3

4

5

67

8

9

10

1112

13

1415

16

17

18 19

20

2122

23

///

///

2425

26

2728

COOLER MASTER CO., LTD.,

Counter-Claim Plaintiff,

v.

AAVID THERMALLOY LLC and BOYD CORPORATION,

Counter-Claim Defendants.

Pursuant to Patent L.R. 4-3, Plaintiff Aavid Thermalloy LLC ("Aavid") and Defendants Cooler Master Co., Ltd. and CMI USA, Inc. ("Defendants") hereby jointly provide this Joint Claim Construction and Prehearing Statement regarding U.S. Patent No. 7,066,240 ("'240 patent"), U.S. Patent No. 7,100,679 ("'679 patent"), and U.S. Patent No. 7,100,680 ("'680 patent") (collectively, "patents-in-suit").

I. Stipulated Claim Constructions Pursuant to Patent L.R. 4-3(a)

Aavid and Defendants have met and conferred in an effort to identify proposed constructions that can be agreed upon and have narrowed their disputes to four claim terms. At this time, however, no stipulated constructions have been identified as necessary.

II. Disputed Terms, Proposed Constructions, and Supporting Evidence Pursuant to Patent L.R. 4-3(b)

The disputed terms and Aavid's and Defendants' respective proposed constructions are set forth in the chart below, along with an identification of the intrinsic and extrinsic evidence on which they intend to rely.¹

¹ Unless otherwise noted, all intrinsic record citations are provided with reference to the '240 patent; the corresponding portions of the '679 patent and the '680 patent are incorporated by reference.

Case No. 4:17-cv-05363-JSW

Claim Terms	Aavid's Proposed Constructions & Support	Defendants' Proposed Constructions & Support
"vapor chamber"	A vacuum sealed chamber, wherein a heat transfer fluid is evaporated and condensed and capillary forces are	Enclosed and sealed void or cavity in which a suitable quantity of liquid is present to be evaporated (or
'240 patent: claims 9-13	utilized to spread heat	vaporized) and condensed to transport or spread heat
'679 patent:	See preamble; title of invention; 1:41-	G G 14 1 4 4 1 50 2 52
claims 1, 2 '680 patent:	44, 57-58, 61, 67; 2:2, 4-5, 11-40; 3:30-35, 48-67; 4:1-5, 19-20, 41-48, 61-67; 5:1-15; and Figs. 1-3.	See reference 14, abstract, 1:50-2:53, 3:6-17, 3:21-5:8, Figs. 1-3; claims 1, 9-14; '240 patent: claims 3, 4, 8; '67'
claims 1-3, 5	01 07,011 10, 4110 1180. 1 0.	patent: claims 1-3, 6; '680 patent:
	U.S. Pat. No. 6,437,983 at 1:32-44.	claims 1, 2, 4.
		http://www.dictionary.com/browse/chamber
		https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/c ctionary/english/chamber
		https://www.merriam- webster.com/dictionary/chamber
		https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/det nition/chamber
		https://www.collinsdictionary.com/u/dictionary/english/chamber
		https://www.macmillandictionary.co m/us/dictionary/american/chamber
		https://www.thefreedictionary.com/chamber
		https://www.ldoceonline.com/dictionary/chamber
		https://www.merriam- webster.com/dictionary/vacuum
		https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/cctionary/english/vacuum
		http://www.dictionary.com/browse/vacuum
		Iononess Evening d Heller M. 1.1
		Japanese Examined Utility Model Application Publication; Title: Heat Pipe; Dates of Publication: July 9,
		1991 and March 27, 1996; Inventors:

