

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

NVIDIA CORPORATION,  
Petitioner,

v.

POLARIS INNOVATIONS LIMITED,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2017-00382  
Patent 7,124,325 B2

---

Before SALLY C. MEDLEY, BARBARA A. PARVIS, and  
WILLIAM M. FINK, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

PARVIS, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

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

## I. INTRODUCTION

NVIDIA Corporation (“Petitioner”) filed a Petition for *inter partes* review of claims 1–20 (“the challenged claims”) of U.S. Patent No. 7,124,325 B2 (Ex. 1001, “the ’325 Patent”). Paper 2 (“Pet.”). Polaris Innovations Limited (“Patent Owner”) filed a Preliminary Response. Paper 7 (“Prelim. Resp.”).

We apply the standard set forth in 35 U.S.C. § 314(a), which requires demonstration of “a reasonable likelihood that the petitioner would prevail with respect to at least 1 of the claims challenged in the petition.” Upon consideration of the Petition and Preliminary Response, we conclude the information presented does not show there is a reasonable likelihood that Petitioner would prevail in establishing the unpatentability of the challenged claims of the ’325 Patent. Accordingly, we do not institute an *inter partes* review.

### A. *Related Matters*

The parties state that the ’325 Patent is the subject of a pending lawsuit that includes assertions against Petitioner. Pet. 93; Paper 4 (“Patent Owner’s Initial Mandatory Notices”), 2–3. Patent Owner identifies a lawsuit pending in the Northern District of California, i.e., *Polaris Innovations Ltd. v. Dell Inc.*, Case No. 4:16–cv-07005 (N.D. Cal.).<sup>1</sup> Patent Owner’s Initial Mandatory Notices, 2–3.

---

<sup>1</sup> This lawsuit is referred to herein as the “companion district court lawsuit.” The companion district court lawsuit was transferred from the United States District Court for the Western District of Texas on December 5, 2016. *Id.* That case was *Polaris Innovations Ltd. v. Dell Inc.*, Case No. 5:16–cv-00451 (W.D. Tex). Pet. 93; Patent Owner’s Initial Mandatory Notices, 2.



in test apparatus 2. *Id.* at 8:8–9. Control path 34 connects test apparatus 2 to trimming register 14. *Id.* at 8:10–11.

*C. Illustrative Claim*

Petitioner challenges claims 1–20 of the '325 Patent. Pet. 1. Claims 1 and 14 are independent claims. Claims 2–13 and 15–20 depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1 or 14. Independent claim 1, reproduced below, is illustrative of the claimed subject matter:

1. A method for trimming interface devices, which comprises:
  - providing a semiconductor device having a plurality of interface devices and providing each one of the plurality of interface devices with a settable control element;
  - providing a test apparatus having a current source;
  - connecting the current source in the test apparatus to an interface connection on the semiconductor device, the interface connection being connected to one of the plurality of interface devices;
  - controlling a measurement current produced by the current source and setting the control element of the one of the plurality of interface devices to an initial value;
  - providing a trimming unit in the semiconductor device;
  - using the trimming unit to acquire a measurement voltage produced by the measurement current in the one of the plurality of interface devices;
  - using the trimming unit to compare the measurement voltage with a nominal voltage;
  - based on a difference between the measurement voltage and the nominal voltage, setting the control element of the one of the plurality of interface devices to a trimming value at which the measurement voltage matches the nominal voltage; and
  - acquiring the trimming value for the control element of the one of the plurality of interface devices.

*Id.* at 8:66–9:24.

*D. Asserted Grounds of Unpatentability*

Petitioner asserts that claims 1–20 are unpatentable, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), based on the following grounds (Pet. 1):

<b>References</b>	<b>Challenged Claims</b>
Tanaka <sup>2</sup> and Ikehashi <sup>3</sup>	1–20
Garrett <sup>4</sup> and Hassoun <sup>5</sup>	1, 8–14, 16, and 17
Garrett, Hassoun, and Ishikawa <sup>6</sup>	2–7, 15, and 18–20

As support, Petitioner proffers a Declaration of Dr. Nick Tredennick, who has been retained by Petitioner for the instant proceeding.

Ex. 1002 ¶ 1–3.

II. DISCUSSION

A. *Claim Construction*

Petitioner contends “[u]nder the broadest reasonable construction, Petitioner does not submit that any claim terms require a construction at this time.” Pet. 7. Patent Owner provides proposed constructions for “interface device,” “trimming,” “DRAM,” “DDRII,” and “settable control element.” Prelim. Resp. 11–23.

---

<sup>2</sup> U.S. Patent No. 7,000,160 B2, issued Feb. 14, 2006 (Ex. 1003) (“Tanaka”).

<sup>3</sup> U.S. Patent No. 6,643,180 B2, issued Nov. 4, 2003 (Ex. 1004) (“Ikehashi”).

<sup>4</sup> U.S. Patent No. 6,556,052 B2, issued Apr. 29, 2003 (Ex. 1005) (“Garrett”).

<sup>5</sup> U.S. Patent No. 5,844,913, issued Dec. 1, 1998, (Ex. 1006) (“Hassoun”).

<sup>6</sup> U.S. Patent No. 5,991,221, issued Nov. 23, 1999 (Ex. 1007) (“Ishikawa”).

# 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.