



## 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	04/05/2011
ADVANCED MICRO DEVICES, INC.		
C/O VEDDER PRICE P.C.		
222 N.LASALLE STREET		
CHICAGO, IL 60601		

  

EXAMINER	
HSU, JONI	

  

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2628	

  

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/05/2011	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.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/459,797  
Filing Date: June 12, 2003  
Appellant(s): LEATHER ET AL.

Christopher J. Reckamp

---

For Appellant

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

Page 2

### **EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

This is in response to the appeal brief filed February 22, 2011 appealing from the Office action mailed April 22, 2010.

#### **(1) Real Party in Interest**

The examiner has no comment on the statement, or lack of statement, identifying by name the real party in interest in the brief.

#### **(2) Related Appeals and Interferences**

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

#### **(3) Status of Claims**

The following is a list of claims that are rejected and pending in the application:

Claims 1-7, 10-22, 24 and 25 are pending and stand rejected.

#### **(4) Status of Amendments After Final**

The examiner has no comment on the appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief.

#### **(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter**

The examiner has no comment on the summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief.

#### **(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal**

The examiner has no comment on the appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal. Every ground of rejection set forth in the Office action from which the

Application/Control Number: 10/459,797

Page 3

Art Unit: 2628

appeal is taken (as modified by any advisory actions) is being maintained by the examiner except for the grounds of rejection (if any) listed under the subheading “WITHDRAWN REJECTIONS.” New grounds of rejection (if any) are provided under the subheading “NEW GROUNDS OF REJECTION.”

### **(7) Claims Appendix**

The examiner has no comment on the copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the appellant’s brief.

### **(8) Evidence Relied Upon**

6,570,579	MACINNIS	5-2003
6,864,896	PEREGO	3-2005
5,794,016	KELLEHER	8-1998
6,778,177	FURTNER	8-2004
5,905,506	HAMBURG	5-1999
2003/0164830	KENT	9-2003

### **(9) Grounds of Rejection**

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

#### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

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

Page 4

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. Claims 1-4, 7, 10, 12, 14, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MacInnis (US006570579B1) in view of Perego (US006864896B2).

4. As per Claim 1, MacInnis teaches a graphics processing circuit, comprising: a graphics pipeline (58, Fig. 2) on a chip (10); a memory controller (54) on the chip (10), as shown in Fig. 2 (col. 4, lines 65-67; col. 5, lines 36-41), in communication with the graphics pipeline (58), operative to transfer pixel data between the pipeline (58) and a memory (col. 6, lines 10-13, 59-66).

However, MacInnis does not teach at least two graphics pipelines on the same chip operative to process data in a corresponding set of tiles of a repeating tile pattern corresponding to screen locations, a respective one of the at least two graphics pipelines operative to process data in a dedicated tile; wherein the repeating tile pattern includes a horizontally and vertically repeating pattern of square regions. However, Perego teaches graphics processing circuit (300, Fig. 3; col. 3, lines 61-63) having at least 2 graphics pipelines (312) operative to process data in corresponding set of tiles of repeating tile pattern corresponding to screen locations, respective one of at least 2 graphics pipelines operative to process data in dedicated tile (col. 5, lines 19-27, 38-44); and memory controller (310, Fig. 3) in communication with at least 2 graphics pipelines

# 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.