

E-filed: 7/25/2008

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

RAMBUS INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

HYNIX SEMICONDUCTOR INC., HYNIX
SEMICONDUCTOR AMERICA INC.,
HYNIX SEMICONDUCTOR
MANUFACTURING AMERICA INC.,

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.,
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA,
INC., SAMSUNG SEMICONDUCTOR, INC.,
SAMSUNG AUSTIN SEMICONDUCTOR,
L.P.,

NANYA TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION,
NANYA TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION
U.S.A.,

Defendants.

No. C-05-00334 RMW

CLAIM CONSTRUCTION ORDER FOR THE
WARE PATENTS AND ORDER DENYING
THE MANUFACTURERS' MOTION FOR
SUMMARY JUDGMENT

[Re Docket Nos. 312, 504]

RAMBUS INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.,
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA,
INC., SAMSUNG SEMICONDUCTOR, INC.,
SAMSUNG AUSTIN SEMICONDUCTOR,
L.P.,

Defendants.

No. C-05-02298 RMW

[Re Docket Nos. 185, 356]

CLAIM CONSTRUCTION ORDER FOR THE WARE PATENTS AND ORDER DENYING THE MANUFACTURERS' MOTION
FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

C-05-00334 RMW; C-05-02298-RMW; C-06-00244-RMW

TSF

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
28

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
28

RAMBUS INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

MICRON TECHNOLOGY, INC., and
MICRON SEMICONDUCTOR PRODUCTS,
INC.

Defendants.

No. C-06-00244 RMW

[Re Docket Nos. 121, 199]

Rambus has accused the Manufacturers of infringing various patents. This order addresses two of the patents, U.S. Patent No. 6,496,897 and 6,493,789, which the parties refer to as the "Ware patents."¹ In accord with the local rules, the parties have submitted their joint claim construction statement. Rambus has filed its opening and responding *Markman*² briefs, motions for summary judgment of infringement, and oppositions to the Manufacturers' motions for summary judgment. The Manufacturers have filed their responsive *Markman* brief, oppositions to Rambus's summary judgment motions, and their own motions for summary judgment of non-infringement and invalidity. The court has reviewed the papers and considered the arguments of counsel and now sets forth its claim construction and rulings on the summary judgment motions dealing with the Ware patents.

I. BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION

The two patents addressed by this order descend from application no. 08/545294, filed by Fred Ware, Craig Hampel, Donald Stark, and Matthew Griffin. Unlike the other patents-in-suit, the Ware patents have not been previously construed. Because the Ware patents share the same specification, the court refers to the specification of the '789 patent.

¹ The court previously construed the claims of the other fifteen patents-in-suit in a separate order. *See Rambus Inc. v. Hynix Semiconductor Inc.*, 2008 WL 2754805 (N.D. Cal. 2008). That order contains additional background on DRAM technology and the present dispute between Rambus and the Manufacturers.

² *Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc.*, 517 U.S. 370 (1996).

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

A. Technology Background — Write Masking

1. The Role of WE Signals in the DRAM Interface

Digital information can be stored in various types of electronic memories. '789 Patent col. 1, ll. 19-22. The chief form of memory used in a modern computer system is dynamic random access memory ("DRAM"). A DRAM stores data in a memory cell, and to prevent loss of the data the DRAM must periodically refresh the data by reading it from the cell and writing it back again. *Id.* at col. 1, ll. 31-34. Figure 1 shows a simple diagram of a prior art DRAM. The DRAM has an array with one or more banks of memory cells, an interface that routes signals coming into and going out of the DRAM, and interface pins that connect the interface to the bus. *Id.* at col. 1, ll. 35-42.




FIG. 1
(PRIOR ART)

The interface communicates with the DRAM array through a multitude of connections. *See id.* at fig. 2. These connections include separate inputs for the row and column addresses, data, a write/read input signal, a row access strobe ("RAS"), a column access strobe ("CAS") signals, and a write enable ("WE") signal. *Id.* at col. 2, ll. 8-11. The row and column addresses identify the specific location in the memory array to be accessed. The write/read input signal is a control signal that indicates whether an operation is a read or a write. *See id.* at col. 2, ll. 4-6. The RAS and CAS

1 signals are timing signals that indicate a row or column access operation. '789 patent at col. 2, ll. 3-
 2 4. Finally, during a write operation, the WE signal indicates whether a specific location in memory
 3 should be written to or not. *Id.* at col. 1, ll. 64-66.³

4 Using a WE signal to selectively write data can increase the performance of a DRAM. *See*
 5 *generally id.* at col. 3, l. 60 - col. 4, l. 18. For example, DRAMs sometimes implement error
 6 detection and correction schemes; one such scheme uses "parity bits." *Id.* at col. 4, ll. 9-11. A parity
 7 bit is a single bit that can be compared against the associated data to check for errors. *Id.* at col. 3,
 8 ll. 39-46. Calculating a parity bit for the associated data is time intensive, so the use of a WE signal
 9 increases speed by allowing the DRAM to avoid calculating the parity bit for data that need not be
 10 written. *Id.* at col. 4, ll. 14-18.

11 2. The Prior Art's Implementation of WE Signals

12 The inventors believed that prior art DRAM designs inefficiently used separate pins for the
 13 DRAM's many inputs. *See id.* at col. 2, ll. 12-14. The data, control signals and WE signals all
 14 required dedicated pins to connect to the bus. *Id.* at col. 2, ll. 7-11. The prior art contains a variety
 15 of schemes for multiplexing (i.e., transmitting different types of signals across the same pins at
 16 different points in time), which can reduce the number of pins required. *Id.* at col. 2, ll. 15-58. All
 17 of the prior art multiplexing schemes still required dedicated WE pins to receive the WE signals. *Id.*
 18 at col. 2, ll. 59-60. Furthermore, because these WE signals traveled a longer path than the data
 19 signals, the DRAM required a dedicated set of registers to store the incoming data signals as the
 20 DRAM awaited the arrival of the WE signal corresponding to the data. *Id.* at col. 2, ll. 60-63.