Case No. 4:17-cv-05363-JSW

JOINT CLAIM CONSTRUCTION AND

PREHEARING STATEMENT

Claim Terms	Aavid's Proposed Constructions & Support	Defendants' Proposed Constructions & Support
	Support	Tadahito Takahashi, Kaoru
		Hasegawa, Muneaki Sokawa (4:48-
		64)
		The American Heritage Dictionary
		4th ed. at 308 (2000): Chamber: An
		enclosed space or compartment.
		The American Heritage Dictionary
		4th ed. at 1897-98 (2000): Vacuum: 1a. Absence of matter. b. A space
		empty of matter. c. A space relatively
		empty of matter. d. A space in which
		the pressure is significantly lower
		than atmospheric pressure. 2. A state
		of emptiness; a void.
		The American Heritage Dictionary
		4th ed. at 297 (2000): Cavity: 1. A
		hollow; a hole.
		U.S. Pat. No. 4,012,770 (13:53-63);
		U.S. Pat. No. 4,165,472 (1:55-60, 4:23-30, 6:60-7:7);
		4.25-50, 0.00-7.7),
		U.S. Pat. No. 6,817,097 (3:1-9, 21-
		36, reference 113).
		Summary of expert testimony:
		Dr. Pokharna will opine how one of ordinary skill in the art would
		understand, at the time of the alleged
		invention for the patents-in-suit, the term "vapor chamber" in the context
		of the patent-in-suit, as well as any
		state-of-the-art or background
		information in connection with the patents-in-suit and the related
		field(s). He will explain why the
		term should be accordingly construed
		as "enclosed and sealed void or

PREHEARING STATEMENT

Claim Terms	Aavid's Proposed Constructions & Support	Defendants' Proposed Constructions & Support
		cavity in which a suitable quantity of liquid is present to be evaporated (or vaporized) and condensed to transport or spread heat."
"lip" '240 patent:	Portion of the plate defined by the bonded region of the plate's inner or interior surface	Portion of the plate comprising a region bonded to another plate
claims 11-13 '679 patent: claim 5	See references 22 and 24 in Figs. 1-3; 3:27-28, 36-37; 4:44-48.	See references 22 and 24, 2:41-53, 3:25-47, 4:6-18, 4:37-5:9, Figs. 1-3.
'680 patent: claims 1-3, 5	https://www.merriam-	https://www.collinsdictionary.com/u/dictionary/english/lip_1
, , ,	webster.com/dictionary/lip (last visited May 29, 2018): lip: the edge	https://www.merriam-
	of a hollow vessel or cavity.	webster.com/dictionary/lip
	Merriam Webster's Collegiate Dictionary 10th ed. at 679 (1995): <u>lip</u>	http://www.dictionary.com/browse/lp
	(4a): the edge of a hollow vessel or cavity.	https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/de
		nition/lip
		Summary of expert testimony: Dr. Pokharna will opine that, at the
		time of the alleged invention for the patents-in-suit, the term "lip" lacked
		a plain and ordinary meaning to one of ordinary skill in the art. He will
		then opine how one of ordinary skill in the art would understand, at that
		time, the term "lip" in the context of the patent-in-suit, as well as any state-of-the-art or background
		information in connection with the patents-in-suit and the related
		field(s). He will explain why the term should be accordingly construe
		as "portion of the plate comprising a region bonded to another plate."
		1551011 conded to unother plate.
"spacer"	A structure, apart from the separately claimed depression, that is configured	Plain and ordinary meaning.

