

1 Andrew G. Strickland (CA SBN: 272364)  
2 Andrew.Strickland@leehayes.com  
3 William B. Dyer III (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
4 Bill.Dyer@leehayes.com  
5 **LEE & HAYES, PC**  
6 1175 Peachtree Street  
100 Colony Square, Suite 2000  
Atlanta, GA 30361  
Tel: (404) 736-1925/Fax: (404) 815-1700

7 Marc E. Hankin (SBN: 170505)  
8 Marc@HankinPatentLaw.com  
9 Anooj Patel (SBN: 300297)  
10 Anooj@HankinPatentLaw.com  
11 **HANKIN PATENT LAW, APC**  
4299 MacArthur Boulevard, Suite 100  
Newport Beach, CA 92660  
Tel: (949) 251-0898; Fax: (310) 979-3603

12 Attorneys for Plaintiff,  
13 **MEMORY TECHNOLOGIES, LLC**

Christopher Kao (SBN 237716)  
christopher.kao@pillsburylaw.com  
Brock S. Weber (SBN 261383)  
brock.weber@pillsburylaw.com  
**PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW  
PITTMAN LLP**  
Four Embarcadero Center, 22<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94111-5998  
Tel: 415.983.1000; Fax: 415.983.1200

Christine Yang (SBN 102048)  
chrisyang@sjclawpc.com  
**LAW OFFICE OF S.J. CHRISTINE  
YANG**  
17220 Newhope Street, Suite 101-102  
Fountain Valley, CA 92708  
Tel: 714.641.4022; Fax: 714.641.2082

Attorneys for Defendants,  
**KINGSTON TECHNOLOGY  
CORPORATION,  
and KINGSTON TECHNOLOGY  
COMPANY, INC.**

14  
15  
16 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
17 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

18 MEMORY TECHNOLOGIES, LLC, a  
19 Nevada company,

20 Plaintiff,

21 vs.

22 KINGSTON TECHNOLOGY  
23 CORPORATION, a California  
24 corporation, KINGSTON  
TECHNOLOGY COMPANY, INC. a  
25 Delaware corporation,

26 Defendants.

Case No. 8:18-cv-00171-JLS-JDE

**THIRD JOINT CLAIM  
CONSTRUCTION AND  
PREHEARING STATEMENT (N.D.  
CAL. PATENT L.R. 4-3)**

Claim Construction Hearing:  
November 27, 2018 at 9 AM

Honorable Josephine L. Staton

1 Plaintiff Memory Technologies, LLC (“MTL” or “Plaintiff”) and  
2 Defendants Kingston Technology Corporation and Kingston Technology  
3 Company, Inc. (collectively, “Kingston” or “Defendants”) submit this Third Joint  
4 Claim Construction Statement because the parties have agreed to a construction for  
5 the only claim term in dispute for U.S. Pat. No. 7,739,487 (“the ’487 Patent”),  
6 obviating the need to discuss the ’487 Patent during the November 27, 2018 Claim  
7 Construction Hearing and Technology Tutorial.

8 This Third Joint Claim Construction Statement and Exhibit A addresses each  
9 of the eight patents-in-suit: U.S. Patent Nos. RE45,486 (“the RE486 Patent”);  
10 RE45,542 (“the RE542 Patent”); 7,565,469 (“the ’469 Patent”); 7,827,370 (“the  
11 ’370 Patent”); 7,739,487 (“the ’487 Patent”); 8,307,180 (“the ’180 Patent”);  
12 9,063,850 (“the ’850 Patent”); and 9,367,486 (“the ’486 Patent”).

## 13 I. AGREED CLAIM CONSTRUCTIONS

### 14 A. U.S. Pat. No. RE45,542

- 15 • “means for connecting the peripheral device to an electronic device  
16 for supplying power to the peripheral device” (claim 18):
  - 17 ○ means-plus-function claim governed by 35 U.S.C. §112, para. 6
  - 18 ○ function: “connecting the peripheral device to an electronic  
19 device for supplying power to the peripheral device”
  - 20 ○ structure: connector 11 of FIG. 1 and FIG. 2, 4:43-48; and  
21 structural equivalents thereof.
- 22 • “means for setting a [the] maximum power consumption of the  
23 peripheral device to a value which is in a range from said default  
24 value to said limiting value, said range including said default value  
25 and said limiting value” (claims 18 and 28)
  - 26 ○ means-plus-function claim governed by 35 U.S.C. §112, para. 6
  - 27 ○ function: “setting the maximum power consumption of the  
28

1 peripheral device to a value which is in a range from said  
2 default value to said limiting value, said range including said  
3 default value and said limiting value”

- 4 ○ structure: processor 13 of Fig. 1, Fig. 2, Fig. 3, 2:49- 59, 4:57-  
5 59, 6:6-30, 6:27-30; and structural equivalents thereof.

