

# **Exhibit G**

Intel Corporation's Responses to Plaintiff STC.UNM's  
First Set of Interrogatories Nos. 1-21

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO

STC.UNM,

Plaintiff,

v.

INTEL CORPORATION,

Defendant.

Civil No. 1:10-cv-01077-RB-WDS

**INTEL CORPORATION'S RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFF STC.UNM'S FIRST  
SET OF INTERROGATORIES NOS. 1-21**

Pursuant to Rules 26 and 33 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Local Rules of Civil Procedure of this Court, Defendant Intel Corporation ("Intel") hereby responds to Plaintiff STC.UNM's ("Plaintiff") First Set of Interrogatories Nos. 1-21 ("Interrogatories").

**RESERVATION OF RIGHTS**

Intel's responses to Plaintiff's Interrogatories shall not constitute an admission by Intel that any interrogatory, or the answer thereto, is admissible as evidence in any trial or other proceeding. Intel reserves the right to object on any ground, at any time, to the admission of any interrogatory, response, or document produced in connection therewith in any trial or other proceeding.

**GENERAL OBJECTIONS**

1. Intel objects to Plaintiff's Interrogatories to the extent they seek information protected by the attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, the joint-defense privilege, the common-interest privilege, and/or any other applicable doctrine of privilege or immunity.

2. Intel objects to Plaintiff's Interrogatories to the extent they seek information and/or documents subject to an obligation of confidentiality to a third party or that Intel

believes are sensitive or proprietary or constitute trade secrets, or are otherwise confidential.

3. Intel objects to Plaintiff's Interrogatories to the extent they purport to impose on Intel duties and/or responsibilities greater than those imposed by the Court's orders, the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and the Local Rules.

4. Intel objects to Plaintiff's Interrogatories to the extent they seek information that does not exist, that is not in Intel's possession, custody, or control, or that is equally available to Plaintiff.

5. Intel objects to Plaintiff's Interrogatories to the extent they use words and phrases that are not defined in an understandable manner.

6. Intel objects to Plaintiff's Interrogatories to the extent they seek information not relevant to the claims or defenses of any party to this action; are overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence; and/or seek documents for which the burden or expense of the proposed discovery outweighs any likely benefit in resolving the issues of this action.

7. Intel objects to Plaintiff's Interrogatories to the extent they do not contain an appropriate restriction on the covered time period as unduly burdensome, unnecessarily broad, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Unless otherwise stated, to the extent these interrogatories seek information from an unspecified or over-expansive timeframe, Intel objects to production of information or documents that address dates or events after expiration of the patent in suit (without conceding that this is a reasonable time period). With regard to Intel's own claims and defenses, including but not limited to inequitable conduct, Intel reserves the right to seek discovery from an earlier period or to disclose documents or information from an earlier period.

8. Intel objects to the Interrogatories to the extent they are premature. Discovery has just begun in this case, and Intel's investigation is ongoing. Accordingly,

additional facts and witnesses may be discovered. Intel reserves the right to use at trial and in any other proceeding in this action any such additional documents, witnesses, facts and evidence that may have been omitted from these responses for one of the foregoing reasons or otherwise and, without obligating Intel to do so, Intel reserves the right to supplement these responses in the future as may be appropriate.

9. Intel objects to the definition of “Accused Products” as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence to the extent it seeks information about potential process technologies that have not been developed and that have not been used to manufacture products. Accordingly, for purposes of its responses, Intel will construe “Accused Products” as being limited to microprocessor semiconductors manufactured with Intel’s 32nm and 45nm technologies.

Intel objects to Plaintiff’s Interrogatories as a whole on each of the above grounds. Insofar as Plaintiff’s Interrogatories seek documents or information to which any of the above Reservation of Rights and/or General Objections apply, Intel hereby incorporates such Reservation of Rights and/or General Objections into its specific responses to such requests. Accordingly, the failure to note any general objection in any specific response above shall not be a waiver of such objection with respect to any request.

