

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

INTELLECTUAL VENTURES MANAGEMENT, LLC
Petitioner

v.

XILINX, INC.
Patent Owner

Case IPR2012-00020
Patent 8,058,897

Before SALLY C. MEDLEY, KARL D. EASTHOM, and
JUSTIN T. ARBES, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

MEDLEY, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION
Institution of *Inter Partes* Review
37 C.F.R. § 42.108

Intellectual Ventures Management, LLC (IVM) filed a petition to institute an *inter partes* review of U.S. Patent 8,058,897 (the “897 patent”) on the basis that claims 1-9 and 12-14 are unpatentable. 35 U.S.C. § 311 *et seq.* (Paper 5). Patent Owner Xilinx, Inc. filed a preliminary response to the petition. (Paper 10). For the

Case IPR2012-00020
Patent 8,058,897

reasons that follow, the Board, acting on behalf of the Director, has determined to institute an *inter partes* review under the terms set forth herein.

BACKGROUND

IVM challenges claims 1-9 and 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). (Paper 5). The Petition is GRANTED as to claims 1-9 and 12-14 on the grounds explained herein.

The '897 Patent (Ex. 1001)

The '897 patent, entitled "Configuration of a Multi-Die Integrated Circuit," issued on November 15, 2011 based on Application 12/825,286, filed June 28, 2010.

The '897 patent generally relates to the configuration of an integrated circuit (IC) that includes multiple dies, such as a master die and a slave die. The '897 patent describes that a master die of an integrated circuit (IC) receives configuration data for both the master and slave dies. The master and slave segment of the configuration data can be determined and the slave segment of the configuration data can be distributed to the slave die of the IC. (Ex. 1001, Col. 2:5-15). The '897 patent also describes sending configuration data from the master die of a first IC to a second IC. (Ex. 1001, Col. 7:45-60).

Exemplary Claims

Of the claims challenged, claims 1 and 8 are the only independent claims. Claims 2-7 depend directly from claim 1 and claims 9 and 12-14 depend directly from claim 8. Claims 1 and 8 are reproduced here:

1. A method of configuring an integrated circuit (IC), the method comprising:

receiving configuration data within a master die of a first IC,
wherein the first IC comprises the master die and a slave die;

determining a master segment and a slave segment of the
configuration data, wherein the master segment specifies a master die
circuit design to be implemented within the master die and the slave
segment specifies a slave die circuit design to be implemented within
the slave die;

distributing the slave segment of the configuration data to the slave
die of the first IC,

determining, within the master die, whether configuration data
comprises a segment of configuration data for a second IC; and

responsive to determining that the configuration data comprises a
segment of configuration data for the second IC, sending the segment
of the configuration data to the second IC.

8. An integrated circuit (IC) comprising:

an interposer comprising a configuration bus;

a first die on a surface of the interposer;

a second die on the surface of the interposer,

wherein the first die and the second die are coupled by the
configuration bus,

wherein the first die is configured, responsive to receiving
configuration data, to determine a first segment and a second segment
of the configuration data and distribute the second segment of the

configuration data to the second die through the configuration bus,

wherein the first die comprises a configuration data output coupled to an output of the IC, and responsive to determining that the configuration data comprises a segment of configuration data for the additional IC, the first die is configured to send the segment of configuration data for the additional IC through the first die configuration data output.

The Prior Art

IVM relies on the following prior art:

U.S. Patent 7,397,272 , Jul. 8, 2008 (“Wennekamp”) (Ex. 1009);

U.S. Patent 7,827,336, Nov. 2, 2010 (“Miller”) (Ex. 1010);

U.S. Patent 7,671,624, Mar. 2, 2010 (“Walstrum”) (Ex. 1011);

U.S. Patent 7,702,893, Apr. 20, 2010 (“Rally”) (Ex. 1012); and

U.S. Patent 6,730,540, May 4, 2004 (“Siniaguine”) (Ex. 1013).

The Asserted Grounds

IVM challenges the patentability of ’897 patent claims 1-9 and 12-14 on the following grounds:

- 1) Claims 1-7 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Wennekamp;
- 2) Claims 1 and 8 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Wennekamp in view of Miller;
- 3) Claims 1 and 8 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Wennekamp in view of Walstrum;

- 4) Claims 12-14 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Wennekamp in view of either Miller or Walstrum;
- 5) Claims 1-3 and 5-7 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Rally;
- 6) Claims 1 and 8 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Rally in view of Miller;
- 7) Claims 1 and 8 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Rally in view of Walstrum;
- 8) Claims 13 and 14 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Rally in view of either Miller or Walstrum; and
- 9) Claim 9 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Wennekamp or Rally in view of either Miller or Walstrum further in view of Siniaguine.

ANALYSIS

Claim Interpretation

Consistent with the statute and the legislative history of the America Invents Act (AIA), the Board interprets claims using “the broadest reasonable construction in light of the specification of the patent in which it appears. 37 C.F.R. § 100(b); *see also* Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 *Fed. Reg.* 48756, 48766 (Aug. 14, 2012). There is a “heavy presumption” that a claim term carries its ordinary and customary meaning. *CCS Fitness, Inc. v. Brunswick Corp.*, 288 F.3d 1359, 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2002). However, claims “must be read in view of the specification. . . . [T]he specification is always highly relevant to the claim construction analysis.

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.