


1 JOSEPH E. THOMAS (State Bar No. 101443)
jthomas@twtlaw.com
 2 WILLIAM J. KOLEGRAFF (State Bar No. 183861)
wkolegraff@twtlaw.com
 3 CAROLYN N. KO (State Bar No. 223540)
cko@twtlaw.com
 4 **THOMAS WHITE LAW & TYLER LLP**
 18101 Von Karman Avenue, Suite 230
 5 Irvine, California 92612-7132
 Telephone: (949) 679-6400
 6 Facsimile: (949) 679-6405

7 Attorneys for Defendant MINDSPEED
 TECHNOLOGIES, INC.



9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 10 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, WESTERN DIVISION

12 MICROPROCESSOR
 ENHANCEMENT CORPORATION
 13 and MICHAEL H. BRANIGIN,
 14 Plaintiffs,
 15 vs.
 16 MINDSPEED TECHNOLOGIES,
 INC.,
 17 Defendant.
 18

CASE NO. CV 09-00603 SVW (Ex)
 [PROPOSED] FINAL JUDGMENT

19
 20 Plaintiffs filed a complaint for patent infringement against defendant
 21 Mindspeed Technologies, Inc. ("Mindspeed") alleging infringement of U.S. Patent
 22 No. 5,471,593 ("593 Patent"). (*See* Complaint, [Docket No. 1].) The parties
 23 stipulated that Plaintiffs only allegation of infringement of the '593 Patent is by
 24 Mindspeed's use of the ARM 11 Core Processors in the accused devices. (*See* Order
 25 Re Discovery, ¶2 [Docket No. 33].) The parties further stipulated to be bound by
 26 the Court's liability determinations regarding the ARM 11 and Cortex-A8 computer
 27 processors in the related action *Microprocessor Enhancement Corp., et al. v. Texas*
 28 *Instruments Inc.*, No. SA CV 08-1123-SVW (RNBx) (C.D. Cal.). (*See* Order re

1 Discovery, at ¶ 5 [Docket No. 33].)

2 On July 1, 2010, the Court issued its Order granting Texas Instruments
3 Incorporated's Motion for Summary Judgment of Noninfringement with Respect to
4 OMAP2/ARM1136 and OMAP3/Cortex-A8 (see No. SA CV 08-1123-SVW,
5 Docket No. 129). Based on the parties' Stipulation concerning liability, Mindspeed
6 is entitled to a finding of noninfringement and judgment entered in its favor
7 accordingly.

8 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED THAT plaintiffs
9 Microprocessor Enhancement Corporation and Michael H. Branigin take nothing
10 and judgment is entered in favor of defendant Mindspeed Technologies, Inc.
11 Mindspeed shall recover its costs of suit. It is further ordered that this lawsuit is
12 dismissed with prejudice.

13 Dated: 7/13/10

By: 

Hon. Stephen V. Wilson
United States District Court Judge

14
15
16 PROPOSED BY:

17
18 DATED: July 6, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

THOMAS WHITELAW & TYLER LLP

21 By: /s/ Joseph E. Thomas

22 JOSEPH E. THOMAS

23 WILLIAM J. KOLEGRAFF

24 CAROLYN N. KO

25 Attorneys for Defendant MINDSPEED
26 TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
27
28