

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

SEQUOIA TECHNOLOGY, LLC, )  
)  
Plaintiff, )  
v. ) C.A. No. 18-1127 (LPS) (CJB)  
) (CONSOLIDATED)  
DELL INC., DELL TECHNOLOGIES INC. and its )  
subsidiary EMC CORPORATION (AKA DELL )  
EMC), )  
)  
Defendants. )  
\_\_\_\_\_  
RED HAT, INC. )  
)  
Plaintiff, )  
v. ) C.A. No. 18-2027 (LPS) (CJB)  
)  
SEQUOIA TECHNOLOGY, LLC and )  
ELECTRONICS AND )  
TELECOMMUNICATIONS RESEARCH )  
INSTITUTE, )  
)  
Defendants. )  
\_\_\_\_\_

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING JOINT MOTION FOR ENTRY OF FINAL  
JUDGMENT**

Whereas, Sequoia Technology, LLC (“Sequoia”) filed complaints for infringement of U.S. Patent No. 6,718,436 (“the ’436 Patent”) against Dell Inc.; Dell Technologies Inc.; and its subsidiary EMC Corporation (a/k/a Dell EMC) (C.A. No. 18-1127); Hewlett Packard Enterprise Company (C.A. No. 18-1128); Hitachi Ltd. and Hitachi Vantara Corporation (C.A. No. 18-1129); and Super Micro Computer, Inc. (C.A. No. 18-1307) (collectively, the “Initial Defendants”);

Whereas, Red Hat, Inc. (“Red Hat”) filed a complaint for declaratory judgment against Sequoia and later amended the complaint to add the Electronics and Telecommunications Research Institute (“ETRI”) as a defendant (C.A. No. 18-2027);

Whereas, Sequoia brought a counterclaim for infringement of the ’436 Patent against Red Hat and Red Hat’s parent company International Business Machines Corp. (“IBM”) (Sequoia, ETRI, Red Hat, IBM, and the Initial Defendants are collectively the “Parties”);

Whereas, the Court stayed the cases against the Initial Defendants and IBM pending resolution of C.A. No. 18-2027;

Whereas, Sequoia served its Asserted Claims and Preliminary Infringement Contentions, in which it identified the asserted Claims 1–3 and 8 of the ’436 Patent (“the Asserted Claims”) and identified the products of infringing these claims as Red Hat Enterprise Linux version 4 or later (“the Accused Products”).

Whereas, on October 1, 2020, Magistrate Judge Burke issued a Report and Recommendation (“R&R,” D.I. 231), recommending that this Court adopt certain claim constructions (the “Claim Constructions”) for disputed terms in the ’436 Patent.

Whereas, on October 29, 2020, Sequoia and ETRI filed Objections to the R&R (D.I. 247), to which Red Hat responded on December 1, 2020 (D.I. 251).

Whereas, on May 20, 2021, this Court overruled Sequoia and ETRI's objections, and adopted the R&R without modification. (D.I. 253).

Whereas, in this Court's Claim Constructions, the term "disk partition" has been construed as "section of a disk that is a minimum unit of a logical volume." (D.I. 231, at 32; D.I. 253). In so holding, the Court adopted Red Hat's proposed construction and indicated agreement with Red Hat's argument "that logical volumes are not created by subsets of disk partitions, but instead from whole or entire disk partitions." (D.I. 231, at 11). The "disk partition" term appears in limitations applicable to each Asserted Claim of the '436 Patent.

Whereas the Parties stipulate that the Accused Products do not meet the claim limitations reciting "disk partition" under this Claim Construction. Specifically, the Parties stipulate that, in the Accused Products, the disk partition is not the "section of a disk that is a minimum unit of a logical volume." Rather, the Accused Products can form logical volumes utilizing units smaller than "whole" or "entire" disk partitions, such as an "extent," as a minimum unit of the alleged logical volume. Accordingly, under this Court's Claim Construction of "disk partition," the Accused Products do not infringe any Asserted Claim.