Claim Terms	Aavid's Proposed Constructions & Support	Defendants' Proposed Constructions & Support
'240 patent:	to maintain a space or clearance	If a construction is necessary:
claim 11	between the plates and provides	Structure used to maintain a space or
'679 patent: claim 5	support for a capillary wick	clearance between the plates
'680 patent:	See 1:57-58; 2:7-11, 14-15, 18-28;	See references 26, 44, 2:3-53, 3:35-
claim 1	3:36-47; 4:2-5; Fig. 2.	4:60, Figs. 1-2.
	https://www.merriam-	https://www.collinsdictionary.com/u
	webster.com/dictionary/spacer (last visited May 29, 2018): spacer: a	/dictionary/english/spacer
	device or piece used to create or	https://www.merriam-
	maintain a desired amount of space (as between two parts).	webster.com/dictionary/spacer
		Summary of expert testimony:
	Webster's Third New International	Dr. Pokharna will opine how one of
	Dictionary Unabridged at 2180 (2002): spacer: a device or piece for	ordinary skill in the art would
	holding two members at a given	understand, at the time of the alleged
	distance from each other,	invention for the patents-in-suit, the
	,	term "spacer" in the context of the patent-in-suit, as well as any state-of
		the-art or background information in
		connection with the patents-in-suit
		and the related field(s). He will
		explain why the term, at that time,
		had a plain and ordinary meaning,
		and if a construction is necessary,
		should be accordingly construed as
		"structure used to maintain a space of clearance between the plates."
441 11	Di i	-
"hollow column"	Plain and ordinary meaning	Cylindrical structure surrounding a void or cavity
1240	If a construction is necessary: a	
'240 patent:	columnar structure defining an	See abstract references 26, 44, 2:3-
claims 9, 10,	unfilled or empty space	53, 3:2-24, 3:35-4:60, Figs. 1-3.
13		
'680 patent:	See title of invention; reference 44 in	https://www.collinsdictionary.com/u
claims 2, 5, 6, 8	Figs. 1-3; 1:60; 2:10; 2:30-31, 37-40;	/dictionary/english/column
O	3:2-3, 21-24; 4:21-25, 35-36, 52.	https://www.thefacedistisses
	The American Heritage Dictionary	https://www.thefreedictionary.com/column
	4th ed. at 367 (2000): column:	<u>orunni</u>
	Something resembling an	

Case No. 4:17-cv-05363-JSW

JOINT CLAIM CONSTRUCTION AND

PREHEARING STATEMENT

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

1

Claim Terms	Aavid's Proposed Constructions & Support	Defendants' Proposed Constructions & Support
	architectural pillar in form or function.	https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/column
	The American Heritage Dictionary 4th ed. at 367 (2000): columnar: having the shape of a column.	http://www.dictionary.com/browse/c olumn?s=t
	The American Heritage Distingury	Summary of expert testimony:
	The American Heritage Dictionary 4th ed. at 838 (2000): hollow: adj. 1. having a cavity, gap, or space within. 2. deeply indented or concave; sunken.	Dr. Pokharna will opine that, at the time of the alleged invention for the patents-in-suit, the term "hollow column" lacked a plain and ordinary meaning to one of ordinary skill in the art. He will then opine how one of ordinary skill in the art would understand, at that time, the term "hollow column" in the context of the patent-in-suit, as well as any state-of-the-art or background information in connection with the patents-in-suit and the related field(s). He will explain why the term should be accordingly construed as "cylindrical structure surrounding a void or cavity."

III. Identification of Case-Dispositive Terms Pursuant to Patent L.R. 4-3(c)

Aavid and Defendants have consolidated their jointly proposed terms for construction to ten disputed terms. Aavid does not believe any of the disputed terms will be case dispositive. Defendants contend the terms "vapor chamber," "hollow column," and "depression" may be case-dispositive with respect to as least some of Aavid's claims.

IV. Anticipated Length of Claim Construction Hearing Pursuant to Patent L.R. 4-3(d)

Aavid and Defendants believe two to two and a half (2 to 2.5) hours may be needed for the claim construction hearing, or as long as the length determined by the Court.

V. Proposed Claim Construction Witnesses Pursuant to Patent L.R. 4-3(e)

Aavid and Defendants dispute whether Defendants should be permitted to submit expert

Case No. 4:17-cv-05363-JSW

	1
	2
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
1	1
	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
	6
1	7
	8
1	9
	0
2	1
2	2
2	3
2	4
2	_
7	5

