

DOCKET NO.: 0107131.00568US2

Filed on behalf of Intel Corporation

By:

David L. Cavanaugh, Reg. No. 36,476

(David.Cavanaugh@wilmerhale.com)

Thomas E. Anderson, Reg. No. 37,063

(Tom.Anderson@wilmerhale.com)

Joseph H. Haag, Reg. No. 42,612

(Joseph.Haag@wilmerhale.com)

Evelyn C. Mak, Reg., No. 50,492

(Evelyn.Mak@wilmerhale.com)

Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP

1875 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

TEL: (202) 663-6000

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Intel Corporation
Petitioner

v.

Patent Owner of
U.S. Patent No. 8,838,949 to Gupta *et al.*

Trial No. IPR2018-01335

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF
U.S. PATENT NO. 8,838,949
UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 312 AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.104**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	MANDATORY NOTICES	2
	A. Real Party-in-Interest	2
	B. Related Matters	2
	C. Counsel.....	3
	D. Service Information.....	3
III.	CERTIFICATION OF GROUNDS FOR STANDING.....	3
IV.	OVERVIEW OF CHALLENGE AND RELIEF REQUESTED.....	4
	A. Prior Art Patents and Printed Publications.....	4
	B. Grounds for Challenge	5
V.	TECHNOLOGY BACKGROUND.....	5
	A. Multi-Processor Systems.....	5
	1. Processor-To-Processor Communications.....	5
	2. Processor Software Code	6
	3. Characteristics of Memory.....	6
	B. Storing, Loading, and Executing Processor Software Code.....	7
	1. Storing the Software Code in Memory	7
	2. Loading and Executing Multi-Segmented Software Images	7
	3. Sharing Memory in Multi-Processor Systems.....	8
	C. Boot Loading.....	9
VI.	OVERVIEW OF THE '949 PATENT	9
	A. Alleged Problem of the Prior Art.....	10
	B. Purported Solution of the '949 Patent.....	11
	C. Prosecution History of the '949 Patent	13
VII.	LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	16
VIII.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	16

A.	“image header” (claims 10 and 16).....	17
B.	Means-Plus-Function Terms (Claim 16).....	17
1.	“means for receiving at a secondary processor, from a primary processor via an inter-chip communication bus, an image header for an executable software image for the secondary processor that is stored in memory coupled to the primary processor”	18
2.	“means for processing, by the secondary processor, the image header to determine at least one location within system memory to which the secondary processor is coupled to store each data segment”.....	19
3.	“means for receiving at the secondary processor, from the primary processor via the inter-chip communication bus, each data segment”.....	20
4.	“means for scatter loading, by the secondary processor, each data segment directly to the determined at least one location within the system memory, and each data segment being scatter loaded based at least in part on the processed image header”	21
IX.	OVERVIEW OF PRINCIPAL PRIOR ART REFERENCES.....	22
A.	Svensson (Ex-1110)	22
B.	Bauer (Ex-1109).....	25
C.	Kim (Ex-1111) (Including English Translation (Ex- 1112))	26
D.	Zhao (Ex-1113)	28
X.	SPECIFIC GROUNDS FOR PETITION.....	29
A.	Ground 1: Claims 10-15 Are Rendered Obvious By The Combination Of Bauer, Svensson, And Kim.....	29
1.	Reference to “Bauer and Svensson Combined”	29
2.	Claim 10.....	31
3.	Claim 11	57
4.	Claim 12.....	60

5.	Claim 13	63
6.	Claim 14	65
7.	Claim 15	65
B.	Ground 2: Claims 16 And 17 Are Rendered Obvious By The Combination Of Bauer, Svensson, Kim, And Zhao	67
1.	Reference to “Bauer and Svensson Combined”	67
2.	Claim 16	67
3.	Claim 17	77
XI.	CONCLUSION	77

Petitioner Intel Corporation respectfully requests *Inter Partes* Review of claims 10-17 of U.S. Patent No. 8,838,949 (the “’949 patent”) (Ex-1101) pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §§ 311-319 and 37 C.F.R. § 42.1 *et seq.*

I. INTRODUCTION

The ’949 patent discloses a particular technique for “scatter loading” an executable software image from a primary processor to a secondary processor in a multi-processor system. The general concept of scatter loading a software image and the specific details proposed by the ’949 patent, however, were neither novel nor non-obvious at the time of the purported invention. This Petition presents two key pieces of prior art—Bauer and Kim—that were not before the Patent Office during prosecution and that disclose exactly what the Examiner found missing from the prior art of record.

The Patent Owner obtained the ’949 patent only by adding claim limitations to distinguish a prior art Svensson PCT reference. The Patent Owner argued that Svensson PCT did not disclose a secondary processor that (1) received separately an image header and data segments of a software image; and (2) scatter loaded each data segment directly from the secondary processor’s hardware buffer to its system memory based on the image header. This Petition explains how Bauer and Kim disclose these two alleged points of novelty of the ’949 patent.

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.