21 Rambus previously developed a method of multiplexing WE signals with data signals to
 22 reduce the number of pins required for the interface. *Id.* at col. 3, ll. 1-2. The operation begins by
 23 transmitting WE bits over eight "Bus-Data" lines in parallel. *Id.* at col. 3, ll. 3-6. The eight WE bits
 24 form a WE "word" 8 bits wide. *Id.* This particular scheme required sending eight WE words before

25
 26 ³ As this order later discusses, the parties dispute the exact nature of the "WE signal"
 27 disclosed by Messrs. Ware, Hampel, Stark and Griffin. To be clear, the court reproduces the exact text
 28 from the specification defining a "We signal:" "A WE signal indicates whether an associated byte is to
 be written or not during a write operation."

1 transmitting data. *Id.* at col. 3, ll. 29-30.

2 Figure 8B illustrates Rambus's prior art method. Figure 8B is a graph showing the series of
3 signals sent to the DRAM over

4 time. Because the other figures in
5 the Ware specification are similar,
6 the court pauses to explain the

7 format of the graph. The "vertical
8 axis" represents times. It begins at
9 the top of the graph and advances

10 from an initial time at the top of
11 the graph to the bottom. The
12 graph measures time in units of

13 clock cycles, with each hash mark
14 on the vertical axis representing a
15 full clock cycle. The "horizontal

16 axis" consists of nine columns,
17 each representing one data line
18 connecting the bus to the DRAM

19 interface. The lines are labeled
20 Bus-Data 0 through 8. Each
21 rectangular field on the graph represents a portion of information. A rectangle that is only one data

22 line wide and only one half-clock cycle long represents a single bit of information (either a 0 or a 1).
23 By its position on the graph, one can determine when that piece of information arrives at the DRAM
24 and which data lines carry the information.

25 Rambus's prior art method for sending WE signals begins with the block labeled 981 above.
26 Block 981 contains 64 bits of information, comprised of eight 8-bit "words" of WE information. *Id.*
27 at col. 3, ll. 4-6. As shown, this block of WE information is sent over bus data lines 0 through 7




FIG. 8B
(PRIOR ART)

1 while bus data line 8 remains idle. *Id.* The arrows connect each WE bit to its corresponding byte of
 2 data. For example, the bit on data line 0 sent on the first half-clock cycle (i.e., the top right
 3 rectangle) indicates whether data byte 1000 should be written to memory or not. *Id.* at col. 3, ll. 18-
 4 21. Likewise, bit 1 indicates whether data byte 1001 should be written to memory or not. *Id.* Each
 5 8-bit WE word conveys the WE information for eight data bytes, or a data block. Consequently, the
 6 first WE word, represented by the first row in figure 8B, contains all of the WE information for data
 7 block 0. *Id.* at col. 3, ll. 17-18.

8 This prior art method transmits both WE signals and data signals over the bus data lines, that
 9 is, it multiplexes the WE and data signals. Using this method eliminates the need for a dedicated
 10 WE pin. *See generally id.* at col. 3, ll. 2-25. This advantageously reduces the number of pins on the
 11 DRAM, but requires the DRAM to temporarily store 64 bits of WE information while waiting for
 12 the WE bits' corresponding data words to arrive. *Id.* at col. 3, ll. 26-28. This method also suffers
 13 from having to interrupt data transmission after every eight blocks of data to send another eight
 14 words of WE information. *Id.* at col. 3, ll. 28-30.

15 3. The Ware Specification's Embodiments for Implementing WE Signals

16 The Ware patents disclose various ways of transmitting write enable information to a
 17 DRAM. *Id.* at col. 1, ll. 14-16. Some of the embodiments reduce the need to store WE bits prior to
 18 transmitting data. *Id.* at col. 5, ll. 46-49. Other embodiments multiplex the WE signals with data
 19 and error correction signals to reduce the number of pins needed for the DRAM interface. *Id.* at col.
 20 5, ll. 49-52.

21 Figure 12A illustrates an embodiment that allows for multiplexing data and WE signals.⁴ *See*
 22 *id.* at col. 8, ll. 35-38. Unlike the Rambus prior art, it also uses a serial stream of WE bits that
 23 prevents the data transmission from having to be interrupted by the need to transmit additional WE
 24 information. The embodiment in Figure 12A uses a single pin for receiving WE signals, labeled 505
 25 or "WE/Data." *Id.* at col. 7, ll. 9-10. The WE/Data pin appears as the leftmost column in the figure.

26
 27 ⁴ The court added the arrows that appear in Figure 12A to mirror the convention used in
 Figure 8B.

1 The first block of WE
 2 information is labeled 820. It is
 3 one bit wide and eight bits long,
 4 and it precedes the transmission
 5 of the data. *Id.* at col. 7, ll. 13-
 6 14; col. 7, ll 26-27. As shown
 7 by the vertical time axis, this
 8 transmission of the first WE
 9 block takes four complete clock
 10 cycles. While this first block of
 11 WE information is being
 12 transferred, the other inputs (bus
 13 data lines 0 through 7) cannot
 14 be used. *Id.* at col. 7, ll. 42-44.




FIG. 12A

15 This first WE block contains the
 16 WE information for the data
 17 block labeled 711, whose transmission only begins once the entire WE block has arrived. *Id.* at col.
 18 7, ll. 31-33.

19 While the first data block (711) is being transmitted, the DRAM also receives the next block
 20 of WE information, labeled 821. *Id.* at col. 7, ll. 33-35. This second WE block provides the WE
 21 information for the following data block, labeled 712. *Id.* This second WE block begins the "serial
 22 stream" of WE information that enables the DRAM to receive an uninterrupted amount of data
 23 because while the second data block is being received, the DRAM also receives the third WE block
 24 *See id.* at col. 8, ll. 39-43. The data transmission can continue in this fashion and never require
 25 interrupting for transmission of additional WE information.

26 Figure 13A represents an embodiment that blends the serial stream of WE bits from Figure
 27 12A's embodiment with the parallel transfer of WE bits seen in the prior art shown in Figure 8B. It
 28

1 begins with a parallel transfer of
 2 an eight-bit WE word (labeled
 3 504) over bus data lines 0
 4 through 7. *See id.* at col. 9, ll.
 5 5-7, 39-40. The eight-bit WE
 6 word contains the same amount
 7 of WE information as the eight-
 8 bit WE block that started the
 9 sequence shown in Figure 12A.
 10 However, because Figure 13A's
 11 first WE word uses eight bus
 12 lines instead of one, it can be
 13 transmitted in a single half
 14 clock cycle, unlike the four
 15 complete clock cycles required
 16 to begin the data transmission
 17 shown in Figure 12A. *See id.* at




FIG. 13A


18 col. 10, ll. 16-19. The specification dubs this a "quick start" because it allows data transmission to
 19 begin three and a half clock cycles earlier than otherwise. *Id.* at col. 10, l. 25.