27

28

testimony on claim construction, in light of Defendants' failure to designate testimony of an expert
witness in their Patent L.R. 4-2 disclosures, which were due no later than May 29, 2018. Patent
L.R. 4-2(e) requires that a party proposing to call one or more witnesses at a Claim Construction
Hearing to provide "the identity of each such witness, and for each witness, a summary of his or
her testimony including, for any expert, each opinion to be offered related to claim construction".
Indeed, "to be useful and fair to all parties, expert opinion must be timely under Patent Local Rules
4-2 and 4-4. These basic rules provide that expert opinions for claim construction must be disclosed
no more than twenty-one days after the exchange of proposed terms for construction." Largare
Precision Co v. Genius Elec. Optical Co., No. 13-cv-02502-JD, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 169052, at
*5 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 5, 2014) (emphasis added). Defendants have failed to identify their proposed
expert's testimony or actual opinions, saying only that their proposed expert's testimony will cover
certain enumerated issues, without any substantive opinions as to those issues. Simply put
Defendants merely mention general topics that presumably any expert could discuss without
providing "each opinion to be offered related to claim construction." Despite Defendants knowing
their proposed constructions and the specific opinions their expert has about those constructions,
they did not even disclose the general issues of the testimony until 1:30am CST on Friday, June 22.
2018 and for the first time disclosed some vague opinions at 11:53pm CST that same day. As a
result, during the claim construction discovery period that the Patent Local Rules permit,
Defendants have left Aavid little basis on which to depose Defendants' proposed expert, as Aavid
has only a vague idea what Defendants' proposed expert's testimony and actual opinions will be.

Aavid does not believe expert testimony on claim construction is necessary in this case. However, to the extent Defendants are permitted to offer expert testimony on claim construction, Aavid reserves its right to rely on declarations and/or testimony of Nelson Gernert as evidence of how one having ordinary skill in the art would interpret the claim elements, to support each of Aavid's proposed claim constructions. Mr. Gernert is the VP of Engineering and Technology at Aavid Thermacore, Inc., which is a subsidiary of Aavid Thermalloy, LLC, and he has over thirty-four (34) years of experience in the thermal management products industry, including substantial involvement in the design, development, manufacturing, and sale of vapor chamber products. Mr.

Case No. 4:17-cv-05363-JSW

11

12

1718

16

1920

22 23

21

2425

26

2728

Case No. 4:17-cv-05363-JSW

Gernert's testimony may address the enumerated issues that Defendants identify, including but not limited to the level of ordinary skill in the art of the patents-in-suit at the time of the invention, how one of ordinary skill in the art would understand the relevant terms in the context of the patent specification and claims, and background information regarding the claimed technology.

Defendants intend to rely on Dr. Himanshu Pokharna for his expert testimony to support each of Defendants' proposed claim constructions. Dr. Pokharna's qualifications have been disclosed in Dkt. No. 49 at 18 (Discovery Letter, Exhibit 7 at 1, ¶¶ 1-2). For each of the terms identified above in Section II under Patent L.R. 4-3(b), Dr. Pokharna's testimony will cover issues relating to (1) the state of the art, the level of ordinary skill in the art, and any other relevant background information in connection with the patents-in-suit and the related field(s) at the time of the alleged invention, (2) whether at that time, there existed, to one of ordinary skill in the art, any plain and ordinary meaning for the term (and why), and in either situation, (3) how one of ordinary skill in the art would understand, at that time, the relevant term in the context of the patent-in-suit, as well as any state-of-the-art or background information in connection with the patents-in-suit and the related field(s). There should be no dispute that Defendants are permitted to introduce Dr. Pokharna's testimony at this time because Patent L.R. 4-4 expressly authorizes discovery "with respect to claim construction of any witnesses, including experts, identified in the Preliminary Claim Construction statement (Patent L.R. 4-2) or Joint Claim Construction and Prehearing Statement (Patent L.R. 4-3)." Patent L.R. 4-4 (emphasis added). As explained to Aavid, Defendants' introduction of Dr. Pokharna's testimony during the very first meet-and-confer after the initial Patent L.R. 4-2 exchange was a response to Aavid's offering of "[p]lain and ordinary meaning" and/or possible expert testimony for certain terms during the initial Patent L.R. 4-2 exchange and, moreover, is aimed at assisting this Court to reach the correct constructions. Aavid has also become fully aware of Defendants' intention to introduce Dr. Pokharna's testimony since as early as June 13, 2018, nine days before this instant filing under Patent L.R. 4-3. Thus, there should be no prejudice to Aavid, and Aavid has identified none. DR Sys. v. Eastman Kodak Co., No. 08-CV-669-H (BLM), 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 104080, at *39 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 9, 2009) (citing Pfingston v. Ronan Eng'g Co., 284 F.3d 999, 1005 (9th Cir. 2002)) ("Exclusion of testimony for

