

Exhibit 3

1 David J. Miclean (CA Bar No. 115098/miclean@fr.com)
Shelley K. Mack (CA Bar No. 209596/mack@fr.com)
2 Robert J. Kent (CA Bar No. 250905/rjkent@fr.com)
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
3 500 Arguello Street, Suite 500
Redwood City, CA 94063
4 Telephone: (650) 839-5070
Facsimile: (650) 839-5071
5

6 Juanita Brooks (CA Bar No. 75934/brooks@fr.com)
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
7 12390 El Camino Real
San Diego, CA 92130
8 Telephone: (858) 678-5070
Facsimile: (858) 678-5099
9

10 Attorneys for Plaintiff
GOOGLE INC.

11
12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
13 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
14 (OAKLAND DIVISION)
15

16 GOOGLE INC.,

17 Plaintiff,

18 v.

19 NETLIST, INC.,

20 Defendant.
21

22 AND RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS.
23
24
25
26
27
28

Case No. C 08-04144 SBA

**[REDACTED] GOOGLE INC.'S
RESPONSIVE CLAIM CONSTRUCTION
BRIEF**

Date: November 12, 2009

Time: 9:00 a.m.

Place: Courtroom 3, 3rd Floor

Judge: Hon. Sandra Brown Armstrong

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THE TECHNOLOGY OF THE '386 PATENT'	2
A. The '386 Patent Specification	2
1. Purpose of the Alleged Invention.....	2
2. Elements of The '386 Patent's Memory Module Are A Printed Circuit Board, Logic Element, And Memory Devices	3
3. Operation of the '386 Patent's Memory Module	4
B. Claim 1 of the 386 Patent	5
III. LEGAL STANDARDS GOVERNING CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	6
A. Plain and Ordinary Meaning In Context of Intrinsic Record Usually Controls	6
B. The Specification Is Always Highly Relevant and Typically Dispositive	6
C. The Disclosed Embodiments Restrict the Scope of the Claims.....	6
D. Each Claim Element Must Be Given Meaning	7
IV. GOOGLE'S PROPOSED CONSTRUCTIONS SHOULD BE ADOPTED IN FULL	7
A. "logic element receiving a set of input control signals from the computer system"	7
1. The Intrinsic Evidence Supports Google's Proposed Construction	7
2. Netlist's Proposed Construction Conflicts with the Intrinsic Record	9
B. "rank"	9
1. The Intrinsic Evidence Unambiguously Shows a "Rank" Is a Row	9
2. Netlist's Construction Of "Rank" Leads To A Nonsensical Reading Of Claim 1	10
C. "signal"	10

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont'd.)

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

	<u>Page</u>
1. The Intrinsic Evidence Affirms Google’s Construction	10
(a) The Drawings Show Signals Presented On Dedicated Pins.....	10
(b) The Text Of The Specification Confirms Signals Are Transmitted On Dedicated Pins	11
(c) Google Does Not Import Limitations Into Claim 1	12
2. Netlist’s Overly Broad Construction Lacks Intrinsic Support.....	12
D. “control signals”.....	13
1. The Specification And Industry Standards Confirm Google’s Construction of “Control Signal”	13
2. Netlist’s Proposed Construction Lacks Intrinsic Support	14
E. “the set of input control signals corresponding to a second number of memory devices smaller than the first number of memory devices”.....	14
1. The Intrinsic Evidence Supports Google’s Proposed Construction.....	15
(a) The Patent’s Purpose Is To Allow A Module To Use More Memory Devices Than The System Is Configured To Operate	15
(b) The Memory Module Informs The Computer System That The Module Has Fewer Memory Devices Than It Actually Contains.....	16
(c) The Computer System Generates A Set Of Input Signals For The Number Of Devices Reported By The Memory Module	17
(d) The Specification Does Not Disclose Any Embodiment Where The Memory Module Reports To The Computer System The Actual Number of Memory Devices It Contains	18
(e) Google’s Construction Does Not Improperly Import A Limitation Into The Claim.....	19
2. Netlist’s Proposed Construction Reads The “Corresponding To” Limitation Out Of Claim 1 And Ignores The Intrinsic Record	19

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont'd.)

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

	<u>Page</u>
F. "command signal"	20
1. The Intrinsic and Extrinsic Evidence Support Google's Construction	20
2. Netlist's Vague Construction Is Not Derived From the Specification	20
G. "number of ranks of memory modules"	21
1. This Term Requires No Construction	21
2. Netlist's Proposed Construction Is Contrary to the Specification	21
H. "the first command signal corresponding to the second number of ranks"	22
1. The Specification Shows That The System Generates A Command Signal To Operate The Number Of Ranks Reported By The Module	22
2. The Patent Does Not Describe Any Embodiment Where The Computer System Generates A Command Signal Corresponding To The Actual Number Of Ranks Of Memory Devices On The Module	23
3. Google's Construction Does Not Import Limitations Into Claim 1	23
4. Netlist's Construction Does Not Give Meaning to Each Claim Term	24
I. "chip-select signal"	24
1. Google's Construction Accords With the Intrinsic Evidence and Industry Standards	24
2. Netlist's Construction Conflicts With the Specification and Is Technically Inaccurate	25
V. CONCLUSION	25

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

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

Page(s)

FEDERAL CASES

02 Micro Int'l Ltd. v. Beyond Innovation Tech. Co., Ltd.,
521 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2008)..... 7, 19, 22

