

EXHIBIT 8



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/459,797	06/12/2003	Mark M. Leather	00100.02.0053	4148
29153 7590 08/28/2007 ADVANCED MICRO DEVICES, INC. C/O VEDDER PRICE KAUFMAN & KAMMHOLZ, P.C. 222 N.LASALLE STREET CHICAGO, IL 60601			EXAMINER HSU, JONI	
			ART UNIT 2628	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 08/28/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/459,797

Applicant(s)

LEATHER ET AL.

Examiner

Joni Hsu

Art Unit

2628

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on June 7, 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 10-22, 24 and 25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 10-22, 24 and 25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/27/07</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Application/Control Number: 10/459,797
Art Unit: 2628

Page 2

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on July 27, 2007 was filed after the mailing date of the application on June 12, 2003. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments, see pages 8-11, filed June 7, 2007, with respect to the claim objection and the 35 U.S.C. 101 rejections have been fully considered and are persuasive. The objection to Claim 25 and the 35 U.S.C. 101 rejections of Claims 20-22 have been withdrawn.

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7, 10-22, 24, and 25 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

4. Applicant's arguments, see pages 12-13, filed June 7, 2007, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-5, 7, 10, 12-16, 18, 20-22, 24, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and claims 6, 11, 17, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Perego (US006864896B2).

5. Applicant argues that Kelleher (US005794016A) does not teach "a memory controller coupled to the at least two graphics pipelines, operative to transfer pixel data between each of a first pipeline and a second pipeline and a memory" (pages 12-13).

In reply, new grounds of rejection are made in view of Perego.

Application/Control Number: 10/459,797

Page 3

Art Unit: 2628

6. As per Claim 25, Applicant argues that Kelleher teaches that each block is square. Since Kelleher does not teach any blocks that are not square, and therefore does not teach a region that includes NxM number of pixels (page 14).

In reply, the Examiner points out that Claim 25 does not recite that N is not equal to M. Therefore, N can be equal to M. New grounds of rejection are made in view of Perego, which more clearly teaches Applicant's disclosed invention. Even if N does not equal to M, Perego teaches that each region is rectangular (c. 5, ll. 23-25).

7. Applicant's arguments filed June 7, 2007 with respect to Claim 24 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

8. As per Claim 24, Applicant argues that Kelleher discloses multiple processors 20, each of which may have its own front end circuitry and a scan converter. Kelleher does not disclose a first and a second scan converter both coupled to the front end circuitry (pages 13-14).

In reply, Examiner disagrees. Kelleher teaches first and second scan converter (update stage, Fig. 7 in 20A and 20B, Fig. 3) both coupled to front end circuitry 14 (c.8, ll. 32-c. 9, ll. 4).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

10. Claims 1-4, 7, 10, 12, 14, 20-22, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Perego (US006864896B2).

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.