Whereas, in this Court's Claim Constructions, the term "logical volume" has been construed as "extensible union of more than one disk partition, the size of which is resized in disk partition units." (D.I. 231, at 32; D.I. 253). In so holding, the Court adopted Red Hat's proposed construction and indicated agreement with Red Hat's argument that a logical volume cannot "be formed from a sub-portion of a disk partition." (D.I. 231, at 14). The "logical volume" term appears in limitations applicable to each Asserted Claim of the '436 Patent.

Whereas the Parties stipulate that the Accused Products do not meet the claim limitations reciting "logical volume" under this Claim Construction. Specifically, the Parties stipulate that,

in the Accused Products, the logical volume is not the “extensible union of more than one disk partition, the size of which is resized in disk partition units.” Rather, logical volumes in the Accused Products can be resized from sub-portions of a disk partition. Accordingly, under this Court’s Claim Construction of “logical volume,” the Accused Products do not infringe any Asserted Claim.

Whereas Sequoia and ETRI intend to appeal the judgment, challenging, among other things, this Court’s Claim Constructions of “disk partition” and “logical volume.” Sequoia and ETRI contend that the Accused Products do infringe under the correct constructions of the ’436 Patent’s Asserted Claims, and that, if the Claim Constructions of “disk partition” and “logical volume” are corrected, Sequoia and ETRI will be able to maintain their allegations that the Accused Products infringe the ’436 Patent. The judgment will be subject to all rights of Sequoia and/or ETRI to appeal including, without limitation, their rights to challenge the Court’s Claim Constructions of “disk partition,” “logical volume,” “computer-readable recording medium,” and any other disputed claim term on appeal.

Whereas, subject to all of Sequoia and/or ETRI’s rights to appeal, the Parties acknowledge that the Court’s Claim Constructions of the “disk partition” and “logical volume” terms of the ’436 Patent fully resolve Sequoia’s claims of infringement against the Initial Defendants, Red Hat, and IBM because the Accused Products do not infringe the Asserted Claims of the ’436 Patent under the Court’s Claim Constructions and the Parties’ stipulations set forth above.

Whereas, Red Hat contends, that under the Court’s Construction of “extent allocation table for indicating whether each extent in the disk partition is used or not used” and the Court’s Construction that the preamble phrase “a method for managing a logical volume in order to support dynamic online resizing and minimizing a size of metadata” is limiting, the Accused Products do

not infringe the Asserted Claims. Red Hat further contends that, under the Court's Construction of "mirror data table for validating data," the Accused Products do not infringe Claim 3. Sequoia and ETRI dispute these contentions, and therefore the Parties have not stipulated to non-infringement based on these constructions.

Whereas, in this Court's Claim Constructions, the term "computer-readable recording medium" has been construed as "transitory or non-transitory computer-readable recording medium." (D.I. 231, at 32). In so holding, the Court adopted Red Hat's proposed construction and indicated that "transitory mediums" include "signals or waves," such as "carrier waves." (D.I. 231, at 28). The Federal Circuit has held "carrier waves" to be ineligible for patenting. *See Mentor Graphics Corp. v. EVE-USA, Inc.*, 851 F.3d 1275, 1294 (Fed. Cir. 2017) (citing *In re Nuijten*, 500 F.3d 1346, 1355, 1357 (Fed. Cir. 2007)). Therefore, the Parties stipulate that, under this Court's Claim Construction, Claims 8 through 10 are invalid under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for encompassing unpatentable subject matter.

Whereas Sequoia and ETRI intend to appeal the judgment, challenging, among other things, this Court's Claim Construction of "computer-readable recording medium." Sequoia and ETRI contend that, under the correct constructions, Claims 8 through 10 do not encompass unpatentable subject matter and do satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 101.

It is hereby **ORDERED** that:

1. Judgment will be entered in a separate document in accordance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 58, providing for judgment in favor of the following Parties on the following claims, based on the Parties' stipulations and the grounds set forth above:
  - a. In favor of Red Hat Inc. on its claim for declaratory judgment of non-infringement of the '436 Patent, on its claim for declaratory judgment of invalidity of Claims 8

# 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.