

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

KINGSTON TECHNOLOGY COMPANY, INC.  
Petitioner,

v.

MEMORY TECHNOLOGIES, LLC  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2019-00644  
Patent RE45,542

---

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. INTRODUCTION .....1

II. THE 'RE542 PATENT.....3

    A. Overview of the 'RE542 Patent .....3

    B. The Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....5

III. PETITIONER FAILS TO ESTABLISH A REASONABLE  
LIKELIHOOD OF PREVAILING ON ANY PROPOSED GROUND. ....6

    A. Grounds 1 and 2: Petitioner Does Not Apply Its Proposed  
    Claim Constructions. ....6

    B. Grounds 1 and 2: Petitioner Proposes a Construction of  
    “Maximum Power Consumption of the Peripheral Device”  
    Broader than the Construction Petitioner Proposed in District  
    Court. ....9

    C. Grounds 1 and 2: Petitioner Does Not Construe Means-Plus-  
    Function Terms Recited in the Challenged Claims. ....11

    D. Ground 1: By Conflating Anticipation and Obviousness,  
    Petitioner Does Not Specify the Specific Statutory Grounds on  
    Which the Challenge in Ground 2 is Based. ....15

    E. Ground 2: Petitioner fails to explain sufficiently the specific  
    combination of Garner and Toombs it relies upon. ....19

IV. CONCLUSION.....28

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

<b>Cases</b>	<b>Page(s)</b>
<i>Apple Inc. v. ContentGuard Holdings, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00455, Paper 9 (Jul. 6, 2015) .....	13
<i>Apple Inc. v. Valencell, Inc.</i> , IPR2017-01704, Paper 9 (Mar. 27, 2018) .....	25
<i>Asekladden LLC v. iSourceLoans LLC</i> , IPR2015-00134, Paper 9 (Apr. 15, 2015).....	14
<i>Blue Coat Systems LLC, v. Finjan, Inc.</i> , IPR2017-00997, Paper 7 (Sep. 5, 2017).....	26
<i>Cardiac Pacemakers, Inc. v. St. Jude Medical, Inc.</i> , 296 F.3d 1106 (Fed. Cir. 2002) .....	12, 14
<i>Chevron Oronite Co. LLC v. Infineum USA L.P.</i> , IPR2018-00923, Paper 9 (Nov. 7, 2018) .....	3
<i>Deeper, UAB v. Vexilar, Inc.</i> , IPR2018-01310, Paper 7 (Jan. 24, 2019).....	3
<i>Facebook, Inc. v. Sound View Innovations, LLC</i> , IPR2017-00998, Paper 13 (Sep. 5, 2017).....	10
<i>Facebook, Inc. v. Sound View Innovations, LLC</i> , IPR2017-01004, Paper 13 (Aug. 29, 2017).....	13
<i>Golight, Inc. v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.</i> , 355 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2004) .....	12
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	18, 20, 21
<i>International Business Machine, Corp. v. Groupon, Inc.</i> , IPR2017-01452, Paper 7 (Dec. 5, 2017).....	21, 26
<i>Ishida Co. v. Taylor</i> , 221 F.3d 1310 (Fed. Cir. 2000) .....	14

<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006) .....	25
<i>KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398, 406-07 (2007) .....	18, 20, 22, 25
<i>Noah Systems, Inc. v. Intuit Inc.</i> , 675 F.3d 1302 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	12
<i>OrthoPediatrics Corp. v K2M, Inc.</i> , IPR2018-01547, Paper 9 (Feb. 22, 2019) .....	9
<i>Qualcomm Inc. v. ParkerVision Inc.</i> , IPR2015-01819, Paper 8 (Mar. 8, 2016) .....	22
<i>Quantificare, Inc. v. The Proctor &amp; Gamble Co.</i> , IPR2017-02113, Paper 11 (Mar. 16, 2018) .....	17, 18
<i>Saffran v. Johnson &amp; Johnson</i> , 712 F.3d 549 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....	14
<i>Sanofi-Aventis U.S. LLC v. AstraZeneca Pharmaceuticals LP</i> , IPR2016-00348, Paper 10 (Jun. 28, 2016) .....	20
<i>SAS Institute Inc. v. Iancu</i> , 138 S. Ct. 1348 (2018) .....	3
<i>Verint Systems Inc. v. Elad Barkan</i> , IPR2018-01579, Paper 8 (Mar. 7, 2019) .....	21
<i>Williamson v. Citrix Online, LLC</i> , 792 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....	11, 12
<i>ZTE Corporation v. Maxell, Ltd.</i> , IPR2018-00238, Paper 8 (Jun. 1, 2018) .....	8
<b>Statutes</b>	
35 U.S.C. § 102 .....	1, 18
35 U.S.C. § 103 .....	1, 19
35 U.S.C. § 312 .....	6

35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(3).....19, 20, 27  
35 U.S.C. § 312(c)(3).....18  
35 U.S.C. § 313 .....1  
35 U.S.C. § 314(a) .....3, 6, 9, 10, 15

**Other Authorities**

37 C.F.R. § 42.6(a)(3).....14  
37 C.F.R. § 42.22(a)(2).....19, 27  
37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(2).....18, 19, 20, 27  
37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(3)..... 1, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 15  
37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(4).....6, 8, 18, 19, 20, 27  
37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(5).....19, 20, 27  
37 C.F.R. § 42.107 .....1

# 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.