unified Has Not Shown That Narayanswami Discloses A Pipeline “operative to process data in a dedicated tile”	38
2.	Unified Has Not Shown That Perego Discloses A Pipeline “operative to process data in a dedicated tile”	42
VII.	Dependent Claims 2 and 3: Unified Has Failed To Meet Its Burden Of Identifying “a two dimensional partitioning of memory”	44
VIII.	Conclusion	46

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**Page(s)****Cases**

<i>ACTV, Inc. v. Walt Disney Co.</i> , 346 F.3d 1082 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	22
<i>Aventis Pharma S.A. v. Hospira, Inc.</i> , 675 F.3d 1324 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	19, 23
<i>Becton, Dickinson and Co. v. One StockDug Holdings, LLC</i> , IPR2013-00235, Paper 30 (PTAB Sept. 25, 2014).....	18, 23
<i>Ericsson, Inc. v. Intellectual Ventures I LLC</i> , IPR2014-00921, Paper 8 (PTAB Dec. 16, 2014)	18, 23
<i>Hill-Rom Services, Inc. v. Stryker Corporation</i> , 755 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	18, 19, 23
<i>Hockerson-Halberstadt, Inc. v. Converse Inc.</i> , 183 F.3d 1369 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	22
<i>Intellectual Ventures Mgmt, LLC, v. Xilinx, Inc.</i> , IPR2012-00019, Paper 33 (PTAB February 10, 2014)	18
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc)	18
<i>Universal Remote Control, Inc. v. Universal Electronics, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00127, Paper 32 (PTAB June 30, 2014)	18
<i>Vivid Techs., Inc. v. Am. Sci. & Eng'g, Inc.</i> , 200 F.3d 795 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	19
<i>Wellman, Inc. v. Eastman Chem. Co.</i> , 642 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	19
<i>Wowza Media Sys., LLC v. Adobe Systems Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00054, No. 12 (PTAB Apr. 8, 2013).....	18

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.