20 Once the DRAM has received this first WE word (which the specification defines as a "WE
 21 mask"), the DRAM can begin receiving the corresponding data block (labeled 310).⁵ While the
 22 DRAM receives the first data block over bus data lines 0 through 7, it begins receiving a serial
 23 stream of WE bits on the pin labeled WE/Data (on the leftmost side of the graph). This is the same
 24 pin that was used for transmitting WE information in the Figure 12A embodiment. *Id.* at col. 9, ll
 25 41-42. This serial stream of WE bits functions like the serial stream in Figure 12A and allows for an

26 _____
 27 ⁵ The court again added the arrows to Figure 13A to follow Figure 8B's convention of
 28 illustrating which blocks of WE information correspond to which blocks of data information.

1 unlimited transfer of data. *Id.*
 2 at col. 10, ll. 25-29.

3 The embodiment of
 4 Figure 14 modifies the
 5 parallel/serial hybrid of Figure
 6 13A.⁶ This embodiment uses
 7 the same eight-bit WE mask
 8 (labeled 3010) to provide an
 9 initial "quick start" like in
 10 figure 13A. *Id.* at col. 10, ll.
 11 59-62. Unlike figure 13A, this
 12 embodiment does not use the
 13 WE/Data pin to transmit a
 14 serial stream of WE bits.



15 Instead, the block of information labeled 604 contains error correction information for the
 16 concurrent data block (labeled 3011). *Id.* at col. 10, ll 56-58. This configuration allows for the
 17 DRAM to receive both a "quick start" of WE information related to a data block as well as error
 18 correction information. *Id.* at col. 11, ll. 1-2.

19 Figure 15 represents another embodiment that modifies the basic parallel/serial hybrid
 20 embodiment of Figure 13A. In this embodiment, the "WE mask," i.e., the 8 bits of parallel WE
 21 information used to "quick start" the DRAM, is appended to a request packet (labeled 500). *Id.* at
 22 col. 11, ll. 15-23. This 10-bit wide packet is sent over Bus-Data pins 0 through 7 as well as the
 23 WE/Data pin (505) and a bus control pin (499). *Id.* at col. 11, ll. 27-31. Within the packet, the last
 24 word is the WE mask. *Id.* at col. 11, ll. 32-33.

25 _____
 26 ⁶ Figure 14 has also been altered to add arrows to demonstrate the relationship between
 27 the WE information, the error detection and correction information and the data information. The court
 28 used a fat arrow to show the connection between the error detection and data information.

1 The only difference
 2 between this embodiment and
 3 Figure 13A is that it integrates the
 4 teaching of Figure 13A into a
 5 packet-based protocol. This
 6 protocol is discussed extensively
 7 in the court's claim construction
 8 order addressing the other patents-
 9 in-suit. *Rambus Inc. v. Hynix*
 10 *Semiconductor Inc.*, 2008 WL
 11 2754805, *5-*6, *22-*27 (N.D.
 12 Cal. 2008).

13 All four of these
 14 embodiments share a few features
 15 worth noting. First, they do not
 16 require a dedicated WE pin
 17 because the embodiments all employ some degree of multiplexing. '897 patent, col. 11, ll. 66-67.
 18 More importantly, these embodiments greatly reduce the amount of temporary storage needed on the
 19 DRAM. *See id.*, col. 12, ll. 2-9. In each of the embodiments, the arrival of the WE information
 20 precedes the arrival of the data information. This negates the need for registers to store the data
 21 information that plagued the prior art. *See id.* at col. 2, ll. 60-63. Furthermore, because one bit of
 22 WE information corresponds to a word of data information (normally, a word is 8 bits or one byte),
 23 the DRAM only needs enough space to store 1/8 of the information that it would have needed had it
 24 stored the data instead of the WE information. Finally, these embodiments never store more than
 25 eight bits of WE information (either the 8 bits from the serial start in Figure 12A, the 8-bit "quick
 26 start" in Figures 12A, 14 and 15, or any 8 bits received later from the serial stream). *Id.*, col. 12, ll.
 27 5-9. This represents a substantial reduction in the number of registers needed to store WE




FIG. 15

1 information over the prior art
2 Rambus design demonstrated in
3 Figure 8A. *Id.*

4 Figure 16A demonstrates
5 another method of transmitting
6 WE information, but it differs
7 substantially from the
8 embodiments displayed in
9 Figures 12 through 15. The
10 DRAM of Figure 16A receives
11 WE bits only on the WE/Data
12 pin (the leftmost pin, labeled
13 505). *Id.* at col. 12, ll. 20-21. It
14 does not use the "WE mask" of
15 Figures 13A, 14 and 15 to "quick
16 start" the data transmission.

17 Furthermore, the Figure 16A
18 does *not* supply WE information in
19 advance of the corresponding data
20 information. *Id.*, col. 12, ll. 11-14.
21 Instead, this embodiment uses a serial
22 stream of WE bits that correspond to

23 the block of data received by the DRAM at the same time. In Figure 16A, the blocks of WE
24 information are labeled 6020-6023. *Id.* at col. 12, ll. 17-18. Each of these WE blocks conveys the
25 WE information for the concurrent data block. *Id.* at col. 12, ll. 21-26. Figure 16B, displayed
26 below, shows this relationship on a bit-by-bit basis. In Figure 16B, "WE 420" represents a single bit
27 of WE information and it corresponds to data word 4110, a single byte of data.




FIG. 16A




FIG. 16B

1 Like the other embodiments, this configuration supports the unlimited transfer of data blocks
 2 and minimizes the amount of storage needed for holding data or WE information.