failure to make required disclosure should only be imposed if the party seeking exclusion suffered some prejudice.") Further, Defendants have provided summaries for Dr. Pokharna's testimony for each of the disputed terms above in accordance with Patent L.R. 4-3. Furthermore, the parties had agreed during an earlier meet-and-confer after the prior Patent L.R. 4-1 exchange that they could modify their claim constructions and supporting evidence during the meet-and-confer process between the Patent L.R. 4-2 exchange and the Patent L.R. 4-3 filing. Aavid now disputes it had so agreed, but Defendants note that Aavid itself added additional supporting evidence for multiple terms in the draft(s) for this Patent L.R. filing, while objecting to Defendants' introduction of additional evidence (including Dr. Pokharna's testimony) nine days earlier. Aavid's unnecessary dispute over Defendants' authorized introduction of expert testimony in this Patent L.R. 4-3 filing is unreasonable, wastes party and judicial resources, and should be rejected by this Court...

In any event, the parties intend to further meet and confer in the coming week(s) to hopefully resolve this dispute regarding expert testimony. The parties may also further meet and confer to narrow their claim construction disputes and may accordingly file an amended Joint Claim Construction and Prehearing Statement.

VI. Requested Findings Pursuant to Patent L.R. 4-3(f)

The Court has not requested any factual findings related to claim construction.

20

23

24

25

27

28

///

Case No. 4:17-cv-05363-JSW

1	Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 5-1(i)(3), by his signature below, counsel for Defendar		
2	attests under penalty of perjury that counsel for Aavid concurs in the filing of this document ar		
3	consents to the affixing of his e	electronic signature on	his document.
4			
	Dated: June 22, 2018	MICHAEL BEST	C & FRIEDRICH LLP
5			
6		By: /s/ Albert Bia	nchi, Jr.
7		-	est (SBN 146849)
8			michaelbest.com
0			Albridge III (pro hac vice)
9			dge@michaelbest.com
10			chi, Jr. (<i>pro hac vice</i>) @michaelbest.com
10			BEST & FRIEDRICH LLP
11			Pinckney Street, Suite 700
		Madison, W	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
12		Tel. 608.25	
13		Fax. 608.28	33.2275
14		Jonathan H.	Margolies (pro hac vice motion to be
1.5		filed)	
15			lies@michaelbest.com
16			BEST & FRIEDRICH LLP
			consin Avenue, Suite 3300
17		Tel. 414.27	WI 53202-4108
18		Fax. 414.27	
19		1 dx. 414.2	7.0050
		SINGULARITY	LLP
20		Frank L. Be	rnstein (SBN 189504)
21			in@ipsingularity.com
		SINGULA	1 0 •
22		555 Twin D	olphin Drive, Suite 610
23			hores, CA 94065
24		Tel. 650.72 Fax. 650.72	
		1 dx. 030.72	
25			intiff and Counter-Claim Defendants
26		AAVID THERMA BOYD CORPOR	
27		DOID CORFOR	THOIN
28			
20			
	Case No. 4:17-cv-05363-JSW	11	JOINT CLAIM CONSTRUCTION AN

	Case 4:17-cv-05363-JSW	Document 64 Filed 06/22/18 Page 12 of 12		
1	Dated: June 22, 2018	COOLEY LLP		
2				
3		By: /s/ Kyle Chen Reuben H. Chen (SBN 228725		
4		rchen@cooley.com Kyle D. Chen (SBN 239501)		
5	kyle.chen@cooley.com COOLEY LLP			
6				
7		Tel. 650.843.5000 Fax 650.849.7400		
8		Attorneys for Defendants and Counter-Claim Plaintiffs		
9		COOLER MASTER CO., LTD. and CMI USA, INC.		
10				
11				
12				
13				
14	179453068			
15	177433000			
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				
	Case No. 4:17-cv-05363-JSW	JOINT CLAIM CONSTRUCTION AND PREHEARING STATEMENT		