Bicon, Inc. v. Straumann Co., 441 F.3d 945 (Fed. Cir. 2006) 7

Curtiss-Wright Flow Control Corp. v. Velan, Inc., 438 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2006)..... 6, 19, 23

Halliburton Energy Servs. Inc. v. M-I LLC, 514 F.3d 1244 (Fed. Cir. 2008)..... 10

Netword v. Centraal, 242 F.3d 1347 (Fed. Cir. 2001)..... 12

Nikon Corp v. ASM Lithography, 308 F.Supp.2d 1039 (N.D. Cal. 2004) 12

Phillips v. AWH Corp., 415 F.3d. 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (*en banc*) 1, 6, 9, 20, 24

Snow v. Lake Shore & M.S. Ry. Co., 121 U.S. 617, 630 (1887) 6

Toro Co. v. White Consol. Indus., Inc., 199 F.3d 1295 (Fed. Cir. 1999)..... 6

Warner-Jenkinson Co. v. Hilton Davis Chem. Co., 520 U.S. 17 (1997) 7, 19, 24

1 Bank Address and Address signal inputs in table of "Pin Descriptions"). JEDEC specifications are
 2 particularly relevant since Netlist claims that its patent covers Mode C of a related JEDEC
 3 standard for FBIDIMM devices. Ex. 5 (Am. Infrg. Cont.); . The
 4 inventors' incorporation of a JEDEC standard into the patent demonstrates that JEDEC standards
 5 are relevant to the alleged invention. 12:41-45.

6 **2. Netlist's Proposed Construction Lacks Intrinsic Support**

7 Netlist's construction of "control signals" is overbroad and not supported by intrinsic or
 8 extrinsic evidence. Nothing in the intrinsic record describes control signals as "signals... *that*
 9 *regulate system operations*" – this language appears nowhere in the specification or prosecution
 10 history. Neither of the specification excerpts Netlist cites refers to "regulat[ing] system
 11 operations" or explain what it means to "regulate system operations." Op. Br. at 12: 6:64-7:2,
 12 2:34-36. Furthermore, Netlist presents no extrinsic evidence to support this language. "Regulate
 13 system operations" is so broad as to be virtually limitless, and would do more to confuse than to
 14 enlighten the jury. In particular, Netlist's construction gives the jury no way to distinguish
 15 "control signals" from other signals (like "command signals") sent by the computer system.

16 **E. "the set of input control signals corresponding to a second number of memory
 17 devices smaller than the first number of memory devices"**

<u>Google's Proposed Construction</u>	<u>Netlist's Proposed Construction</u>
"the set of input control signals generated by the computer system to control a memory module having the second number of memory devices, based on the computer system understanding the memory module to have the second number of devices" ⁸	no construction required, or, alternatively, "the set of input control signals received from the computer system, which is configured to utilize a memory module having a second number of memory devices"

22
 23 The parties' dispute over this phrase stems from Netlist's effort to read the "corresponding
 24 to" limitation – the heart of the alleged invention -- out of the claim entirely.⁹

25
 26 ⁸ See footnotes 1 and 2, *supra*, for clarification of the terms "first number" and "second number."
 27 ⁹ Unless the two "corresponding to" limitations in the patent are construed to preclude a signal
 28 from "corresponding to" both the actual number and the apparent number of memory devices and
 ranks of devices, the asserted claims are indefinite. The claims implicitly require that the signal
 "corresponding to" the smaller, apparent number of devices or ranks does not also "correspond to"

1 **I. The Intrinsic Evidence Supports Google's Proposed Construction**

2 **(a) The Patent's Purpose Is To Allow A Module To Use More**
3 **Memory Devices Than The System Is Configured To Operate**

4 The specification shows Google's construction is correct. It repeatedly indicates, including
5 in the Summary of the Invention, that the patent's purpose is to allow a computer system to use a
6 memory module with more memory devices or ranks than it was designed to operate, stating that:

- 7 • "In certain embodiments, the memory module 10 simulates a virtual memory module
8 when the number of memory devices 30 of the memory module 10 is larger than the
9 number of memory devices 30 per memory module for which the computer system is
10 configured to utilize." 7:23-28.
- 11 • "In certain embodiments, the set of output control signals corresponds to a first number of
12 ranks in which the plurality of memory devices 30 of the memory module 10 are arranged,
13 and the set of input control signals corresponds to a second number of ranks per memory
14 module for which the computer system is configured. The second number of ranks in
15 certain embodiments is smaller than the first number of ranks." 7:6-14.
- 16 • "In certain embodiments, the computer system is configured for a number of ranks per
17 memory module which is smaller than the number of ranks in which the memory devices
18 30 of the memory module 10 are arranged." 7:30-33; *see also* 7:33-43.
- 19 • "The logic element receives a set of input control signals from the computer system. The
20 set of input control signals corresponds to a second number of memory devices smaller
21 than the first number of memory devices. The logic element generates a set of output
22 control signals in response to the set of input control signals. The set of output control
23 signals corresponds to the first number of memory devices." 2:51-58; *see also* 2:63-3:3;
24 3:8-16.

25
26
27 the actual number of devices or ranks, and this is necessarily so; otherwise, the claims would
28 encompass modules in which the actual number of memory devices and ranks is the same as the
apparent number of devices and ranks, and such modules are clearly prior art.