3 **B. The Claims-In-Suit**

4 Rambus has asserted that the Manufacturers infringe claim 13 of the '789 patent and claims 2
 5 and 16 of the '897 patent. The claims-in-suit read as follows:

U.S. Patent No.; Claim	Claim Language ⁷
6,493,789; 13	[A semiconductor memory device which includes sense amplifiers coupled to an array of memory cells, wherein the memory device comprises: a set of interface terminals to receive a plurality of control signals which specify that the memory device: receive a first set of data bits and a second set of data bits; precharge sense amplifiers used in writing the first set of data bits to the array; and precharge sense amplifiers used in writing the second set of data bits to the array; and a mask terminal to receive; a first mask bit during a first half of a clock cycle of an external clock signal, the first mask bit to indicate whether to write the first set of data bits to the array; and a second mask bit during a second half of the clock cycle of the external clock signal, the second mask bit to indicate whether to write the second set of data bits to the array] wherein: the first set of data bits is received during the first half of the clock cycle of the external clock signal; and the second set of data bits is received during the second half of the clock cycle of the external clock signal.

7 Bracketed text indicates that the claim is dependent on a prior claim. The bracketed text represents the prior claim's language that is incorporated in the dependent claim.

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
28

6,496,897; 2	[A method of operation in a semiconductor memory device, wherein the memory device receives an external clock signal and includes an array of memory cells, the method comprises: receiving, during a first half of a clock cycle of the external clock signal, a first data value and a first mask bit, wherein the first mask bit indicates whether to write the first data value to the array; and receiving during a second half of the clock cycle of the external clock signal, a second data value and a second mask bit, wherein the second mask bit indicates whether to write the second data value to the array] wherein the memory device is a dynamic random access memory device.
6,496,897; 16	[A synchronous semiconductor memory device, wherein the memory device receives an external clock signal and includes an array of memory cells, the memory device comprises: a pin to receive a first mask bit during a first half of a clock cycle of the external clock signal and to receive a second mask bit during a second half of the clock cycle of the external clock signal; and an interface to receive: a first data value with the first mask bit, wherein the first mask bit indicates whether to write the first data value to the array; and a second data value with the second mask bit, wherein the second mask bit indicates whether to write the second data value to the array] wherein the memory cells are dynamic random access memory cells.

II. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION

A. Claim Construction Legal Standard

The court begins its claim construction inquiry by considering the ordinary and customary meaning of the terms in the claims from the perspective of a person of ordinary skill in the art. *Phillips*, 415 F.3d at 1312-13. This ordinary meaning is influenced by the use of language in the asserted and unasserted claims in the patents. *Id.* at 1314-15. For example, the phrase "steel baffles" implies that a "baffle" need not be made of steel. *See id.* at 1314. More generally, the appearance of a limitation in a dependent claim creates a presumption that the independent claim lacks that limitation. *Id.* at 1315; *but see Curtiss-Wright Flow Control Corp. v. Velan, Inc.*, 438 F.3d 1374, 1380-81 (Fed. Cir. 2006) (discussing limits of claim differentiation).

1 This "objective baseline" of ordinary meaning is also formed in part by the patent
2 specification's use of the claim language because a person of ordinary skill understands a claim's
3 language in the context of the entire patent. *Id.* at 1313. For example, the specification is often
4 helpful in defining the scope of technical terms. *See id.* at 1315. The specification can also reveal a
5 "special definition" of a claim term or demonstrate "an intentional disclaimer" or "disavowal" of
6 claim scope. *Id.* at 1316. The specification's statutory role in determining a claim's validity justifies
7 placing this heavy weight on it. *Id.* at 1315-16.

8 Similarly, the prosecution history of a patent can inform the proper construction of a patent's
9 claims. *Id.* at 1317. It provides evidence of how both the Patent Office and the inventor understood
10 the claims. *Id.* The prosecution history's back-and-forth nature often makes it unclear, however, and
11 therefore it is rarely as helpful in construing a patent's claims as the claims themselves and the
12 specification. *Id.* Still, the prosecution history can be invaluable for demonstrating the inventor's
13 understanding of the claims and checking "whether the inventor limited the invention in the course
14 of prosecution, making the claim scope narrower than it would otherwise be." *Id.*

15 Finally, a court may consider extrinsic evidence like inventor and expert testimony,
16 dictionaries, and treatises. *Id.* at 1318. Such evidence can be helpful, but courts must be mindful
17 that it is not necessarily created contemporaneously with the patent application and that the litigation
18 context can produce biased evidence. *Id.* Accordingly, extrinsic evidence is rarely more probative
19 of the proper construction of the claims than the intrinsic record, *id.* at 1319, but extrinsic evidence
20 is particularly helpful "[w]hen the intrinsic evidence is silent as to the plain meaning of a term."
21 *Helmsderfer v. Bobrick Washroom Equipment, Inc.*, 527 F.3d 1379, 1381-83 (Fed. Cir. 2008)
22 (construing a claim term in light of three dictionary definitions); *see also Phillips*, 415 F.3d at 1322-
23 23. Nonetheless, to avoid "the risk of systematic overbreadth" the court begins its inquiry focused
24 "on how the patentee used the claim term in the claims, specification, and prosecution history, rather
25 than starting with a broad definition and whittling it down." *Phillips*, 415 F.3d at 1321.

26 All four sources of evidence discussed above have their advantages and drawbacks and
27 varying amounts of persuasive force. There is no "rigid algorithm" or "sequence of steps" which the

1 court must follow in considering these sources of evidence. *Id.* at 1324. All that matters "is for the
2 court to attach the appropriate weight to be assigned to those sources in light of the statutes and
3 policies that inform patent law." *Id.*

4 **B. "Mask Bit"**

5 All three claims-in-suit include limitations reciting the use of a "mask bit." The parties'
6 dispute turns on the meaning of "mask" in the phrase "mask bit." Rambus argues that "mask" refers
7 to the act of masking a location in memory to prevent writing data there. To Rambus, a mask bit is
8 identical to the WE bits discussed in the specification because both determine whether a data word
9 should be "masked," or not written to memory. The Manufacturers argue that "mask" refers to a
10 collection of eight WE bits transferred in parallel to "quick start" the data transfer. This collection
11 of WE bits forms a "mask" that determines which portions of a subsequent data block should be
12 written to memory. The parties' constructions appear below:

Claim term:	Rambus's construction:	The Manufacturers' Construction:
"mask bit"	A binary digit indicating whether to write data.	One of eight bits in a write-enable word.

