


1 Russell L. Johnson (SBN 053833)  
 rljohnson@sidley.com  
 2 Peter H. Kang (SBN 158101)  
 pkang@sidley.com  
 3 Teague I. Donahey (SBN 197531)  
 tdonahey@sidley.com  
 4 Sidley Austin LLP  
 555 California Street  
 5 San Francisco, California 94104  
 Telephone: (415) 772-1200  
 6 Facsimile: (415) 772-7400

7 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
 8 AMKOR TECHNOLOGY, INC.

9 William J. Bohler (SBN 141970)  
 wjbohler@comcast.net  
 10 LAW OFFICE OF WILLIAM BOHLER  
 8043 Rockford Place  
 11 Pleasanton, California 94566  
 Telephone: (650) 218-6652  
 12 Facsimile: (925) 846-3914

13 Attorneys for Defendants  
 14 CARSEM (M) SDN BHD, CARSEM SEMICONDUCTOR SDN BHD, and CARSEM INC.,



15 United States District Court  
 16 Northern District of California  
 17 San Francisco Division  
 18

19	AMKOR TECHNOLOGY, INC.,	)	No. C 03-5116 VRW (filed Nov. 18, 2003)
20		)	
	Plaintiff,	)	
21		)	<b>TWELFTH JOINT STATUS REPORT</b>
	vs.	)	<b>CONCERNING STAY OF PROCEEDINGS</b>
22		)	
		)	
23	CARSEM (M) SDN BHD, CARSEM	)	
	SEMICONDUCTOR SDN BHD, and	)	
24	CARSEM INC.,	)	
		)	
25	Defendants.	)	
26		)	

27 Pursuant to the Court's request, *see* Docket No. 41 (June 25, 2010), the parties hereby submit  
 28 this Twelfth Joint Status Report Concerning Stay of Proceedings. The parties are continuing to

1 litigate their dispute before the U.S. International Trade Commission (“ITC”) in the investigation  
2 styled *In the Matter of Certain Encapsulated Integrated Circuit Devices and Products Containing*  
3 *Same*, ITC Inv. No. 337-TA-501. The Administrative Law Judge (“ALJ”) issued an Initial  
4 Determination (“ID”) on November 18, 2004. Thereafter, on February 1, 2005, the ITC decided to  
5 review the ALJ’s ID. The ITC modified the ALJ’s claim construction regarding certain terms and  
6 remanded the investigation back to the ALJ for further findings in light of these changes. On  
7 November 9, 2005, the ALJ issued a second ID. On July 1, 2009, the ITC again remanded this  
8 investigation to the ALJ. A further evidentiary hearing was held before the ALJ on September 10  
9 and 11, 2009, and a third ID was issued on October 30, 2009. On December 16, 2009, the ITC  
10 determined that it would review the third ID in its entirety and requested additional briefing from the  
11 parties. On February 18, 2010, the ITC reversed the third ID and remanded this investigation to the  
12 ALJ to make findings on the issues of anticipation and obviousness in light of prior art  
13 determinations by the Commission. On March 22, 2010, the ALJ issued a fourth ID, which is under  
14 review by the Commission. The target date for completion of this investigation is July 20, 2010.

15           Therefore, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1659, the parties respectfully request that the Stay Order  
16 remain in effect until the determination of the Commission in the ITC Inv. No. 337-TA-501 becomes  
17 final, including any appeals pursuant to the decision in *In re Princo Corp.*, 478 F.3d 1345, *reh. den.*,  
18 486 F.3d 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2007).

1 Pursuant to General Order 45.X.B, Plaintiff obtained concurrence in the filing of this  
2 document from counsel for Defendants, as listed below.

3  
4 Dated: July 15, 2010

SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP

5  
6 By: /s/ Peter H. Kang

7 Peter H. Kang  
8 Attorneys For Plaintiff  
Amkor Technology, Inc.

9 Dated: July 15, 2010

LAW OFFICE OF WILLIAM BOHLER

10  
11 By: /s/ William J. Bohler

12 William J. Bohler  
13 Attorneys For Defendants  
14 Carsem (M) Sdn Bhd, Carsem Semiconductor  
Sdn Bhd, and Carsem Inc.