


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



UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

IN RE RICOH COMPANY LTD. PATENT) CASE NO.: C 03-02289 JW
LITIGATION)

JUDGMENT

_____)

1 This action involves consolidated cases related to Ricoh's U.S. Patent No. 4,922,432
2 ("the '432 Patent"). In January 2003, Ricoh filed a patent infringement action in the District of
3 Delaware against defendants Aeroflex, Inc., AMI Semiconductor, Inc., Matrox Electronics
4 Systems, Ltd., Matrox Graphics, Inc., Matrox International Corp., Matrox Tech., Inc. and
5 Aeroflex Colorado Springs, Inc. (hereinafter collectively, "the Customer Defendants") for
6 infringement of the '432 Patent. In May 2003, Synopsys filed a declaratory judgment action
7 against Ricoh in the Northern District of California on behalf of its customers, seeking a
8 declaratory judgment of noninfringement, invalidity and unenforceability of the '432 Patent (No.
9 C 03-02289). Subsequently, the Delaware action was transferred to the Northern District of
10 California (No. C 03-04669). This Court consolidated the two actions into 5:03-cv-02289-JW.

11 Pursuant to the Court's April 15, 2010 Order Granting Synopsys' Motion for Summary
12 Judgment of Noninfringement ("April 15 Order," Docket Item No. 698), and pursuant to the
13 Court's May 12, 2010 Order Denying Defendant Ricoh Company Ltd.'s Motion for Leave to
14 File a Motion for Reconsideration (Docket Item No. 707), there has now been an adjudication of
15 all of the infringement claims asserted by Ricoh against the Customer Defendants in this
16 consolidated action, and of Synopsys' declaratory judgment claim and the Customer Defendant's
17 counterclaims for a declaratory judgment of noninfringement.

18 First, for the reasons set forth in the April 15 Order, judgment is entered in favor of
19 Synopsys and the Customer Defendants and against Ricoh. The Court declares that the asserted
20 claims of the '432 Patent are not infringed by Synopsys or the Customer Defendants.

21 Second, Synopsys' remaining declaratory judgment claims of invalidity and
22 unenforceability of the '432 Patent, and the Customer Defendants' remaining counterclaims of
23 invalidity and unenforceability of the '432 Patent, are dismissed without prejudice under Federal
24 Rule of Civil Procedure 54(b), pursuant to the agreement of the parties that these other claims
25 and counterclaims should be dismissed without prejudice.¹

26
27 ¹ On November 2, 2006, the Court granted Ricoh's Motion for Summary Judgment on
28 Defendants Aeroflex and Aeroflex Colorado, Inc.'s Affirmative Defense of Authorization and
Consent (D.I. 535), and ordered the Clerk to enter partial judgment on that affirmative defense.

1 The Court declares that Synopsys and the Customer Defendants are the prevailing parties,
2 and may request recover costs pursuant to Local Rules 54-1 through 54-4. Accordingly, the
3 Court finds that there is no just reason for delay of entry of final judgment in favor of Synopsys
4 and the Customer Defendants and against Ricoh. Given the dismissal without prejudice of the
5 declaratory judgment claims and counterclaims as set forth above, this is accordingly a full and
6 final adjudication of all issues before this Court in these consolidated actions.

7 The Clerk shall close this file and the member case, 03-4669 JW

8
9 Dated: May 28, 2010



JAMES WARE
United States District Judge

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