6 **B. U.S. Pat. No. 7,827,370**

- 7 • “data register” (claims 1, 5, 12, 14, 25)  
8 ○ “a portion of memory containing information about a memory  
9 card”  
10 • “redefine the command to allow permanent write protection” (claims  
11 1, 12, 25)  
12 ○ “cause a command that would not result in permanent write  
13 protection to result in permanent write protection”  
14 • “wherein said at least one bit has a certain predefined value” (claim 2)  
15 ○ “wherein the bit is set to a value associated with permanent  
16 write protection”  
17 • “wherein said at least one bit is reprogrammable” (claim 3)  
18 ○ “wherein the at least one bit can be changed”  
19 • “memory group” (claims 5, 6, 13, 14, 15)  
20 ○ “a segment of memory”

21 **C. U.S. Pat. No. 7,565,469**

- 22 • “within [a / the] command execution” (claim 19)  
23 ○ “while performing in accordance with the same command”

24 **D. U.S. Pat. No. 7,739,487**

- 25 • “during power up [process]”  
26 ○ “during the power up process of the peripheral device”  
27  
28

- 1 • “memory module”
  - 2 ○ “memory portion of the peripheral device, or a sub-portion of
  - 3 the memory portion of the peripheral device”

4 **E. U.S. Pat. No. 9,367,486**

- 5 • “means for receiving one or more commands to activate at least one
- 6 predefined access profile of two or more predefined access profiles
- 7 associated with the memory device” (claim 15)
  - 8 ○ means-plus-function claim governed by 35 U.S.C. §112, para. 6
  - 9 ○ function: “receiving one or more commands to activate at least
  - 10 one predefined access profile of two or more predefined access
  - 11 profiles associated with the memory device”
  - 12 ○ structure: controller 508, communication interface 512, and
  - 13 interface 506 of Figure 5, 4:38-55; and structural equivalents
  - 14 thereof.
- 15 • “means for configuring, based at least in part on the one or more
- 16 commands, access to the memory device in accordance with the at
- 17 least one predefined access profile” (claim 15)
  - 18 ○ means-plus-function claim governed by 35 U.S.C. §112, para. 6
  - 19 ○ function: “configuring, based at least in part on the one or more
  - 20 commands, access to the memory device in accordance with the
  - 21 at least one predefined access profile”
  - 22 ○ structure: controller 508 of Figure 5, 4:38-55; and structural
  - 23 equivalents thereof.
- 24 • “means for activating, based at least in part on the one or more
- 25 commands, at least two predefined access profiles of the two or more
- 26 predefined access profiles in parallel”
  - 27 ○ means-plus-function claim governed by 35 U.S.C. §112, para. 6
  - 28 ○

- 1           ○ function: “activating, based at least in part on the one or more
- 2            commands, at least two predefined access profiles of the two or
- 3            more predefined access profiles in parallel”
- 4           ○ structure: controller 508, physical memory 502, memory
- 5            registers 504, communication interface 512, and interface 506
- 6            of Figure 5, 4:38-55; and structural equivalents thereof.

## 7 **II. DISPUTED CLAIM CONSTRUCTIONS**

8           Those claim terms or phrases for which the parties were unable to reach  
9 agreement are disclosed in Exhibit A. Exhibit A also identifies the Parties’  
10 proposed constructions and intrinsic and extrinsic evidence for each disputed claim  
11 term or phrase. The parties note that there are no claim terms in dispute for U.S.  
12 Pat. No. 7,827,370 or U.S. Pat. No. 7,739,487.

13           The parties respectfully reserve the right to amend, correct, or supplement  
14 their respective claim construction positions in response to any change of position  
15 by another party or for other good cause.

## 16 **III. MOST SIGNIFICANT CLAIM TERMS**

17           The parties jointly believe that the following terms, up to a maximum of ten,  
18 are most significant to the resolution of the case:

- 19           1.     “maximum power consumption [of / for] the peripheral device” (the  
20 RE542 Patent)
- 21           2.     “[predefined] access profile(s)” (the ’180 Patent, the ’850 Patent, and  
22 the ’486 Patent)

23           MTL does not believe any additional terms are most significant to the  
24 resolution of the case.

25           Kingston believes the following additional terms are most significant to the  
26 resolution of this case:

- 27           3.     “expanded addressing method” (the RE486 Patent)

- 28           4.     “the memory card further configured to have stored therein an

# 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.