16 The Manufacturers base their argument on the specification's use of the phrase "WE mask,"
17 which is the only context in which the written description expressly uses the word "mask." As
18 discussed above, the Figure 13A embodiment is the first embodiment to use a "WE mask." *See* '789
19 patent, col. 9, ll. 5-25. As described, the Figure 13A embodiment uses "initial write enable signals
20 sent in parallel and subsequent write enable signals sent serially." *Id.* at col. 9, ll. 5-7. The written
21 description refers to this initial transmission of WE signals in parallel as a "WE mask." *Id.* at col. 9,
22 ll. 8-11. The WE mask of Figure 13A is "8 bits wide and one word long." *Id.* Referring to Figure
23 13A, the WE mask is the narrow rectangle toward the top of the figure labeled 504. To recap, "one
24 advantage of starting write operations with the WE mask 504 is that the eight parallel WE bits of
25 WE mask 504 are received by the DRAM in only one-half of a clock cycle." *Id.* at col. 10, ll. 16-19.
26 This permits the "quick start" of the write operation. *Id.* at col. 10, ll. 25-29. But significantly, after
27

1 the WE mask has been received, the Figure 13A embodiment switches to a serial stream of WE bits
2 and "there is no requirement that the parallel WE mask 504 be sent again to enable writes." *Id.* at
3 col. 10, ll. 29-30. This is the case because "the serial stream of WE bits allows the data words to
4 keep being written to the DRAM." *Id.* at col. 10, ll. 31-33.

5 The Manufacturers argue that this consistent usage of the phrase "WE mask" would inform
6 the person of ordinary skill's understanding of the phrase "mask bit" in the claims. Because a "WE
7 mask" is routinely referred to as an 8-bit write enable word, the Manufacturers propose that a "mask
8 bit" is "one of eight bits in a write-enable word."

9 While the Manufacturers' proposed construction is compelling when only the written
10 description is considered, it cannot be reconciled with the language of the claims, and therefore must
11 be rejected. All three claims include limitations that require a DRAM to receive a "first mask bit"
12 during the first half of clock cycle and a "second mask bit" during the second half of a clock cycle.
13 In all of the embodiments that use a WE mask (Figures 13A, 14 and 15), the DRAM receives the
14 entire WE mask in the first half of a clock cycle. While it is conceivable that the DRAM could
15 receive a second WE mask (for example, at the beginning of a new write operation many clock
16 cycles later), the disclosed embodiments all switch from using a WE mask to "quick start" the write
17 operation to a serial stream of WE bits to sustain the data transmission. If the court adopted the
18 Manufacturers' proposed construction, none of the three asserted claims would read on the three
19 embodiments that use a WE mask. The reason is that none of the embodiments receives a "second
20 mask bit" on a second half clock cycle as the Manufacturers construe "mask bit." The embodiments
21 do not receive a second WE mask; they instead receive the serial stream of WE bits on the WE/Data
22 pin. Indeed, the parties confirmed that the Manufacturers' construction of "mask bit" would prevent
23 claim 13 of the '789 patent from reading on the Figure 13A embodiment. *See Claim Construction*
24 *Hrg. Tr. 475:23-478:2 (Jun. 5, 2008).*

25 Proper claim construction rarely results in construing a claim such that it does not cover a
26 preferred embodiment. "Such an interpretation is rarely, if ever, correct and would require highly
27 persuasive evidentiary support." *Vitronics Corp. v. Conceptronic, Inc.*, 90 F.3d 1576, 1583 (Fed.

28 CLAIM CONSTRUCTION ORDER FOR THE WARE PATENTS AND ORDER DENYING THE MANUFACTURERS' MOTION
FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

C-05-00334 RMW; C-05-02298-RMW; C-06-00244-RMW

TSF

1 Cir. 1996). Indeed, construing claims to read out preferred embodiments appears to be the "third
2 rail" of claim construction. *See, e.g., Oatey Co. v. IPS Corp.*, 514 F.3d 1271, 1277 (Fed. Cir. 2008)
3 (reversing claim construction that read out a preferred embodiment), *MBO Laboratories, Inc. v.*
4 *Becton, Dickinson & Co.*, 474 F.3d 1323, 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2007) (same); *On-Line Tech. v.*
5 *Bodenseewerk Perkin-Elmer*, 386 F.3d 1133, 1138-39 (Fed. Cir. 2004) (same); *Burke, Inc. v. Bruno*
6 *Independent Living Aids, Inc.*, 183 F.3d 1334, 1341 (Fed. Cir. 1999) (same).

7 The Federal Circuit recently summarized the line of cases addressing constructions that read
8 out disclosed embodiments and concluded that the "highly persuasive evidentiary support" required
9 normally consists of disclaimers in the specification or the prosecution history. *Oatey*, 514 F.3d at
10 1276-77, *see e.g., Elekta Instrument S.A. v. O.U.R. Scientific Int'l, Inc.*, 214 F.3d 1302 (Fed. Cir.
11 2000) (affirming claim construction excluding preferred embodiment based on unambiguous
12 prosecution disclaimer). Another recent case pointed out the importance of considering whether or
13 not other claims in a patent might read on the allegedly excluded embodiment, and in affirming a
14 claim construction that excluded an embodiment, the court pointed out that certain other claims
15 might embrace it. *Helmsderfer v. Bobrick Washroom Equipment, Inc.*, 527 F.3d 1379, 1383 (Fed.
16 Cir. 2008).

