UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE —————— BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD ——————

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., Petitioner,

v.

PROMOS TECHNOLOGIES, INC., Patent Owner.

Case IPR2017-01415 Patent 6,208,574

PATENT OWNER PROMOS TECHNOLOGIES, INC.'S RESPONSE TO PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF UNITED STATES PATENT NO. 6,208,574

Mail Stop PATENT BOARD
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
United States Patent and Trademark Office
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313–1450



Case No. IPR2017-01415 Patent No. 6,208,574

TABLE OF CONTENTS

			Page(s)	
I.	INTRODUCTION			
II.	RELIEF REQUESTED			
III.	OVERVIEW OF THE '574 PATENT			
IV.	PROMOS'S PROPOSED CLAIM CONSTRUCTIONS6			
	A.	Samsung's Proposed Claim Constructions Are Unnecessary an Not Relevant to Any Issue to be Resolved by the Board		
	B.	The Construction of "Local Data Write Driver Circuit" is a "write driver circuit having definite spatial form or location"	7	
	C.	The Construction of "Local Column Read Amplifier" is a "column read amplifier having definite spatial form or location	ı"13	
V.	INOU	ERSON OF SKILL IN THE ART WOULD NOT COMBINE UE/MIN WITH HAMADE TO RENDER CLAIMS 4-18 AND OBVIOUS	14	
VI.	INOU	ERSON OF SKILL IN THE ART WOULD NOT COMBINE UE/MIN/HAMADE WITH OGAWA TO RENDER CLAIMS AND 18 OBVIOUS	18	
VII.		ERVATION OF RIGHTS REGARDING STITUTIONALITY	22	
VIII	CON	ICLUSION	23	



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)
Cases
Advanced Cardiovascular Sys., Inc. v. Medtronics, Inc., 265 F.3d 1294 (Fed. Cir. 2001)
In re: CSB-System Int'l, Inc., 832 F.3d 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2016)
<i>DePuy Spine, Inc. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc.</i> , 567 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2009)
EMI Grp. N. Am., Inc. v. Intel Corp., 157 F.3d 887 (Fed. Cir. 1998)
Fin Control Systems Pty, Ltd. v. OAM, Inc., 265 F.3d 1311 (Fed. Cir. 2001)
Inline Plastics Corp. v. Easypak, LLC, 799 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2015)
KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. 398 (2007)17
Liebel-Flarsheim Co. v. Medrad, Inc., 358 F.3d 898 (Fed. Cir. 2004)
McGinley v. Franklin Sports, Inc., 262 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2001) 17, 18, 22
MCM Portfolio LLC v. Hewlett-Packard Co., 812 F.3d 1284 (Fed. Cir. 2015)22
<i>In re: Nuvasive, Inc.</i> , 842 F.3d 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2016)
Oil States Energy Servs., LLC v. Greene's Energy Grp., LLC, No. 16-712, 2017 WL 2507340 (U.S. June 12, 2017)22



Case No. IPR2017-01415 Patent No. 6,208,574	
Phillips v. AWH Corp.,	
415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	9
ScriptPro LLC v. Innovation Assocs., Inc., 833 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	8, 11
Teleflex, Inc. v. Ficosa N. Am. Corp., 299 F.3d 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	8, 11
Wellman, Inc. v. Eastman Chem. Co., 642 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	7
Other Authorities	
Toyota Motor Corp. v. Cellport Sys., Inc., IPR2015-00633, Paper No. 11 (Aug. 14, 2015)	7



Case No. IPR2017-01415 Patent No. 6,208,574

I. INTRODUCTION

Patent Owner ProMOS Technologies, Inc. hereby responds to Samsung's Petition for *Inter Partes* Review seeking cancellation of claims 4-18, and 21-27 of U.S. Patent No. 6,208,574 (Ex. 1001).

The Board should find that all challenged claims are not invalid. For claims 4-10, 14-17, and 21-27, Samsung has combined Inoue with and Min and Hamade, and for claims 11-13 and 18 Samsung has combined Inoue with Min, Hamade, and Ogawa. The Board should reject Samsung's proffered combination of the Inoue/Min system with both Hamade and Ogawa, because each of Hamade and Ogawa are incompatible with the goals and structure disclosed by Inoue. Inoue is directed to a sense amplifier circuit designed to consume less power. Hamade describes a structure that achieves the opposite result – it achieves greater speed by adding a four-transistor drive circuit for each bit line pair, and in doing so consumes greater power. Similarly, Ogawa describes a circuit that would increase power consumption by using an additional decoder which would worsen the very problem that Inoue sought to overcome. A person of ordinary skill in the art would not combine the references in the way suggested.

In addition to its invalidity arguments, Samsung proposed a construction of the terms "local data write driver circuit" and "local column read amplifier" requiring these structures to be "associated with only one latch circuit." The Board



DOCKET

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.

