

ROBINS, KAPLAN, MILLER & CIRESI L.L.P.
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
MINNEAPOLIS

1 William H. Manning (*pro hac vice*)
 E-mail: WHManning@rkmc.com
 2 Cole M. Fauver (*pro hac vice*)
 E-mail: CMFauver@rkmc.com
 3 Anthony G. Beasley (*pro hac vice*)
 E-mail: AGBeasley@rkmc.com
 4 **Robins, Kaplan, Miller & Ciresi L.L.P.**
 2800 LaSalle Plaza
 5 800 LaSalle Avenue
 Minneapolis, MN 55402-2015
 6 Telephone: 612-349-8500
 Facsimile: 612-339-4181

7
 8 John P. Bovich (SBN 150688)
 E-mail: JBovich@reedsmith.com
Reed Smith LLP
 9 Two Embarcadero Center, Suite 2000
 San Francisco, CA 94111
 10 Telephone: 415-543-8700
 Facsimile: 415-391-8269

11 Attorneys for Plaintiffs and Counterclaim-
 12 Defendants Advanced Micro Devices, Inc. and ATI
 Technologies, ULC

13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 14 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 15 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

16
 17 SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.
 18 Counterclaim-Plaintiff

Case No. CV-08-0986-SI

19 v.
 20 ADVANCED MICRO DEVICES, INC., et
 21 al.,
 22 Counterclaim-
 23 Defendants.

**DECLARATION OF ANTHONY G.
 BEASLEY IN SUPPORT OF
 COUNTERCLAIM-DEFENDANTS'
 RESPONSIVE CLAIM CONSTRUCTION
 BRIEF**

1 I, Anthony G. Beasley, do hereby declare as follows:

2 1. I am an associate with the law firm of Robins, Kaplan, Miller & Ciresi L.L.P., and
3 am one of the attorneys representing the Counterclaim-Defendants in this action. I make all of
4 the statements in this Declaration of my own personal knowledge and in accord with 28 U.S.C. §
5 1746.

6 2. Attached as Exhibit A is a true and correct copy of U.S. Patent No. 5,781,750
7 (Blomgren).

8 3. Attached as Exhibit B is a true and correct copy of U.S. Patent No. 5,740,065
9 (Jang).

10 4. Attached as Exhibit C is a true and correct copy of an excerpt from 08/179,926
11 Examiner's Action, Jun. 16, 1994 (the first office action rejecting all claims of the '750 patent as
12 anticipated by Ueda and de Nicolas).

13 5. Attached as Exhibit D is a true and correct copy of an excerpt from 08/179,926
14 Amendment and Response, Sep. 20, 1994 (the first response from the applicant distinguishing
15 Ueda and de Nicolas).

16 6. Attached as Exhibit E is a true and correct copy of an excerpt from 08/179,926
17 Examiner's Action, Nov. 16, 1994 (the second office action rejecting all claims of the '750 patent
18 as obvious over Portanova in view of Onishi and Bullions).

19 7. Attached as Exhibit F is a true and correct copy of an excerpt from 08/179,926
20 Amendment and Response, Feb. 14, 1995 (the second response from the applicant distinguishing
21 Portanova, Onishi and Bullions).

22 8. Attached as Exhibit G is a true and correct copy of an excerpt from 08/179,926
23 Examiner's Action, Apr. 5, 1995 (the third office action rejecting all claims of the '750 patent as
24 obvious over Portanova in view of Onishi and Bullions, and citing Lee and Agnew as of general
25 interest.)

26 9. Attached as Exhibit H is a true and correct copy of an excerpt from 08/179,926
27 Amendment and Response, May 22, 1995 (the third response from the applicant distinguishing
28 Portanova, Onishi, Bullions, Lee and Agnew).

1 10. Attached as Exhibit I is a true and correct copy of an excerpt from 08/179,926
2 Brief on Appeal, Aug. 29, 1995 (the applicant's appeal from the examiner's final rejection of all
3 claims of the '750 patent).

4 11. Attached as Exhibit J is a true and correct copy of an excerpt from 08/179,926
5 Reply Brief (Nov. 29, 1995) (the examiner's answer to the applicant's appeal brief).

6 12. Attached as Exhibit K is a true and correct copy of an excerpt from Webster's
7 Third New International Dictionary (2002).

8 13. Attached as Exhibit L is a true and correct copy of an excerpt from Merriam-
9 Webster's Collegiate Dictionary (10th Ed. 1994).

10 14. Attached as Exhibit M is a true and correct copy of a Wikipedia.com article
11 entitled "Moving average," from http://en.wikipedia.org/Moving_average, retrieved Dec. 18,
12 2008.

13 15. Attached as Exhibit N is a true and correct copy of "Table A: Applicant's use of
14 'separate instruction sets' to distinguish prior art."

15 16. Attached as Exhibit O is a true and correct copy of "Table B: Applicant's
16 limitation of the '750 invention to one that processes RISC and CISC instruction sets
17 specifically."

18 17. Attached as Exhibit P is a true and correct copy of "Table C: Applicant's
19 disclaimer of 'mere extensions' of instruction sets."

20 18. Attached as Exhibit Q is a true and correct copy of the Translation of Amendment
21 to Japanese Patent No. 2662377, Nov. 12, 1998 (produced at SAMAMD0038787).

22 19. Attached as Exhibit R is a true and correct copy of U.S. Patent No. 3,764,988
23 (Onishi) (a prior art reference cited by the examiner in the '750 prosecution history).

24 20. Attached as Exhibit S is a true and correct copy of U.S. Patent No. 4,763,242 (Lee)
25 (a prior art reference cited by the examiner in the '750 prosecution history).

26 21. Attached as Exhibit T is a true and correct copy of U.S. Patent No. 4,514,803
27 (Agnew) (a prior art reference cited by the examiner in the '750 prosecution history).

28 22. Attached as Exhibit U is a true and correct copy of U.S. Patent No. 4,821,187


1 (Ueda) (a prior art reference cited by the examiner in the '750 prosecution history).

2 23. Attached as Exhibit V is a true and correct copy of U.S. Patent No. 4,992,934
3 (Portanova) (a prior art reference cited by the examiner in the '750 prosecution history).

4 24. Attached as Exhibit W is a true and correct copy of U.S. Patent No. 5,167,023 (de
5 Nicolas) (a prior art reference cited by the examiner in the '750 prosecution history).

6 25. Attached as Exhibit X is a true and correct copy of "High Performance Dual
7 Architecture Processor," IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin, vol. 36, No. 2, Feb. 1993.

8 I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on this
9 30 day of March, 2009, at Minneapolis, Minnesota.

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Anthony G. Beasley (*pro hac vice*)