17 The Manufacturers fail to provide the evidentiary support required to accept their proposed
18 claim construction. At most, the Manufacturers provide evidence from the prosecution history that
19 the original Ware patent application's claims did not use the phrase "mask bit," but did use the
20 phrases "serial sequence of write enable signals" and "serial sequence of write enable bits." The
21 Manufacturers fail to explain why Rambus made any changes to the patent applications, and they do
22 not explain why this evidence compels interpreting "mask bit" as a bit within a parallel transmission
23 of WE signals, but not a serial transmission of WE signals. As noted in *Phillips*, the prosecution
24 history "often lacks the clarity of the specification and thus is less useful for claim construction
25 purposes." 415 F.3d at 1317. Here, the Manufacturers have failed to do anything but point out that
26 Rambus has previously used different phrases to claim its inventions. This is far from the "highly
27 persuasive evidentiary support" required to adopt the Manufacturers' proffered construction. Nor

28 CLAIM CONSTRUCTION ORDER FOR THE WARE PATENTS AND ORDER DENYING THE MANUFACTURERS' MOTION
FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

C-05-00334 RMW; C-05-02298-RMW; C-06-00244-RMW

TSF

1 can the Manufacturers point to any other embodiment that the claims-in-suit might cover. None of
2 the disclosed embodiments (Figures 12A, 13A, 14, 15 and 16A) transmits two WE masks in
3 succession.

4 The parties also submit two dictionaries that bear on this dispute. The *1993 IEEE Dictionary*
5 defines "mask" as "a pattern of characters that is used to control the retention or elimination of
6 portions of another pattern of characters." See Murphy Decl. ¶ 218. The *Microsoft Press Computer*
7 *Dictionary* (1991) defines a "mask bit" as "a given bit within a mask whose function is to screen out
8 or let through the corresponding bit in a data value." *Id.* At first glance, these definitions might
9 appear to support the Manufacturers' argument because each definition emphasizes that a "mask" is a
10 group of characters. However, the definitions also lend some support to Rambus's proposed
11 construction because each definition emphasizes the mask's function in determining how another bit
12 of data is processed. Further, a person of ordinary skill with the understanding of these definitions
13 would encounter the problem discussed above, namely, that the construction of the term "mask bit"
14 proposed by the Manufacturers, when read in the context of the three claims-in-suit, corresponds to
15 nothing discussed in the specification.

16 This is not to say that Rambus's proposed construction is free of difficulties. To begin,
17 Rambus's construction of "mask bit" is synonymous with the specification's definition of "WE bit"
18 or "WE signal." Rambus argues that a mask bit is a "binary digit indicating whether to write data,"
19 while in the specification, Rambus noted that a WE signal "indicates whether an associated byte is to
20 be written or not during a write operation." See, e.g., Claim Construction Hrg. Tr. 377:3-378:15
21 (Jun. 5, 2008) (Mr. Detre urging that a "mask bit" and "write enable signal" are synonymous).

22 Yet in a predecessor patent, Rambus claimed a method involving a first and second mask bit,
23 and then in a dependent claim added the further limitation that "the first mask bit is a first write
24 enable bit and the second mask bit is a second write enable bit." See U.S. Patent No. 6,266,737, col.
25 13, l. 62 - col. 14, l. 4 (claims 1 and 2). Pursuant to the doctrine of claim differentiation, this prior
26 usage suggests that Rambus understood "mask bits" to be distinct from "WE bits," though it now
27 contends that they are identical. On the other hand, this does not support the Manufacturers'

28 CLAIM CONSTRUCTION ORDER FOR THE WARE PATENTS AND ORDER DENYING THE MANUFACTURERS' MOTION
FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

C-05-00334 RMW; C-05-02298-RMW; C-06-00244-RMW

TSF

1 proposed construction of "mask bit" because the '737 patent's claims still require both a first and
2 second mask bit sent at different times. As discussed, the Manufacturers' construction cannot be
3 reconciled with any of the embodiments set forth in the patent. In the end, an attempt to draw
4 conclusions from claim differentiation of claims 1 and 2 of the '737 patent appear to be unhelpful
5 and demonstrates a difficulty in some cases of applying the doctrine of claim differentiation.
6 *Compare with Rambus Inc. v. Hynix Semiconductor Inc.*, 2008 WL 2754805, *22-*24 (N.D. Cal.
7 Jul. 10, 2008).

8 That aside, Rambus's proposed construction of the claims-at-issue accords with the disclosed
9 embodiments, specifically Figure 16A. Figure 16A discloses a system for receiving WE bits
10 contemporaneously with the data associated with each WE bit. It appears that the three claims-in-
11 suit attempt to claim this embodiment of the inventors' disclosure, and Rambus's construction
12 accords with that. Nonetheless, the court cannot adopt Rambus's construction as proposed because it
13 remains ambiguous. By defining a "mask bit" as a "binary digit indicating whether to write data,"
14 the construction blurs two distinct concepts. On the one hand, a DRAM receives a bit of
15 information indicating whether an operation will be a read or a write operation. *See* '789 patent, col.
16 2, ll. 4-6. The Ware specification refers to this signal as a "W/R signal." *Id.* On the other hand, a
17 DRAM can also receive a bit of information *during a write operation* indicating whether a particular
18 piece of data should be written or not. The court's understanding of the specification and the claims
19 indicate that Rambus's claims embrace the latter, but not the former. Nonetheless, Rambus's
20 proposed construction of "mask bit" – "a binary digit indicating whether to write data" – could be
21 misconstrued in the context of these claims to cover a "W/R signal" as well as the specification's
22 "WE signal." Accordingly, the court opts to modify slightly Rambus's proposed construction. A
23 "mask bit" is simply a "binary digit indicating whether to *mask* data involved in a write operation."
24 This construction clarifies that the "mask" in "mask bit" refers to the action of masking data, and not
25 the structure of a mask of data. It may also prevent future confusion about the scope of Rambus's
26 claims.

27 C. "Mask Terminal" and "Pin"

28 CLAIM CONSTRUCTION ORDER FOR THE WARE PATENTS AND ORDER DENYING THE MANUFACTURERS' MOTION
FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

C-05-00334 RMW; C-05-02298-RMW; C-06-00244-RMW

TSF

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
28

Claim term:	Rambus's construction:	The Manufacturers' Construction:
"mask terminal"	A terminal that receives mask bits.	A pin that receives write-enable signals.

Turning to "mask terminal," the court agrees with the parties that the construction of a "mask terminal" turns on the construction of "mask bit." Rambus argues that a "mask terminal" is simply a terminal that receives mask bits. The Manufacturers argue that a "mask terminal" is a "pin that receives write-enable signals," but then point out that "each party defines [mask terminal] as a terminal that receives their version of a 'mask bit.'" Mfrs. Br. at 33-34. Apparently, the Manufacturers believe that a "terminal" and a "pin" are synonymous. Given the Manufacturers' response to the court's inquiry about their definition, Claim Construction Hrg. Tr. 398:5-13 (Jun. 5, 2008), the court sees no reason to introduce further ambiguity. The court is not convinced that it should narrow the meaning of "terminal" to only a "pin" and possibly exclude other terminal options. Accordingly, a "mask terminal" is simply a "terminal that receives mask bits."

