

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Intel Corporation,
Petitioner,

v.

VLSI Technology, LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2019-01196
Patent No. 7,246,027

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

Mail Stop "PATENT BOARD"
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THE BOARD SHOULD DENY THE PETITION UNDER 314(a) BECAUSE THE DISTRICT COURT ACTION IS IN AN ADVANCED STAGE	9
III. SUMMARY OF THE '027 PATENT.....	12
IV. THE PRIOR ART REFERENCES DIFFER FROM THE '027 INVENTIONS	16
A. Starr Overview	16
B. Bilak Overview.....	19
C. Kang Overview.....	21
V. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL	23
VI. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	23
A. "Determining/Determine An Analog Variation Parameter"	23
1. Substituting "determining/determine" with "sensing/sense" alters the claims scope	24
2. "Variation" refers to IC-to-IC variance, which variance may or may not occur during operation.....	27
B. "Determining/Determine An Operational Temperature"	30
C. "Determining/Determine A Digital Variation Parameter"	32
VII. GROUND 1: CLAIMS 1, 2, 8, 9, 18, AND 19 ARE NOT RENDERED OBVIOUS BY STARR IN VIEW OF BILAK.	32
A. The Petition Fails To Establish That Starr Discloses "Determining An Adjustment Signal"	32

	<u>Page</u>
B. The Petition Fails To Establish That Starr Discloses "Analog Variation Parameter" (All Claims).....	38
1. Monitoring Circuit B to determine a drift in threshold voltage differs from determining "a parameter of an analog portion of the integrated circuit"	38
C. Petitioner Has Not Presented Any Competent Evidence That Starr's Threshold Voltage Is "Representative Of An Integrated Circuit Fabrication Process Variance Of The Integrated Circuit"	42
1. Petitioner presents no competent evidence that Starr's measured threshold voltage or voltage drift relates to IC fabrication process variance.....	42
2. Starr's threshold voltage varies due to aging.	44
3. Petitioner fails to establish that threshold voltages are inherently "representative of the integrated circuit fabrication process variance of the integrated circuit"	46
D. The Petition Fails To Establish That Starr Discloses "Determining An Analog Variation Parameter" (Claims 1, 2, 8, 9, 18, and 19).....	48
E. The Petition Fails To Establish That Starr Discloses "Determining An Operational Temperature Associated With The Analog Variation Parameter" (Claims 1, 2, 8, 9, and 19).....	51
1. Starr regards changes in operating temperature and shifts in threshold voltages as two independent variables and do not associate them with each other.....	52
2. Alleged Similarity In Starr's Figure 10 And The '027 Patent's Figure 8 Does Not Establish That Starr's Operating Temperature Is Associated With Its Threshold Voltage.....	54

Page

3.	Petitioner presents no basis for equating Starr's threshold voltage to Tsvividis' threshold value.	57
F.	The Petition Fails To Establish That A POSA Would Combine Starr and Bilak (All Claims).....	59
VIII.	GROUND 2: CLAIMS 3, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, AND 20 ARE NOT RENDERED OBVIOUS BY STARR IN VIEW OF BILAK AND KANG.....	63
IX.	CONCLUSION.....	66

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Arendi S.A.R.L. v. Apple Inc.</i> , 832 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	65
<i>DSS Technology Management, Inc. v. Apple Inc.</i> , 885 F.3d. 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	65
<i>E-One, Inc. v. Oshkosh Corp.</i> , No. IPR2019-00161 (PTAB May 15, 2019).....	10
<i>Int'l Rectifier Corp. v. IXYS Corp.</i> , 361 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	27, 31
<i>Kara Tech. Inc. v. Stamps.com, Inc.</i> , 582 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	27
<i>NHK Spring Co., Ltd. v. Intri-Plextechnologies, Inc.</i> , IPR2018-00752, Paper No. 8 (PTAB Sep. 12, 2018).....	9
<i>Omega Eng'g, Inc. v. Raytek Corp.</i> , 334 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir.2003)	25
<i>Paice LLC v. Ford Motor Co.</i> , 881 F.3d 894 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	26
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	27
<i>Tokai Corp. v. Easton Enters., Inc.</i> , 632 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	62
<i>Univ. of Md. Biotechnology Inst. v. Presens Precision Sensing GmbH</i> , 711 Fed. App'x. 1007 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	62
<i>ZTE (USA), Inc. v. Fractus S.A.</i> , IPR2018-01461, Paper 10, 17 (PTAB Feb. 28, 2019).....	10

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.