

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

**ADVANCED MICRO DEVICES, INC.**  
Petitioner

v.

**ADVANCED CLUSTER SYSTEMS, INC.**  
Patent Owner

---

IPR2025-00862  
IPR2025-00863  
U.S. Patent No. 10,333,768

**PETITIONER'S NOTICE RANKING PETITIONS AND  
EXPLAINING MATERIAL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PETITIONS  
FOR U.S. PATENT NO. 10,333,768**

**I. INTRODUCTION**

Petitioner filed two Petitions on April 16, 2025, challenging claims of U.S. Patent 10,333,768 (the “’768 patent”). Petitioner also filed a contingent motion to join two corresponding petitions filed on March 28, 2025 in *Intel Corporation v. Advanced Cluster Systems, Inc.*, Case Nos. IPR2025-00794 and IPR2025-00795 (“the Intel IPRs”), in which Intel is challenging the same claims on the same grounds.

Pursuant to the Consolidated Trial Practice Guide November 2019 (“TPG”), Petitioner submits this paper to “identify: (1) a ranking of the Petitions in the order in which it wishes the Board to consider the merits..., and (2) a succinct explanation of the differences between the petitions, why the issues addressed by the differences are material, and why the Board should exercise its discretion to institute additional petitions.” TPG, 60.

**II. RANKING OF PETITIONS**

The ’768 Patent has 4 independent claims and a total of 39 claims. Petitioner is challenging all claims over two petitions. The petition for IPR2025-00862 challenges independent claim 1 and all claims depending therefrom. The petition for IPR2025-00863 challenges independent claims 26, 29 and 35 and all claims depending therefrom. The petitions group the claims

so that there are different, non-overlapping claim sets. As demonstrated by each petition, the grounds are meritorious and justified.

Per the Board’s TPG guidance, Petitioner ranks as follows:

<b>RANK</b>	<b>PETITION</b>	<b>CLAIMS</b>	<b>GROUND</b>
1	<b>IPR2025-00862</b> (challenges claims 1-25 and 30-34)	Claims 1-25 and 30	35 U.S.C. §103 over Menon in view of Trefethen, RS6000 and POEref
		Claims 31-34	35 U.S.C. §103 over Menon in view of Trefethen, RS6000 and POEref further in view of MPIref
2	<b>IPR2025-00863</b> (challenges claims 26-29 and 35-39)	Claims 26, 29, 35-36, 39	35 U.S.C. §103 over Menon in view of Trefethen, RS6000 and POEref
		Claims 27-28 and 37-38	35 U.S.C. §103 over Menon in view of Trefethen, RS6000 and POEref further in view of MPIref

### **III. EXPLANATION OF MATERIAL DIFFERENCES AND REASONS FOR INSTITUTION OF MULTIPLE PETITIONS**

The Board recognized that “there may be circumstances in which more than one petition may be necessary.” TPG at 59-60. Those circumstances are present here:

---

A. The '768 Patent Contains Numerous Lengthy Claims

The textual language of the thirty-nine (39) claims in the '768 patent is 2,899 words, representing 20% of the 14,000 allowable words for a single petition.

The considerable number and length of the challenged claims makes presenting the asserted grounds in a single petition impractical. Thus, institution of two petitions is warranted and consistent with the Board's decisions in other cases. *See, e.g., Flex Logix Techs., Inc. v. Venkat Konda*, IPR2020-00261, Paper 22 at 24 (PTAB Aug. 3, 2020) (independent claim more than one column long did not weigh in favor of discretionary denial); *Peloton Interactive, Inc. v. Ifit, Inc.*, IPR2022-00030, Paper 12 at 33-34 (PTAB Apr. 22, 2022) (finding "Petitioner's filing of three petitions to challenge different claims of the '062 patent...promotes efficiency" where the patent "include[s] five independent claims" that "differ[]...in various, potentially significant ways."); *Novartis Gene Therapies v. Genzyme Corporation*, IPR2023-01045, Paper 10 at 3 (PTAB Jan. 17, 2024) (instituting multiple petitions where patent included seven independent claims with differing features and scope).

Petitioner is filing the two petitions concurrently and has not sought "a timing advantage that might otherwise occur were the petitions filed serially," which further supports institution. *Samsung Electronics Col., Ltd. v. Ryan*

---

*Hardin*, IPR2022-01335, Paper 13, 22-23 (PTAB Feb. 8, 2023) (Institution Decision).

**B. Parallel Petitions Have No Overlap.**

As shown in the table above, each petition challenges a distinct set of claims. Accordingly, the petitions are materially different.

Further, Patent Owner has served a complaint that declines to constrain the claims that it asserts. EX-1019, ¶55 (“at least claim 1 and 35 of the ’768 Patent”). Patent Owner’s Preliminary Infringement Contentions assert all independent claims, along with many dependent claims, and “reserves the right to modify, amend, or otherwise supplement” its contentions. Ex.1022.1, 13. Moreover, Final Infringement Contentions are not due until October 8, 2025. Ex.1020.2. Given the uncertainty of which claims Patent Owner intends to assert at trial and the eventual one year time bar, Petitioner is placed in the position of having to challenge all claims.

Nevertheless, as shown in the table above, Petitioner has structured the petitions so that there is no overlap of claims. Thus, Petitioner is not seeking duplicative or repetitive grounds, and the petitions are materially different.

---

C. Parallel Petitions Would Not Materially Increase Burden on the Board

Because the Petitions challenge each claim only once, while relying on the same combinations of prior art and the same expert declaration, institution of the two petitions would not raise concerns of duplicative time and resources.

Moreover, because the grounds, prior art and expert declaration are the same, consolidation of the two proceedings under 35 U.S.C. § 315(d) would be appropriate and would serve to increase efficiency.

**IV. CONCLUSION**

Petitioner respectfully submits that the Board should institute trial on the two parallel petitions.

Dated: April 14, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

WINSTON & STRAWN LLP

/s/ Brian E. Ferguson

Brian E. Ferguson

Lead Counsel for Petitioner

Registration No. 36,801

---

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

The undersigned certifies that in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(e) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.105, service was made on Patent Owner as detailed below.

*Date of service* April 16, 2025

*Manner of service* FEDERAL EXPRESS

*Documents served* Petitioner's Notice Ranking Petitions and Explaining Material Differences Between Petitions for U.S. Patent No. 10,333,768

*Persons served* Knobbe, Martens, Olson & Bear, LLP  
2040 Main Street, Fourteenth Floor  
Irvine, CA 92614

Courtesy copies were also sent via electronic mail to Patent Owner's counsel of record in the related district court proceeding:

David P. Lindner  
Email: [dlindner@crowell.com](mailto:dlindner@crowell.com)

Jon W. Gurka  
Email: [jgurka@crowell.com](mailto:jgurka@crowell.com)

Kainoa Asuega  
Email: [kasuega@crowell.com](mailto:kasuega@crowell.com)

Andrew Mcelligott  
Email: [amcelligott@crowell.com](mailto:amcelligott@crowell.com)

Michelle Wang  
Email: [michellewang@crowell.com](mailto:michellewang@crowell.com)

Mark D. Siegmund  
Email: [msiegmund@cjsjlaw.com](mailto:msiegmund@cjsjlaw.com)

William D. Ellerman  
Email: [wellerman@cjsjlaw.com](mailto:wellerman@cjsjlaw.com)

Reynaldo C. Barcelo  
Email: [rey@bhiplaw.com](mailto:rey@bhiplaw.com)

/s/ Brian E. Ferguson  
Brian E. Ferguson  
Lead Counsel for Petitioner  
Registration No. 36,801