

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

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

KILOPASS TECHNOLOGY INC.,

No. C 10-02066 SI

Plaintiff,

**ORDER REQUESTING
SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION**

v.

SIDENSE CORPORATION,

Defendant.


On May 15, 2012, Kilopass filed a Motion for Leave to File Motion for Reconsideration of Court's Order on Claim Scope Disavowal Pursuant to Civ. L.R. 7-9. In considering Kilopass' motion, the Court requests that either party file a document with the Court. In the USPTO's February 18, 2011 Action Closing Prosecution, the USPTO stated:

Furthermore, as evidenced by US-PG PUB 2006/0104108 (See Paragraph 5-7) it [sic] well known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that the bitlines and wordlines have a distinct functional effect on the operation of memory devices and thus are not interchangeable.

Khaliq Decl., Ex. B, at 6. The Court requests that either Kilopass or Sidense file the document referenced by the USPTO – "US-PG PUB 2006/0104108" – by **Thursday, May 24, 2012.**

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 21, 2012



SUSAN ILLSTON
United States District Judge