

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION

HYNIX SEMICONDUCTOR INC., HYNIX  
SEMICONDUCTOR AMERICA INC.,  
HYNIX SEMICONDUCTOR U.K. LTD., and  
HYNIX SEMICONDUCTOR  
DEUTSCHLAND GmbH,  
  
Plaintiffs,  
  
v.  
  
RAMBUS INC.,  
  
Defendant.

No. CV-00-20905 RMW  
  
ORDER DENYING RAMBUS'S MOTION  
FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT OF  
INFRINGEMENT RELATING TO ACCESS  
TIME REGISTER LIMITATIONS  
  
**[Re Docket No. 1018]**

Defendant Rambus Inc. ("Rambus") seeks summary judgment that (1) the Synchronous Dynamic Random Access Memory ("SDRAM") and Double Data Rate Synchronous Dynamic Random Access Memory ("DDR SDRAM") devices of Hynix<sup>1</sup> infringe claims 12 and 34 of U.S. Patent No. 6,324,120 (the "'120 patent"), claim 24 of U.S. Patent No. 6,034,918 (the "'918 patent")<sup>2</sup>, and claims 1, 9, 12, 14,

---

<sup>1</sup> Hynix designated one SDRAM product (part number HY7V28820AT) and one DDR SDRAM product (HY5DU2822T) as representative products accused by Rambus of infringement.

<sup>2</sup> Hynix notes that summary judgment on claim 24 of the '918 patent would not appropriate because the court previously ruled that there is a triable issue of fact as to the "read request limitation." *See* Clarified and Corrected Order on Rambus's Motion for Summary Judgment of Infringement at 8.

1 26, 28, and 37 of U.S. Patent No. 6,426,916 (the "'916 patent"); and (2) Hynix's DDR SDRAM devices  
2 infringe claims 3 and 40 of the '916 patent. The court issued a tentative ruling denying the motion on  
3 or about May 6, 2005. The court heard argument with respect to the tentative ruling, has re-read the  
4 moving and responding papers and the applicable portions of the opinions of the parties' experts.  
5 Although the court hereby acknowledges some reservations about its reasoning and analysis in its  
6 tentative order, particularly with respect to whether the accused SDRAM device is covered by the access  
7 time register limitation set forth in claims 26, 28, 27 and 40 of U.S. Patent No. 6,426,916, the court  
8 nevertheless adopts the conclusion of the tentative order. Therefore, summary adjudication of the time  
9 access limitation in claims 12 and 34 of U.S. Patent No. 6,324,120, claim 24 of U.S. Patent No.  
10 6,034,918, and claims 1, 3, 9, 12, 14, 26, 28, 37, and 40 of U.S. Patent No. 6,426,916 is denied.

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

DATED: March 13, 2006

/s/ Ronald M. Whyte  
RONALD M. WHYTE  
United States District Judge

1 **THIS SHALL CERTIFY THAT A COPY OF THIS ORDER WAS PROVIDED TO:**

2 **Counsel for plaintiff:**

3 Daniel J. Furniss  
4 Theodore G. Brown, III  
5 Jordan Trent Jones  
6 Townsend & Townsend & Crew LLP  
7 379 Lytton Ave  
8 Palo Alto, CA 94301

9 Patrick Lynch  
10 Kenneth R. O'Rourke  
11 O'Melveny & Myers  
12 400 So Hope St Ste 1060  
13 Los Angeles, CA 90071-2899

14 Kenneth L. Nissly  
15 Susan van Keulen  
16 Geoffrey H. Yost  
17 Thelen Reid & Priest LLP  
18 225 West Santa Clara Street,  
19 12th Floor  
20 San Jose, CA 95113-1723

21 **Counsel for defendant:**

22 Gregory Stone  
23 Kelly M. Klaus  
24 Catherine Augustson  
25 Munger Tolles & Olson  
26 355 So Grand Ave Ste 3500  
27 Los Angeles, CA 90071-1560

28 Peter A. Detre  
Carolyn Hoecker Luedtke  
Munger Tolles & Olson  
560 Mission Street  
27th Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94105-2907

Peter I Ostroff  
Rollin A. Ransom  
Michelle B. Goodman  
V. Bryan Medlock, Jr.  
Sidley Austin Brown & Wood  
555 West Fifth Street, Suite 4000  
Los Angeles, CA 90013-1010

Jeannine Yoo Sano  
Pierre J. Hubert  
Dewey Ballantine  
1950 University Avenue, Suite 500  
East Palo Alto, CA 94303

29 Date: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chambers of Judge Whyte