

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

VLSI TECHNOLOGY LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

INTEL CORPORATION,

Defendant.

C.A. No. 18-966-CFC

**FILED UNDER SEAL**

---

**REPLY BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF  
PLAINTIFF VLSI TECHNOLOGY LLC'S SECOND MOTION  
TO REINTRODUCE CERTAIN ASSERTED PATENT CLAIMS, OR TO  
SEVER SUCH CLAIMS INTO A SEPARATE ACTION TO BE STAYED**

---

Dated: March 20, 2020

Brian E. Farnan (Bar No. 4089)  
Michael J. Farnan (Bar No. 5165)  
FARNAN LLP  
919 N. Market St., 12th Floor  
Wilmington, DE 19801  
Telephone : (302) 777-0300  
Fax : (302) 777-0301  
bfarnan@farnanlaw.com  
mfarnan@farnanlaw.com

Morgan Chu (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Benjamin Hattenbach (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Iian D. Jablon (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Christopher Abernethy (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Amy E. Proctor (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Dominik Slusarczyk (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
S. Adina Stohl (admitted *pro hac vice*)

Charlotte J. Wen (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Brian M. Weissenberg (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
IRELL & MANELLA LLP  
1800 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 900  
Los Angeles, California 90067  
Telephone: (310) 277-1010  
mchu@irell.com  
bhatenbach@irell.com  
ijablon@irell.com  
cabernethy@irell.com  
aproctor@irell.com  
dslusarczyk@irell.com  
astohl@irell.com  
cwen@irell.com  
bweissenberg@irell.com

*Attorneys for Plaintiff  
VLSI Technology LLC*

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
I. There Is No Dispute The Reintroduced Claims Present Unique Issues of Validity and Infringement, Implicating Due Process.....	1
A. Intel Admits The <i>Katz</i> Standard Is Satisfied .....	1
B. Intel's "General Arguments" Are Mere Attempts At Misdirection .....	1
C. Intel Fails To Refute Any of VLSI's Claim-By-Claim Arguments.....	3
1. The '331 Patent .....	3
2. The '026 Patent .....	4
3. The '633 Patent .....	5
4. The '552 Patent .....	6
II. VLSI Has Provided "A Showing of Good Cause That Includes A Demonstration that [Reintroduction] Is Necessary To Vindicate [VLSI's] Due Process Rights" .....	6
A. Intel Misstates Both This Court's Order and The Law .....	6
B. Intel's Suggestion That VLSI's Motion Is "Untimely" Is Meritless .....	8
III. Intel's Suggestion That Upholding Due Process Would Be Disruptive and Prejudicial Is Misguided .....	9
IV. If Not Reintroduced, The Claims At Issue Must Be Severed And Stayed.....	10

...

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Page(s)**

**Cases**

*In re Katz Interactive Call Processing Patent Litig., Inc.*,  
639 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....*passim*

**Other Authorities**

Fed. R. Civ. P. 11 .....2

\* Unless noted, all emphasis is added.

**I. There Is No Dispute The Reintroduced Claims Present Unique Issues of Validity and Infringement, Implicating Due Process**

**A. Intel Admits The *Katz* Standard Is Satisfied**

Intel admits that "the limitations of each unelected claim are ... different from the limitations of each elected claim" and that "the unelected claims omit certain limitations that form the basis for Intel's noninfringement defenses for certain elected claims." D.I. 591 ("Intel Op.") at 2, 12. This aligns perfectly with the *Katz* standard—*i.e.*, a "defense raised by [the] defendant [] to a currently asserted claim does not apply in substantially the same manner to a newly asserted claim." *In re Katz Interactive Call Processing Patent Litig., Inc.*, 639 F.3d 1303, 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2011).

Because Intel admits that the claims VLSI seeks to reintroduce present unique issues of infringement and validity, there is no meaningful dispute that they implicate VLSI's due process rights. The Court could end its analysis here.

**B. Intel's "General Arguments" Are Mere Attempts At Misdirection**

Having admitted the *Katz* standard is satisfied, Intel resorts to misdirection.

First, Intel argues it is not enough that "the unelected claims contain certain limitations not present in certain elected claims." Intel Op. at 12. This is a strawman. VLSI agrees, as does the Federal Circuit, that "[w]hile different claims are presumed to be of different scope, that does not mean that they necessarily present different questions of validity or infringement." *Katz*, 639 F.3d at 1313. There must be a difference that actually matters, whereby a "*defense* raised by [the] defendant [] to a

# Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

## Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

## Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

## Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

## API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

## LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

## FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

## E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.