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-CJB

VLSI TECHNOLOGY LLC'S RESPONSE TO THE COURT'S OCTOBER 17, 2022 MEMORANDUM ORDER

Dated: December 2, 2022

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*)
Ian Washburn (admitted *pro hac vice)*
Christopher Abernethy (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Amy E. Proctor (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Dominik Slusarczyk (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Charlotte J. Wen (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
bhattenbach@irell.com

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

ijablon@irell.com
iwashburn@irell.com
cabernethy@irell.com
aproctor@irell.com
dslusarczyk@irell.com
cwen@irell.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff VLSI Technology LLC

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

I. INTRODUCTION……..……1

II. DISCUSSION……...……2

Question 1: Did the Court have the authority to issue its April 18, 2022 Standing Order Regarding Disclosure Statements Required by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 7.1?.....2

Answer to Question 1: No. The Court's April 18 Standing Order covers subject matter not appropriate for a standing order. Accordingly, the April 18 Standing Order should at minimum have gone through the more rigorous vetting process to be made a Local Rule. Since it did not, it is therefore void……...2

Question 2: Without knowing the identity of the true owners of VLSI, how can the Court assure itself that it does not have a conflict of interest that precludes it from presiding over the case?.....7

Answer to Question 2: The Court does know the identity of the true owners of VLSI sufficient to conclude that there is no conflict of interest or appearance of impropriety requiring disqualification……..……7

Question 3: Without knowing the identity of the true owners of VLSI, how can the Court assure itself that its presiding over the case will not create an appearance of impropriety?.....10

Answer to Question 3: VLSI incorporates its response to Question 2 above. The Court does know the identity of the true owners of VLSI sufficient to conclude that there is no conflict of interest or appearance of impropriety requiring disqualification……..……10

Question 4: Should the Court dismiss the case because of VLSI's failure to provide the information required by the Court's April 18, 2022 Standing Order Regarding Disclosure Statements Required by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 7.1?.....12

Answer to Question 4: No. As explained above in VLSI's response to Question 1, the Court lacks authority to enter the April 18 Standing Order.

DOCKET ALARM Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

Moreover, and in any event, as explained in VLSI's responses to Questions 2 and 3, VLSI complied with the Order to the best of VLSI's ability, and sufficient to allow the Court to confirm that no ethical conflict exists……12

III. CONCLUSION……...……19

DOCKET ALARM Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases Page(s)

Alexander v. Primerica Holdings,
10 F.3d 155 (3d Cir.1993)……..……..11

Arunachalam v. Int'l Bus. Machines Corp.,
No. CV 16-281, 2016 WL 5403592 (D. Del. Sept. 26, 2016), aff'd, 759 F. App'x 927 (Fed. Cir. 2019)……..……..9

Blanche Rd. Corp. v. Bensalem Twp.,
57 F.3d 253 (3d Cir. 1995)……..…10, 11

Cent. Tel. Co. of Va. v. Sprint Comm. Co. of Va.,
715 F.3d 501 (4th Cir. 2013)……..….8

Ciaverelli v. Stryker Med,
29 F. App'x 832 (3d Cir. 2002)…….14

Commercial Cleaning Servs. LLC v. Colin Serv. Sys., Inc.
271 F.3d 374 (2d Cir. 2001)…….16

Cowley v. Pulsifer,
137 Mass. 392 (1884)……..……..18

Doe v. Megless,
654 F.3d 404 (3d Cir. 2011)……..……17, 18

Gerling Int'l. Ins. Co. v. Comm'r Internal Revenue
839 F.2d 131 (3d Cir. 1988) …….……16

Hammond Packing Co. v. Arkansas,
212 U.S. 322 (1909)……..……17

Hildebrand v. Allegheny Cty.,
923 F.3d 128 (3d Cir. 2019)……..……15

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKET ALARM

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.