EXHIBIT 2

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

VOLKSWAGEN GROUP OF AMERICA, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

ADVANCED SILICON TECHNOLOGIES LLC
Patent Owner

Case IPR2016-00894
U.S. Patent No. 8,933,945 B2

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

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

I. Introduction & Summary of Arguments....1
II. The '945 Patent....2
A. The '945 Patent Discloses Improved Graphics Pipelines....2
B. The Challenged Claims of the '945 Patent....7
III. The Primary Asserted References....9
A. Narayanaswami....9
B. Gove....12
IV. The Correct Claim Construction of Material Disputed Terms....15
A. The Controlling Claim Construction Standard....15
B. The Material Claim Construction Issue Facing The Board....17
1. "memory controller"....17
a. The Correct Construction Of "memory controller"....17
b. Volkswagen's Petition Depends On An Incorrect And Unsupported Construction Of "memory controller"....18
i. Volkswagen neither alleges nor proves that its construction is the ordinary meaning of the claimed "memory controller"....19
ii. Volkswagen neither alleges nor proves that its construction is some purported special definition of the claimed "memory controller"....20
2. "scan converter"....22
a. "scan converter" Should Be Construed To Have Its Ordinary Meaning....24
b. Volkswagen Failed To Argue Or Prove Any Clear And Unambiguous Special Definition Or Disavowal....27
C. The Remaining Claim Construction Dispute Is Not Material And Should Not Be Decided By The Board....29

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

V. Volkswagen's Petition Fails With Respect To All Challenged Claims 30

A. All Challenged Claims: Gove Cannot Cure Narayanaswami's Admitted Deficiencies Regarding The "Memory Controller" And "Same Chip" Limitations 30

1. Under the correct construction, Gove indisputably does not disclose the missing claimed "memory controller" 31

2. Volkswagen failed to identify evidence sufficient to meet its burden of proving that it would have been obvious to combine Gove with Narayanaswami to provide the missing "memory controller" and "same chip" 34

a. Volkswagen identifies no explanation for how a person of ordinary skill would have combined Narayanaswami and Gove 37

b. Volkswagen fails to establish a reasonable likelihood of proving why a person of ordinary skill would have combined Narayanaswami and Gove 39

B. All Challenged Claims: A Pipeline "operative to process data in a dedicated tile" 42

VI. Volkswagen's Petition Also Fails With Respect To Various Limitations Specific To Certain Challenged Dependent Claims 48

A. Dependent Claims 2 And 3: "a two dimensional partitioning of memory" 48

1. Narayanaswami teaches away from "two dimensional partitioning of memory" 49

2. Combining "two dimensional partitioning of memory" with Narayanaswami would result in an inoperable system 51

B. Dependent Claim 5: "scan converter … operative to determine the portion of the pixel data to be processed by the back end circuitry" 52

VII. Conclusion 55

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases

ACTV, Inc. v. Walt Disney Co.,
346 F.3d 1082 (Fed. Cir. 2003) 19

Ariosa Diagnostics v. Verinata Health, Inc., et al.,
IPR2013-00276, Paper 43 (PTAB Oct. 23, 2014).....36

Aventis Pharma S.A. v. Hospira, Inc.,
675 F.3d 1324 (Fed. Cir. 2012) 17, 24

In re Beasley,
117 Fed. Appx. 739 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....39

Becton, Dickinson and Co. v. One StockDuq Holdings, LLC,
IPR2013-00235, Paper 30 (PTAB Sept. 25, 2014).....*passim*

Callcopy v. Verint Americas, et al.,
IPR2013-00486, Paper 11 (PTAB Feb. 5, 2014).....35

In re Chaganti,
554 Fed. Appx. 917 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....36

Ericcson, Inc. v. Intellectual Ventures I LLC,
IPR2014-00921, Paper 8 (PTAB Dec. 16, 2014) 16, 24

Galderma Labs., L.P. v. Tolmar, Inc.,
737 F.3d 731 (Fed. Cir. 2013) 40

In re Gordon,
733 F.2d 900 (Fed. Cir. 1984) 51, 52

In re Gurley,
27 F.3d 551 (Fed. Cir. 1994) 51, 52

Hill-Rom Services, Inc. v. Stryker Corporation,
755 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2014) 16, 17, 24

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKET ALARM

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.