### **SPECIFIC OBJECTIONS**

#### **INTERROGATORY NO. 1:**

Identify each Accused Product and for each product explain in detail the factual and legal basis for any contention by Intel that it has not infringed the ‘998 patent including any contention that there is no literal infringement, infringement under the doctrine of equivalents, contributory infringement or induced infringement.

#### **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 1:**

Intel objects to the extent that this interrogatory seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege or the attorney work product doctrine. Intel further objects to the disclosure of confidential information prior to the entry of an appropriate protective order.

Intel also objects that this interrogatory is overbroad, unduly burdensome, and seeks information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Intel also objects to this interrogatory as premature. The parties have agreed that responses to contention interrogatories are not due until April 1, 2011.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 2:**

Explain in detail the factual and legal basis for any contention by Intel that it has not willfully infringed the '998 patent.

**RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 2:**

Intel objects to the extent that this interrogatory seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege or the attorney work product doctrine. Intel further objects to the disclosure of confidential information prior to the entry of an appropriate protective order. Intel also objects to this interrogatory as premature. The parties have agreed that responses to contention interrogatories are not due until April 1, 2011.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 3:**

Explain in detail the factual and legal basis for any contention by Intel that to the extent any claims of the '998 patent could be construed so as to read on any Intel products, STC's infringement claims are barred or limited by the applicable statute [sic] of limitations (including, but not necessarily limited to, 35 U.S.C. § 286), by the statutory notice requirements (including, but not necessarily limited to, 35 U.S.C. § 287), by absolute and equitable intervening rights (including, but not limited to, as set forth in 35 U.S.C. §§ 252 and 307(b)), by laches, prosecution history estoppel, estoppel (including dedication to the public) and by res judicata (including collateral estoppel).

**RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 3:**

Intel objects to the extent that this interrogatory seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege or the attorney work product doctrine. Intel further objects to the

disclosure of confidential information prior to the entry of an appropriate protective order. Intel also objects to this interrogatory as premature. The parties have agreed that responses to contention interrogatories are not due until April 1, 2011.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 4:**

Explain in detail the factual and legal basis for any contention by Intel that the '998 patent is invalid because the purported inventions claimed therein do not satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103, 111, 112, or 256, or judicially created doctrines of invalidity, and the Rules and Regulations of the U.S. PTO, including, but not limited to, an identification of all prior art Intel intends to rely upon along with an element-by-element application of any alleged prior art to each claim Intel alleges is invalid. In addition, for any contention concerning §103 state what Intel contends is the applicable level of skill of one of ordinary skill in the art.

**RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 4:**

Intel objects to the extent that this interrogatory seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege or the attorney work product doctrine. Intel further objects to the disclosure of confidential information prior to the entry of an appropriate protective order. Intel also objects to this interrogatory as premature. The parties have agreed that responses to contention interrogatories are not due until April 1, 2011.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 5:**

Explain in detail the factual and legal basis for any contention by Intel that STC does not own all right, title, and interest in the '998 patent, or that there are other owners in the '998 patent that are indispensable parties to this action mandating dismissal if they cannot be joined in the litigation.

**RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 5:**

Intel objects to the extent that this interrogatory seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege or the attorney work product doctrine. Intel further objects to the disclosure of confidential information prior to the entry of an appropriate protective order. Intel also objects to this interrogatory as premature. The parties have agreed that responses to contention interrogatories are not due until April 1, 2011.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 6:**

Explain in detail the factual and legal basis for any contention by Intel that it is licensed to perform some or all of the acts alleged to infringe the '998 patent.

**RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 6:**

Intel objects to the extent that this interrogatory seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege or the attorney work product doctrine. Intel further objects to the disclosure of confidential information prior to the entry of an appropriate protective order. Intel also objects to this interrogatory as premature. The parties have agreed that responses to contention interrogatories are not due until April 1, 2011.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 7:**

Explain in detail the factual and legal basis for any contention by Intel that STC has impermissibly broadened the scope of its patent grant with anticompetitive effect.

**RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 7:**

Intel objects to the extent that this interrogatory seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege or the attorney work product doctrine. Intel further objects to the disclosure of confidential information prior to the entry of an appropriate protective order. Intel also objects to this interrogatory as premature. The parties have agreed that responses to contention interrogatories are not due until April 1, 2011.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 8:**

Explain in detail the factual and legal basis for any contention by Intel that the '998 patent is unenforceable due to inequitable conduct.

**RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 8:**

Intel objects to the extent that this interrogatory seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege or the attorney work product doctrine. Intel further objects to the disclosure of confidential information prior to the entry of an appropriate protective order. Intel also objects to this interrogatory as premature. The parties have agreed that responses to contention interrogatories are not due until April 1, 2011.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 9:**

State when Intel first became aware of or had knowledge of the '998 patent, and state in detail the particulars of each fact supporting such date and each person having knowledge of each fact claimed to support the date.

**RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 9:**

Intel objects to the extent that this interrogatory seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege or the attorney work product doctrine. Intel further objects to the disclosure of confidential information prior to the entry of an appropriate protective order. Intel also objects to this interrogatory as premature.

Subject to and without waiving its general and specific objections, Intel responds that Stadheim & Grear sent Intel a letter dated June 12, 2008, that discussed the '998 patent. Intel's investigation is ongoing.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 10:**

For the years 2007 and thereafter, identify for each accused product the monthly sales, gross and net profits and/or revenues generated from the use and/or sale of the accused products and all costs associated with the sales and/or revenues.



**RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 10:**

Intel objects to the disclosure of confidential information prior to the entry of an appropriate protective order. Intel also objects that this interrogatory is overbroad, unduly burdensome, and seeks information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 33(d), Intel will produce business records containing summary financial information concerning the Accused Products (as Intel has defined the term in its general objections) after entry of such an order.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 11:**

If infringement liability is found, state what Intel contends is a proper basis for damages due to STC, and the rationale thereof.

**RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 11:**

Intel objects to the extent that this interrogatory seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege or the attorney work product doctrine. Intel further objects to the disclosure of confidential information prior to the entry of an appropriate protective order. Intel also objects to this interrogatory as premature. Intel further objects that this interrogatory seeks information that will be the subject of expert testimony. Intel will produce such information in accordance with the schedule set by the Court for the disclosure of experts.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 12:**

Identify all expert witnesses that Intel intends to call at any evidentiary hearing in this case and provide a detailed statement of any opinions to be rendered by each such expert and the basis for each such opinion.

**RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 12:**

Intel objects to the extent that this interrogatory seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege or the attorney work product doctrine. Intel further objects to the

disclosure of confidential information prior to the entry of an appropriate protective order. Intel also objects to this interrogatory as premature. Intel further objects that this interrogatory seeks information that will be the subject of expert testimony. Intel will produce such information in accordance with the schedule set by the Court for the disclosure of experts.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 13:**

Identify each person with personal knowledge of the facts in this case, and for each such person, identify the substance of their knowledge, their address, the company where each such person is employed and the position each such person holds with that company; and state of the identified individuals which ones Intel intends to call as a witness at trial in this lawsuit.

**RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 13:**

Intel objects to the extent that this interrogatory seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege or the attorney work product doctrine. Intel further objects to the disclosure of confidential information prior to the entry of an appropriate protective order. Intel also objects to this interrogatory as premature. Intel will disclose its trial witnesses in accordance with the schedule set by the Court.

Subject to and without waiving its general and specific objections, Intel directs Plaintiff to Intel's initial disclosures and the potential witnesses Intel identified in the joint status report.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 14:**

Identify each document and tangible thing Intel intends to rely upon at trial in this lawsuit.

**RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 14:**

Intel objects to the extent that this interrogatory seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege or the attorney work product doctrine. Intel further objects to the disclosure of confidential information prior to the entry of an appropriate protective order. Intel also objects to this interrogatory as premature. Intel will disclose its trial exhibits in accordance with the schedule set by the Court.

