



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
95/001,189	05/18/2009	7287119	2805.002REX8	8867
26111	7590	03/08/2013	EXAMINER	
STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C. 1100 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			CHOI, WOO H	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3992	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/08/2013	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

NVIDIA CORPORATION
Respondent, Requester

v.

RAMBUS, INC.
Patent Owner, Appellant

Appeal 2012-004035
Inter partes Reexamination Control No. 95/001,189
Patent 7,287,119
Technology Center 3900

Before HOWARD B. BLANKENSHIP, KARL D. EASTHOM, and
STEPHEN C. SIU, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

SIU, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON REQUEST FOR REHEARING

In papers filed December 17, 2012, Appellant requests a rehearing under 37 C.F.R. § 41.79 from the Decision of the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (hereinafter Board), dated November 16, 2012. In the Decision, we

Appeal 2012-004035
Inter partes Reexamination Control No. 95/001,189
US Patent 7,287,119

affirmed the Examiner's rejection of claims 1, 2, 6, and 19 as anticipated by Ware; claims 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13-17, and 20-23 as unpatentable over Ware and any one of Gustavson or Ohshima; claims 1, 2, 6, 13, 17, 19, 21, and 22 as unpatentable over Ware and JEDEC; claims 4, 5, 14-16, 20, and 23 as unpatentable over Ware, JEDEC, and Gustavson; claims 4, 5, 7, 10, 11, 16, and 20 as unpatentable over Ware, JEDEC, and Inagaki (Decision 15).

Appellant argues that “[t]he independent claims . . . are clear with respect to ‘write command’ originating outside of the claimed integrated circuit memory device, and being provided to or received by the integrated circuit memory device” and that Ware fails to disclose Start R/W as having an “**external origin**” (Req. Reh’g. 5). However, Appellant does not specifically indicate which independent claim requires that the “write command” originates outside of an integrated circuit memory device or any specific location from which the write command must originate. Claim 1, for example, recites a write command that specifies that the memory device receive write data and store the write data but does not appear to recite that the write command must originate from any specific location, much less from an “external” location. We are therefore not persuaded by Appellant’s argument.

Even assuming that at least one disputed claim required that the write command originate externally, we note that Ware provides this disclosure (*see, e.g.*, Fig. 17 showing Start R/W originating from outside – *i.e.*, external to – the DRAM control logic 500).

Appellant argues that “Ware does not disclose that its Start R/W signal is ‘provided to’ or ‘received’ by the . . . memory device” (Req. Reh’g 5). We disagree with Appellant for at least the reasons previously set forth in the Decision. For example, Ware discloses Start R/W being “provided to” the DRAM control logic (*see, e.g.*, Fig. 17 illustrating Start R/W being “provided to” DRAM control logic 500). Appellant does not indicate how a write sequence can be initiated by memory as disclosed by Ware without receiving the signal that initiates the write sequence. We disagree with Appellant that the memory of Ware writes data (*i.e.*, the write sequence being “initiated”) without receiving an instruction to do so (*i.e.*, Start R/W) – or being provided with the instruction – that is disclosed as initiating the write sequence in the first place.

Appellant argues that “[t]he Board overlooked the fact that Ware itself distinguishes its ‘write command’ from its ‘Start R/W’ timing signal” (Req. Reh’g 9) and that “Ware does not use the terms ‘write command’ and ‘Start R/W’ interchangeably” (Req. Reh’g 10). Thus, it appears that Appellant argues that the “write command” as claimed differs from “Start R/W” of Ware because, according to Appellant’s implication, Ware does not explicitly disclose that the “Start R/W” is a “write command.” We disagree with Appellant for at least the reasons previously stated in the Decision.

Claim 1, for example, recites that the write command specifies that a memory device receive write data and store the write data at a location. One of ordinary skill in the art would have understood that specifying a memory

device to receive write data and storing the write data at a particular location is merely a write operation in which data is written (and stored) at a particular location. As previously discussed in the Decision, Ware discloses that “Start R/W” initiates a write sequence (*see, e.g.*, Fig. 17). One of skill in the art would have understood a “write sequence” to include a write operation in which data is written (and stored) to a specific desired location in memory. Since the “write command” as claimed performs this same function (*i.e.*, writing data to a specified location of a specified memory device), we continue to discern no difference between the write command as claimed and Ware’s disclosure.

Appellant argues that Ware fails to disclose the ‘dual functionality of the . . . ‘write command’” (Req. Reh’g 11) as claimed because, according to Appellant, Ware “does not convey the information as to what operation is to be performed” by Start R/W (Req. Reh’g 11). We disagree with Appellant for at least the reasons previously provided in the Decision. Contrary to Appellant’s assertion that Ware fails to disclose what operation Start R/W initiates, Ware actually discloses that Start R/W initiates a “write sequence” (*see, e.g.*, Fig. 17), which Appellant does not differentiate from the write operation that is initiated by the “write command” as recited in the disputed claims.

We have considered Appellant’s arguments but find no points that we have misapprehended or overlooked. Therefore, the Request for Rehearing is DENIED.

Appeal 2012-004035
Inter partes Reexamination Control No. 95/001,189
US Patent 7,287,119

DENIED

alw

Patent Owner:

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.
1100 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

Third Party Requester:

David M. O'Dell
Haynes and Boone, LLP
IP Section
2323 Victory Avenue, Suite 700
Dallas, TX 75219