

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

LSI CORPORATION and AVAGO TECHNOLOGIES U.S., INC.,

Petitioners,

v.

REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA,

Patent Owner.

Case No. IPR2017-01068

Patent No. 5,859,601

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iii
EXHIBIT LISTING	vi
CHALLENGED CLAIMS	x
I. Introduction.....	1
II. Summary of the '601 Patent.....	5
A. HDD Basics	6
B. Reading Data From a Disk	9
C. Problem Addressed by the '601 Patent.....	13
D. The Beauty of the Inventive MTR Codes of the '601 Patent	18
III. Petitioners' Invalidation Grounds and Evidence	21
A. Okada.....	21
B. The Tsang Patent	29
C. Soljanin's Testimony	30
IV. Claim Construction	35
V. Okada Does Not Anticipate the Challenged Claims.....	41
A. Okada Does Not Disclose Every Element of Claim 13	42
1. Okada Does Not Disclose the <i>j</i> Constraint.....	42
2. Okada Does Not Disclose the <i>k</i> Constraint	44
B. Okada Does Not Disclose Every Limitation of Dependent Claims 14 and 17	45
VI. The Tsang Patent Does Not Anticipate the Challenged Claims	46
A. Factual Background.....	47

B.	Applicable Legal Principles.....	53
C.	The Tsang Patent Does Not Qualify as Prior Art	56
1.	Moon and Brickner Completed Their Invention Prior to Tsang’s Filing Date	56
2.	The Disclosure of MTR Codes in the Tsang Patent Was Derived From Moon and Brickner	61
D.	The Tsang Patent Cannot Anticipate Under § 102(g)	65
VII.	Conclusion	66

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>AK Steel Corp. v. Sollac & Ugine</i> , 344 F.3d 1234 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	38
<i>Apple Inc. v. Smartflash LLC</i> , CBM2015-00028, WL 3035555, (P.T.A.B. May 26, 2016) (Paper 44, “Final Written Decision”).....	33
<i>Apple, Inc. v. Motorola, Inc.</i> , No. 1-11-cv- 8540 (N.D. Ill.)	5
<i>Becton, Dickinson and Co. v. Baxter Corp. Englewood</i> , IPR2019-00119 (May 3, 2019)	4, 65
<i>Carnegie Mellon Univ. v. Marvell Tech. Grp., Ltd.</i> , 801 F.3d 1283 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	10
<i>Cooper v. Goldfarb</i> , 154 F.3d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....	54, 55
<i>In re DeBaun</i> , 687 F.2d 459 (C.C.P.A. 1982)	56
<i>Dynamic Drinkware, LLC v. Nat’l Graphics, Inc.</i> , 800 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	41, 46
<i>Enzo Biochem, Inc. v. Applera Corp.</i> , 599 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	3, 31
<i>EON Corp. v. Silver Spring Networks, Inc.</i> , 815 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	37
<i>Green Cross Corp. v. Shire Human Genetic Therapies, Inc.</i> , IPR2016-00258, 2017 WL 1096597 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 22, 2017) (Paper 89).....	46
<i>Honeywell Int’l, Inc. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n</i> , 341 F.3d 1332 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	3, 31

<i>ICU Med., Inc. v. Alaris Med. Sys.</i> , 558 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	38
<i>In re Land</i> , 368 F.3d 866 (C.C.P.A. 1966)	55, 65
<i>In re Mathews</i> , 408 F.2d 1393 (C.C.P.A. 1969)	55, 65
<i>Ocean Innovations, Inc. v. Archer</i> , 145 Fed. App'x 366 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	38
<i>Perfect Surgical Tech. Inc. v. Olympus Am., Inc.</i> , 841 F.3d 1004 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	61
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc).....	37
<i>Power Integrations, Inc. v. Fairchild Semiconductor Int'l, Inc.</i> , 711 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	37
<i>Price v. Symsek</i> , 988 F.2d 1187 (Fed. Cir. 1993).....	55, 56
<i>Regents of the Univ. of Minn. v. LSI Corp. et al.</i> , No. 5:18-cv-00821-EJD (N.D. Cal.)	2, 30, 31
<i>Renishaw PLC v. Marposs Societa'</i> <i>per Azioni</i> , 158 F.3d 1243, 1250 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	37
<i>Riverwood Int'l Corp. v. R.A. Jones & Co.</i> , 324 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	56
<i>In re Robertson</i> , 169 F.3d 743 (Fed. Cir. 1999).....	41
<i>Scott v. Finney</i> , 34 F.3d 1058 (Fed. Cir. 1994).....	59
<i>Smith & Nephew, Inc. v. ConforMIS, Inc.</i> , IPR2017-00511, 2018 WL 2972960, (P.T.A.B. June 11, 2018).....	34

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.