D. "During a First/Second Half of a Clock Cycle of an External Clock Signal"

As discussed above, the DRAMs covered by the claims-in-suit receive a first mask bit and then receive a second mask bit. Each claim requires the DRAM to receive the first mask bit "during a first half of a clock cycle of the external clock signal" and the second mask bit "during a second half of a clock cycle of the external clock signal." The parties' next disagree over the scope of this timing limitation. Their proposed constructions appear below:

Claim term:	Rambus's construction:	The Manufacturers' Construction:
"during a first/second half of a clock cycle of an external clock signal"	Phrase does not require separate construction, but is construed in view of the terms therein (see "clock cycle," "external clock signal"), plus plain meaning.	Only between two adjacent clock edges beginning with a rising edge of the clock signal and ending at the next falling edge of the clock signal or beginning with a falling edge of the clock signal and ending at the next rising edge.

The Ware specification says very little about clocking. *Compare with Rambus Inc. v. Hynix Semiconductor Inc.*, 2008 WL 2754805 (N.D. Cal. Jul. 10, 2008) (construing Rambus's Farmwald/Horowitz patents's clocking terms). The only statement in the Ware specification

1 regarding the invention occurs in the discussion of the Figure 12A embodiment. There, the
2 inventors noted that "[f]or the embodiments of the invention, a single clock cycle has two phases,
3 allowing two transfer operations within a single clock cycle" and that "[f]or alternative
4 embodiments, other clocking schemes may be used." '789 Patent at col. 7, ll. 21-24.

5 Absent any help from the intrinsic evidence, the court turns to extrinsic evidence of how a
6 person of ordinary skill in the art would understand "during a first half of a clock cycle."
7 *Helmsderfer*, 527 F.3d at 1382. The Manufacturers' expert, Mr. McAlexander, states that "a clock
8 cycle is measured between two consecutive rising (leading) edges of a clock signal." McAlexander
9 Decl. ¶ 138. Mr. McAlexander concludes that this mandates the Manufacturers' proffered claim
10 construction because that would be the understanding of person of ordinary skill in the art. *Id.* ¶¶
11 139, 140. Mr. McAlexander cites no support for these statements. On the other hand, Rambus's
12 expert, Mr. Murphy, states that the phrase requires no construction. Murphy Decl. ¶ 247. Mr.
13 Murphy criticizes Mr. McAlexander's construction of the term as arbitrary, but also cites no support
14 for what a person of ordinary skill would understand. The Federal Circuit has observed that
15 "extrinsic evidence consisting of expert reports and testimony is generated at the time of and for the
16 purpose of litigation and thus can suffer from bias that is not present in intrinsic evidence." *Phillips*,
17 415 F.3d at 1318. The court is concerned that the views of the experts suffer from such bias here,
18 and therefore, it accords little weight to the opinion testimony of either.

19 This leaves the dictionaries. The most probative dictionary submitted is the *1996 IEEE*
20 *Dictionary*, which defines "clock cycle" as "one period of the [clock] signal, beginning with the
21 rising edge of the signal and ending on the following rising edge of the signal." This supports the
22 Manufacturers' proposed construction of phrase "during the first half of a clock cycle." But absent
23 the idealized square wave used to model a clock signal, the Manufacturers' construction is plagued
24 by the practical question of how to measure "the beginning of the rising edge" of a clock signal.
25 Would a person of ordinary skill understand that a "rising edge" begins when the voltage begins
26 increasing? When the voltage crosses the midpoint from negative to positive?

27 Given the cursory briefing associated with this dispute, the court declines to construe to the

1 phrase at the present time. As this phrase requires construction before the court may address the
 2 Manufacturers' motion for summary judgment of non-infringement, the court requests that the
 3 parties simultaneously submit a brief of up to 10 pages on this topic by August 1, 2008. Each side
 4 may submit up to 5 pages in reply one week later.⁸

5 **E. "First/Second Mask Bit with a First/Second Data Bit"**

6 Lastly, the parties disagree on the meaning of "with." Specifically, the parties dispute the
 7 degree of precision required for a DRAM to have received one signal "with" another. The
 8 Manufacturers argue that in the context of the claims "with" means "at the same time." Rambus
 9 argues that "with" means during the same first/second half of a clock cycle. The parties'
 10 constructions appear below:

Claim term:	Rambus's construction:	The Manufacturers' Construction:
"first/second data value with the first/second mask bit"	First/second data value is received during the first/second half of a clock cycle of the external clock signal.	The information is received at the interface at the same time as the mask bit.

15 Of the three claims, only claim 16 of the '897 patent uses the disputed phrasing. Claim 16
 16 recites a synchronous semiconductor memory device. One of the limitations is "a pin to receive a
 17 first mask bit during a first half of a clock cycle of the external clock signal." The disputed
 18 limitation requires "an interface to receive . . . a first data value with the first mask bit, wherein the
 19 first mask bit indicates whether to write the first data value to the array."

20 Throughout the Ware specification, time is measured in clock cycles and transfers occur
 21 within half-clock cycles. *See, e.g., supra*, Figs. 8B, 12A, 13A, 14, 15, 16A & 16B. The
 22 specification teaches that the appropriate margin of error for the invention is therefore less than one
 23 half of a clock cycle. But so long as the data value and the mask bit arrive within the same half
 24

25
 26 ⁸ The court recognizes that Rambus's final infringement contentions are due on August 1,
 27 2008. The parties may stipulate to extend the deadline for final infringement contentions of the Ware
 28 patent claims affected by this unresolved dispute. If the parties cannot agree, they may submit a joint
 statement outlining their proposals for modifying the schedule.

1 clock cycle, the DRAM can perform the required operation. The Manufacturers' proposed
2 construction could lead to mischief if interpreted by the lay jury to mean "simultaneously." While
3 Rambus's proposed construction may represent too broad a margin of error for receiving a mask bit
4 and a data value, the Manufacturers have not introduced any evidence to suggest this and made no
5 argument to that effect. Accordingly, the court adopts Rambus's proposed construction of the
6 phrase.

