

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

**QUALCOMM INC. AND QUALCOMM TECHNOLOGIES,
INC.,**

Petitioners

v.

APPLE INC.,

Patent Owner

U.S. PATENT NO. 8,443,216

**TITLE: HARDWARE AUTOMATIC PERFORMANCE STATE
TRANSITIONS IN SYSTEM ON PROCESSOR SLEEP AND
WAKE EVENTS**

Issue Date: May 14, 2013

PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW
UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 312

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. Introduction	1
II. Mandatory Notices.....	1
A. Real Party in Interest (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1))	1
B. Related Matters (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2)).....	1
C. Lead and Back-Up Counsel and Service Information (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3) and (b)(4))	2
D. Fees (37 C.F.R. § 42.103)	2
III. Grounds for Standing Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 104(a).....	3
IV. Statement of Precise Relief Requested for Each Challenged Claim.....	3
A. 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(1): Claims for Which Review Is Requested	3
B. 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(2): Statutory Grounds and Prior Art on Which the Challenge is Based.....	3
V. Reasons for the Relief Requested Under 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.22(a)(2) and 42.104(b)(4).....	5
A. Overview of the '216 Patent and its Technology	5
B. The Prosecution History of the '812 Patent to Which the '216 Patent Claims Priority	9
C. The Prosecution History of the '216 Patent	11
D. 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(3): Claim Construction.....	11
1. A Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art	11
2. Construction of Claim Terms.....	11
E. Overview of the Prior Art.....	14
F. 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(4): How the Construed Claims are Unpatentable	24
G. 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(5): Supporting Evidence	24
VI. Claims 1–3, 6, 8–10, and 13 of the '216 Patent Are Unpatentable	25
A. Ground 1: Claims 1–3, 6, 8–10, and 13 are Anticipated by Mandelblat.....	27

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
1. Independent Claim 1	27
2. Dependent Claim 2	37
3. Dependent Claim 3	38
4. Dependent Claim 6	39
5. Independent Claim 8	40
6. Dependent Claim 9	40
7. Dependent Claim 10	41
8. Dependent Claim 13	41
B. Ground 2: Claims 1–3, 6, 8–10, and 13 are Rendered Obvious by Mandelblat in View of Kurts	41
1. Independent Claim 1	45
2. Dependent Claim 2	53
3. Dependent Claim 3	54
4. Dependent Claim 6	54
5. Independent Claim 8	55
6. Dependent Claim 9	56
7. Dependent Claim 10	56
8. Dependent Claim 13	56
C. Ground 3: Claims 1–3, 6, 8–10, and 13 Are Rendered Obvious by Kurts in view of Kang	56
1. Independent Claim 1	59
2. Dependent Claim 2	64
3. Dependent Claim 3	65
4. Dependent Claim 6	66
5. Independent Claim 8	66
6. Dependent Claim 9	67
7. Dependent Claim 10	67

..

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
8. Dependent Claim 13	67
VII. Conclusion.....	68

I. Introduction

Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 312 and 37 C.F.R. § 42.100 *et seq.*, Qualcomm Inc. and Qualcomm Technologies, Inc. (collectively, “Petitioners” or “Qualcomm”) request *inter partes* review of claims 8 and 9 (the “Challenged Claims”) of U.S. Patent No. 8,443,216 (“the ’216 Patent,” Ex. 1001), which is assigned to Apple, Inc. (“Patent Owner” or “Apple”). Because the Challenged Claims are unpatentable over the prior art, *inter partes* review should be instituted, and the Challenged Claims should be cancelled.

II. Mandatory Notices

A. Real Party in Interest (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1))

Qualcomm Inc. and Qualcomm Technologies, Inc. are the real parties-in-interest.

B. Related Matters (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2))

The ’216 Patent and its Related Patents (U.S. Pat. No. 8,271,812, the parent from which the ’216 Patent issued as a continuation, and its child U.S. Patent No. 8,656,196, which is a continuation of the ’216 Patent) are involved in the following pending litigation that may affect, or be affected by, a decision in this proceeding: Qualcomm Inc. v. Apple Inc., Case No. 3:17-cv-1375 (S.D. Cal.) (“’1375 Case”).

Petitioners are filing IPR petitions directed to the Related Patents (U.S. Pat. Nos. 8,271,812 and 8,656,196) concurrently with the filing of this petition.

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.