UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

XILINX, INC., Petitioner

V.

QUICKCOMPILE IP, LLC and PIXEL VELOCITY INCORPORATED, Patent Owner

PETITION FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW

OF

U.S. PATENT NO. 7,073,158



TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	MANDATORY NOTICES		
	A.	Real Party-in-Interest	1
	B.	Related Matters	1
	C.	Patent Owner	1
	D.	Lead and Back-up Counsel and Service Information	2
II.	CER	TIFICATION OF GROUNDS FOR STANDING	3
III.	OVE	RVIEW OF THE '158 Patent	3
	A.	Specification and Claims of the '158 Patent	3
	B.	Prosecution History of the '158 Patent	6
IV.	. OVE	RVIEW OF CHALLENGE AND RELIEF REQUESTED	7
	A.	Prior Art Printed Publications of the Present Petition	7
	B.	Statutory Grounds for Challenge	9
	C.	Requested Relief	10
V.	CLA	IM CONSTRUCTION	10
	A.	"analyzing"	11
VI.	. IDEN	NTIFICATION OF GROUNDS FOR PETITION	12
	A.	Ground I: Claims 1, 2, 4, 9, 16, and 18-20 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Banerjee and Benkrid	13
	B.	Ground II: Claims 3, 5, 7, and 8 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Baneriee Benkrid and Haldar	35



	C.	Ground III: Claim 6 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Banerjee, Benkrid, Haldar, and Hammes	44
	D.	Ground IV: Claims 10-13 and 17 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Banerjee, Benkrid, and AAPA	46
	E.	Ground V: Claims 14 and 15 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Banerjee, Benkrid, AAPA, and Grant	56
VII		CONCLUSION	50



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

FEDERAL CASES

Dystar Textilfarben GmbH & Co. Deutschland KG v. C.H. Patrick, 464 F.3d 1356, 1368, (Fed. Cir. 2006)37	, 57
In re GPAC Inc.,	10
57 F.3d 1573, 1579 (Fed. Cir. 1995)	12
In re Gurley,	
27 F.3d 551, 554 (Fed. Cir. 1994)	35
In re Paulsen,	
30 F.3d 1475, 1480 (Fed. Cir. 1994)	12
In re Preda,	
401 F.2d 825, 826 (CCPA 1968)	13
In re Rinehart,	
531 F.2d 1048, 1051 (CCPA 1976)12	, 52
In re Samour,	
571 F.2d 559, 562 (CCPA 1978)	12
In re Susi,	
440 F.2d 442 (CCPA 1971)	35
In re Translogic Tech., Inc.,	
504 F.3d 1249, 1257 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	, 13
KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.,	
550 U.S. 398, 406 (2007)	. 53



Medichem, S.A. v. Rolabo, S.L.,	
437 F.3d 1157, 1165 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	35
Multiform Desiccants, Inc. v. Medzam, Ltd.,	
133 F.3d 1473, 1477 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	10
Okajima v. Bourdeau,	
261 F.3d 1350, 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	12
REGULATORY CASES	
Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd. v. Va. Innov. Scis., Inc.,	
IPR2013-00569 Paper 9 at *2 (Oct. 30, 2013)	10



DOCKET A L A R M

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.