Subject to and without waiving its general and specific objections, Intel directs Plaintiff to the potential trial exhibits Intel identified in the joint status report.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 15:**

Identify all designations, including internal names, code names, product names and project names, alphanumeric or otherwise, used internally to refer to each Accused Product, including an explanation of the meaning of such designations.

**RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 15:**

Intel objects to the disclosure of confidential information prior to the entry of an appropriate protective order. Intel also objects that this interrogatory is overbroad, unduly burdensome, and seeks information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 16:**

Identify all designations, including internal names, code names, product names and project names, alphanumeric or otherwise, used internally to refer to the lithography process(es) and/or lithography process flow(s) used in the manufacture of each Accused Product, including an explanation of the meaning of such designations.

**RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 16:**

Intel objects to the disclosure of confidential information prior to the entry of an appropriate protective order. Intel also objects that this interrogatory is overbroad, unduly

burdensome, and seeks information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 33(d), Intel will produce documents sufficient to identify the code names of 32nm and 45nm process technology after entry of such an order.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 17:**

Identify all documents by Bates number that explain the meaning of the designations, including internal names, code names, product names and project names, alphanumeric or otherwise, used internally to refer to (1) each Accused Product, (2) the lithography process(es) used in the manufacture of each Accused Product, and (3) each device and/or mask layer used in the manufacture thereof of each Accused Product.

**RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 17:**

Intel objects to the disclosure of confidential information prior to the entry of an appropriate protective order. Intel also objects that this interrogatory is overbroad, unduly burdensome, and seeks information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 33(d), Intel will produce documents sufficient to identify the code names of its 32nm and 45nm process technology after entry of such an order.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 18:**

For each lithography process identified in response to Interrogatory No. 16, separately state the smallest critical dimension and smallest pattern pitch that each such process is intended to fabricate.

**RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 18:**

Intel objects to the disclosure of confidential information prior to the entry of an appropriate protective order. Intel also objects that this interrogatory is overbroad, unduly

burdensome, and seeks information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Intel further objects to this interrogatory as vague and ambiguous.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 19:**

For each Accused Product separately identify by Bates number all documents showing, explaining, and/or illustrating the lithographic mask data, the lithographic design data, and GDS 2 or GDS II files used in the manufacture of that product.

**RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 19:**

Intel objects to the disclosure of confidential information prior to the entry of an appropriate protective order. Intel also objects that this interrogatory is overbroad, unduly burdensome, and seeks information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. After entry of an appropriate protective order, Intel will make available for inspection the relevant GDS files for representative products for its 32nm and 45nm process technology.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 20:**

For each Accused Product, separately identify by Bates number all documents showing, explaining, and/or illustrating which lithography process identified in response to Interrogatory No. 16 was used for each device and/or mask layer identified in response to Interrogatory No. 17.

**RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 20:**

Intel objects to the disclosure of confidential information prior to the entry of an appropriate protective order. Intel also objects that this interrogatory is overbroad, unduly burdensome, and seeks information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. After entry of an appropriate protective order, Intel will make available for inspection the relevant GDS files for representative products for its 32nm and 45nm process technology.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 21:**

Identify all patents the numbers of which are marked on any of the accused Accused [sic] Products, or the documentation and/or packaging accompanying the accused Accused [sic] Products.

**RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 21:**

Intel objects that this interrogatory is overbroad, unduly burdensome, and seeks information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

Dated: March 4, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

ATKINSON, THAL & BAKER, P.C.

By /s/ Clifford K. Atkinson

Douglas A. Baker

Clifford K. Atkinson

201 Third Street, N.W., Suite 1850

Albuquerque, NM 87102

(505) 764-8111

Robert A. Van nest

Brian L. Ferrall

KEKER & VAN NEST LLP

Chad S. Campbell

Jonathan M. James

Timothy J. Franks

Mark E. Strickland

Jonathan L. McFarland

PERKINS COIE LLP

*Attorneys for Defendant*

*Intel Corporation*