7 **IV. NON-INFRINGEMENT**

8 The Manufacturers have moved for summary judgment of non-infringement based on the
9 court adopting their proposed construction of "mask bit." It has not, so the court denies that portion
10 of the Manufacturers' motion for summary judgment as moot. The Manufacturers have also moved
11 for summary judgment of non-infringement based on the court adopting their construction of "during
12 a first half of a clock cycle." The court has deferred construing that phrase, and likewise defers
13 ruling on that portion of the Manufacturers' motion for summary judgment of non-infringement.

14 **V. INVALIDITY**

15 The Manufacturers' motion for summary judgment of non-infringement includes a motion for
16 summary judgment of invalidity contingent on the court adopting Rambus's construction of the
17 phrase "mask bit." The court has done so. The ruling on the motion for summary judgment will be
18 in a separate order.

19 **VI. ORDER**

20 For the reasons set forth above, the court construes the claims as described. The
21 Manufacturers' motion for summary judgment of non-infringement with respect to the "mask bit"
22 claims is denied as moot. The court defers ruling on the Manufacturers' remaining motions for
23 summary judgment.

24
25 DATED: 7/25/2008



26 RONALD M. WHYTE
27 United States District Judge

1 Notice of this document has been electronically sent to counsel in C-05-00334, C-05-02298 and C-06-00244.

Counsel for Rambus Inc., all actions		Counsel for Hynix entities, C-00-20905 and C-05-00334	
Burton Alexander Gross	Burton.Gross@mto.com	Allen Ruby	ruby@allenrubylaw.com
Carolyn Hoecker Luedtke	carolyn.luedtke@mto.com	Belinda Martinez Vega	bvega@omm.com
Catherine Rajwani	crajwani@sidley.com	Daniel J. Furniss	djfurniss@townsend.com
Craig N. Tolliver	ctolliver@mckoolsmith.com	Geoffrey Hurdall Yost	gyost@thelenreid.com
David C. Yang	david.yang@mto.com	Jordan Trent Jones	jtjones@townsend.com
Douglas A. Cawley	dcawley@mckoolsmith.com	Joseph A. Greco	jagreco@townsend.com
Erin C. Dougherty	erin.dougherty@mto.com	Kenneth Lee Nissly	kennissly@thelenreid.com
Gregory P. Stone	gregory.stone@mto.com	Kenneth Ryan O'Rourke	korourke@omm.com
Jennifer Lynn Polse	jen.polse@mto.com	Patrick Lynch	plynch@omm.com
Keith Rhoderic Dhu Hamilton, II	keith.hamilton@mto.com	Susan Gregory VanKeulen	svankeulen@thelenreid.com
Kelly Max Klaus	kelly.klaus@mto.com	Theodore G. Brown, III	tgbrown@townsend.com
Miriam Kim	Miriam.Kim@mto.com	Tomomi Katherine Harkey	tharkey@thelen.com
Peter A. Detre	detrepa@mto.com	Counsel for Micron entities, C-06-00244	
Pierre J. Hubert	phubert@mckoolsmith.com	Aaron Bennett Craig	aaroncraig@quinnemanuel.com
Rosemarie Theresa Ring	rose.ring@mto.com	David J. Ruderman	davidruderman@quinnemanuel.com
Scott L Cole	scole@mckoolsmith.com	Harold Avrum Barza	halbarza@quinnemanuel.com
Scott W. Hejny	shejny@sidley.com	Jared Bobrow	jared.bobrow@weil.com
Sean Eskovitz	sean.eskovitz@mto.com	John D Beynon	john.beynon@weil.com
Steven McCall Perry	steven.perry@mto.com	Leeron Kalay	leeron.kalay@weil.com
Thomas N Tarnay	ttarnay@sidley.com	Linda Jane Brewer	lindabrewer@quinnemanuel.com
William Hans Baumgartner, Jr	wbaumgartner@sidley.com	Rachael Lynn Ballard McCracken	rachaelmccracken@quinnemanuel.com
		Robert Jason Becher	robertbecher@quinnemanuel.com
		Yonaton M Rosenzweig	yonirosenzweig@quinnemanuel.com

28 CLAIM CONSTRUCTION ORDER FOR THE WARE PATENTS AND ORDER DENYING THE MANUFACTURERS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

C-05-00334 RMW; C-05-02298-RMW; C-06-00244-RMW

TSF

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
28

Counsel for Nanya entities, C-05-00334		Counsel for Samsung entities, C-05-00334 and C-05-02298	
Chester Wren-Ming Day	cday@orrick.com	Ana Elena Kadala	anita.kadala@weil.com
Craig R. Kaufman	ckaufman@orrick.com	Claire Elise Goldstein	claire.goldstein@weil.com
Jan Ellen Ellard	jellard@orrick.com	David J. Healey	david.healey@weil.com
Jason Sheffield Angell	jangell@orrick.com	Edward Robert Reines	Edward.Reines@weil.com
Kaiwen Tseng	ktseng@orrick.com	Matthew D. Powers	matthew.powers@weil.com
Mark Shean	mshean@orrick.com		
Robert E. Freitas	rfreitas@orrick.com		
Vickie L. Feeman	vfeeman@orrick.com		

Counsel for intervenor, Texas Instruments, Inc., C-05-00334	
Kelli A. Crouch	kcrouch@jonesday.com
Counsel for intervenor, United States Department of Justice, C-00-20905	
Eugene S. Litvinoff	eugene.litvinoff@usdoj.gov
May Lee Heye	may.hey@usdoj.gov
Nathanael M. Cousins	nat.cousins@usdoj.gov
Niall Edmund Lynch	Niall.Lynch@USDOJ.GOV
Counsel for intervenor, Elpida Memory, Inc., C-00-20905 and C-05-00334	
Eric R. Lamison	elamison@kirkland.com
John J. Feldhaus	jfeldhaus@foley.com

Counsel are responsible for distributing copies of this document to co-counsel that have not registered for e-filing under the court's CM/ECF program in each action.

Dated: 7/25/2008

TSF
 Chambers of Judge Whyte