

Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 9,703,750
Claims 5-13, 18-20, 25-28, 35-38, and 46-47

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Intel Corporation
Petitioner

v.

ACQIS LLC
Patent Owner

Case IPR2021-01111

PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF
U.S. PATENT NO. 9,703,750
CHALLENGING CLAIMS 5-13, 18-20, 25-28, 35-38, and 46-47
UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 312 AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.104

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

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Mandatory Notices.....	1
	A. Related Matters.....	1
	B. Real Parties-in-Interest.....	8
	C. Counsel.....	8
	D. Service Information (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4)).....	9
III.	Fees.....	10
IV.	Grounds for Standing.....	10
V.	Identification of Challenge and Relief Requested.....	10
	A. Identification of Prior Art.....	10
	B. Statutory Grounds of Unpatentability.....	11
VI.	Overview of the '750 Patent.....	11
VII.	The '750 Patent Is Not Entitled To A Priority Date Before April 15, 2011.....	17
	A. The Challenged Claims Recite Limitations Not Supported By The '436 Patent's Parent Applications.....	19
	1. The Purported Written Description Support For The "Integrated CPU-Graphics/Controller" and "CPU- LVDS" Limitations Was First Introduced In The '436 Patent.....	22
	B. The '436 Patent Introduced Subject Matter Not Found In Its Parent Applications.....	24
	1. Materials Incorporated By Reference Must Be Identified "With Detailed Particularity" and "Specific[ity]".....	25

2.	The '436 Patent's Parent Applications Never Incorporated By Reference the '886 Provisional.....	26
C.	The Challenged Claims Are Not Entitled To A Priority Date Earlier Than The Filing Date Of The '436 Patent	30
VIII.	Prosecution History of the '750 Patent.....	31
IX.	Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art	32
X.	Claim Construction.....	32
XI.	Specific Grounds for Challenge	35
A.	Ground I: Chu330 in combination with Cupps Render Obvious Claims 5-13, 18-20, 25-28, 35-38, and 46-47	35
1.	Prior Art	35
2.	Claim 5	54
3.	Claim 6	91
4.	Claim 7	98
5.	Claim 8	102
6.	Claim 9	103
7.	Claim 10	103
8.	Claim 11	106
9.	Claim 12	106
10.	Claim 13	107
11.	Claim 18	108
12.	Claim 19	115

Petition for *Inter Partes* Review

U.S. Patent No. 9,703,750 (claims 5-13, 18-20, 25-28, 35-38, and 46-47)

13.	Claim 20	115
14.	Claim 25	115
15.	Claim 26	124
16.	Claim 27	124
17.	Claim 28	128
18.	Claim 35	128
19.	Claim 36	130
20.	Claims 37 and 38	130
21.	Claim 46	133
22.	Claim 47	137
XII.	Discretionary Factors	137
A.	35 U.S.C. § 325(d) – Prosecution History	137
B.	35 U.S.C. § 314(a) – <i>General Plastic</i> (GP) Factors and Valve Factor	139
C.	35 U.S.C. § 314(a) – Fintiv Factors	140
1.	Factor 1	141
2.	Factor 2	141
3.	Factor 3	142
4.	Factor 4	142
5.	Factor 5	144
6.	Factor 6	144
XIII.	Conclusion	144

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases

<i>Advanced Bionics, LLC v. Med-El Elektromedizinische Gerate GmbH</i> , IPR2019-01469, Paper 6 (PTAB Feb. 13, 2020)	138
<i>Advanced Display System, Inc. v. Kent State University</i> , 212 F.3d 1272 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	28, 36
<i>ALZA Corp. v. Andrx Pharms., LLC</i> , 603 F.3d 935 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	31
<i>Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc.</i> , IPR2020-00019, Paper 11 (PTAB March 20, 2020) ..	141, 144
<i>Ariad Pharms., Inc. v. Eli Lilly & Co.</i> , 598 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	31
<i>Auto. Techs. Int’l, Inc. v. BMW of N. Am., Inc.</i> , 501 F.3d 1274 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	31
<i>Droplets, Inc., v. E*Trade Bank</i> , 887 F.3d 1309 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	26
<i>Genentech, Inc. v. Novo Nordisk A/S</i> , 108 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	31
<i>Google Inc. v. Uniloc 2017</i> , IPR2020-00396, Paper 11 (PTAB Aug. 03, 2020)	139
<i>Harari v. Hollmer</i> , 602 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	26
<i>Hollmer v. Harari</i> , 681 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	26, 29, 30
<i>In re NTP, Inc.</i> , 654 F.3d, 1278 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	138
<i>Navistar, Inc. v. Fatigue Fracture Tech., LLC</i> , IPR2018-00853, Paper 13 (PTAB Sept. 12, 2018)	138
<i>PowerOasis, Inc. v. T-Mobile USA, Inc.</i> , 522 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	138



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.