UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

INTEL CORPORATION, Petitioner

v.

QUALCOMM INCORPORATED, Patent Owner

Patent No. 8,838,949

Case IPR2018-01334

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE BRIEF ON REMAND¹

¹ IPR2018-01335 and IPR2018-01336 have been consolidated with IPR2018-01334, and Patent Owner will file this brief only in IPR2018-01334. All citations are to IPR2018-01334 unless otherwise noted.

DOCKE.

Δ

LARM Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at <u>docketalarm.com</u>.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABI	LE OF	AUTHORITIES ii	
LIST	OF PA	ATENT OWNER EXHIBITS iii	
I.	INTR	ODUCTION1	
II.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION—"HARDWARE BUFFER"		
	A.	The '949 Patent Describes Conventional Loading Processes That Use Temporary Buffers In System Memory	
	B.	The '949 Invention's Use Of A Dedicated, Permanent Hardware Buffer Enables More Efficient Loading	
	C.	Inventor Testimony Supports Qualcomm's Construction	
	D.	Intel's Arguments Contrary To Qualcomm's Construction Are Wrong	
	E.	Intel's Proposed Construction Is Overly Broad And Does Not Capture The Scope Of The Actual Invention14	
III.	CLAIMS 1-9 AND 12 ARE NOT UNPATENTABLE		
	A.	The ISA Is Not A Permanent Buffer16	
	В.	The ISA Is Not A Dedicated Buffer Distinct From System Memory	
IV.	CLAIMS 16 AND 17		
V.	CONCLUSION		

IPR2018-01334

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

CASES

3M Innovative Props. Co. v. Avery Dennison Corp.,350 F.3d 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	15
Fantasy Sports Props., Inc. v. Sportsline.com, Inc., 287 F.3d 1108 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	10
Intel Corp. v. Qualcomm Inc., 21 F.4th 801 (Fed. Cir. 2021)	passim
Laitram Corp. v. Rexnord, Inc., 939 F.2d 1533 (Fed. Cir. 1991)	10
Salazar v. Procter & Gamble Co., 414 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	15

LIST OF PATENT OWNER EXHIBITS

Ex. 2001	Transcript of the Deposition of Dr. Bill Lin
Ex. 2002	U.S. Provisional Patent Application No. 61/324,122
Ex. 2003	Qualcomm v. Apple, Case No. 3:17-CV-1375-DMS-MDD, S.D. Cal., Transcript of Jury Trial, Day 2, Volume 2-A
Ex. 2004	Qualcomm v. Apple, Case No. 3:17-CV-1375-DMS-MDD, S.D. Cal., Transcript of Jury Trial, Day 2, Volume 2-B
Ex. 2005	Qualcomm v. Apple, Case No. 3:17-CV-1375-DMS-MDD, S.D. Cal., Transcript of Jury Trial, Day 6, Volume 6-B
Ex. 2006	Qualcomm v. Apple, Case No. 3:17-CV-1375-DMS-MDD, S.D. Cal., Transcript of Jury Trial, Day 7, Volume 7-A
Ex. 2007	Declaration of Dr. Martin Rinard
Ex. 2008	Transcript of Second Deposition of Dr. Bill Lin
Ex. 2009	Patent Owner's Demonstratives
Ex. 2010	Lin Deposition Transcript (May 5, 2022)
Ex. 2011	Oxford University Press, "A Dictionary of Computing" (6th ed.)
Ex. 2012	"Computer Architecture—A Quantitative Approach" by John L. Hennessy and David A. Patterson (5th ed.)
Ex. 2013	FIFO Architecture, Functions, and Applications (Texas Instruments, 1999)
Ex. 2014	"Computer Architecture—A Quantitative Approach" by John L. Hennessy and David A. Patterson (4th ed.)
Ex. 2015	Remand Declaration of Dr. Martin Rinard

IPR2018-01334

I. INTRODUCTION

The primary issue before the Board on remand is the meaning of the claim term "hardware buffer." Claims 1-9 of the '949 patent are directed to a multiprocessor system including "system memory and a hardware buffer for receiving an image header and at least one data segment of an executable software image." The claimed multi-processor system also includes a scatter loader controller configured "to scatter load each received data segment … directly from the hardware buffer to the system memory." Dependent claim 2 further recites that "the scatter loader controller is configured to load the executable software image directly from the hardware buffer to the system memory of the secondary processor without copying data between system memory locations on the secondary processor."

Analyzing this claim language, the Federal Circuit determined that "the meaning of 'hardware buffer' relates to the ability to move the software image 'directly' to the second processor's system memory and to avoid 'copying data between system memory locations." *Intel Corp. v. Qualcomm Inc.*, 21 F.4th 801, 810 (Fed. Cir. 2021) (hereinafter, the "Opinion"). The court further found that "because claim 1 requires both a 'system memory' and a 'hardware buffer,' there must be some distinction between those two concepts." *Id.*

The Federal Circuit determined, however, that these "conclusions from the claim language advance the claim-construction inquiry only so far." *Id.* "What is

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.