

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

INTEL CORPORATION,  
Petitioner,

v.

QUALCOMM INCORPORATED,  
Patent Owner.

---

IPR2018-01334  
U.S. Patent No. 8,838,949

---

**PETITIONER'S OPENING BRIEF ON REMAND<sup>1</sup>**

---

<sup>1</sup> IPR2018-01335 and IPR2018-01336 have been consolidated with IPR2018-01334, and Petitioner will file this brief only in IPR2018-01334. All citations are to IPR2018-01334 unless otherwise noted.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. INTRODUCTION .....1

II. STATEMENT OF FACTS AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY .....2

    A. “Hardware Buffer” Limitation .....2

    B. Means-Plus-Function Limitations .....3

    C. Issues On Remand .....4

III. ARGUMENT .....5

    A. “Hardware Buffer” Should Be Given The Broadest Reasonable Interpretation Supported By The Intrinsic Record.....5

        1. Petitioner’s proposed claim construction is consistent with the Federal Circuit’s opinion and the claim language. ....5

        2. The specification supports Petitioner’s proposed claim construction. ....7

        3. The prosecution history supports Petitioner’s proposed claim construction. ....11

    B. The Intermediate Storage Area Of Bauer And Svensson Is A “Hardware Buffer.” .....13

    C. Claims 16 And 17 Are Obvious In Light Of The Proposed Prior Art Or, At The Very Least, Indefinite.....17

        1. The Board should find claims 16-17 unpatentable. ....18

        2. If the Board finds it is logically impossible to render a decision on patentability of claims 16-17, it should find that it is impossible to reach a decision on the merits. ....20

IV. CONCLUSION.....20

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

Page(s)

**CASES**

*Intel Corp. v. Qualcomm Inc.*, 21 F.4th 801 (Fed. Cir. 2021)  
..... 4, 5, 6, 12, 18, 19, 20

*Nidec Motor Corp. v. Zhongshan Broad Ocean Motor Co.*, 868 F.3d  
1013 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....19

**STATUTES, RULES, AND REGULATIONS**

83 Fed. Reg. 51,340 (Oct. 11, 2018).....5

35 U.S.C. § 103 .....2

..

## I. INTRODUCTION

This consolidated *Inter Partes Review* proceeding is before the Board on remand from the Federal Circuit. In its Final Written Decision, the Board found claims 10, 11, 13-15, and 18-23 of U.S. Patent No. 8,838,949 (“the ’949 patent”) obvious but held that Petitioner had not proven by a preponderance of the evidence that claims 1-9, 12, 16, and 17 were unpatentable. The Board found that “hardware buffer” ““should not be read so broadly as to encompass’ the use of a temporary buffer” (FWD (Paper 30) at 17) and claims 1-9 and 12 were not obvious under that negative construction. The Board also declined to determine whether there was structure corresponding to the mean-plus-function terms of claims 16 and 17. Instead, it found that Petitioner failed to carry its burden of providing adequate evidence of the corresponding structure.

On appeal, the Federal Circuit remanded, instructing the Board to properly construe “hardware buffer,” determine whether claims 1-9 and 12 are obvious under that construction, and determine whether the Board can resolve the prior art challenge to the patentability of claims 16 and 17 despite the potential indefiniteness of the means-plus-function terms or whether the terms are indefinite and it is impossible to adjudicate the prior art challenge on its merits. Petitioner asks the Board to (1) adopt its proposed claim construction for “hardware buffer”; (2) hold claims 1-9 and 12 unpatentable under this construction; and (3) find claims 16 and 17

obvious and/or indefinite.

## II. STATEMENT OF FACTS AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

In July 2018, Petitioner filed these Petitions challenging all claims of the '949 patent as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on four references, two of which are discussed here: Bauer (Ex. 1009) and Svensson (Ex. 1010).

The '949 patent claims to solve certain inefficiencies in prior art multi-processor systems by allowing data to be loaded to a secondary processor's system memory without copying the entire software image from a buffer. Ex. 1001 ('949 patent) at 9:42-56. However, the system and methods of the '949 patent were routine and well-known in the prior art. Multi-processor systems and the direct transfer of data between processors were disclosed in multiple prior art references, some of which were not before the Patent Office during the original prosecution.

### A. "Hardware Buffer" Limitation

Petitioner did not originally propose a claim construction for the term "hardware buffer," but argued that the "intermediate storage area" ("ISA") in Bauer and Svensson is a "hardware buffer" under the term's plain meaning and the broadest reasonable interpretation standard that applies here. *See* Petition (Paper 3) at 26-27; IPR2018-01335 Petition (Paper 3) at 61-62. In its Institution Decision, the Board agreed that Bauer and Svensson's ISA is a "hardware buffer" because "[t]he intermediate storage area of Bauer and Svensson is a buffer used to store data destined for another

# 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.