

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

ELM 3DS INNOVATIONS, LLC, Plaintiff, v. SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., et al., Defendants.	C.A. No. 14-cv-1430-LPS-CJB JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
ELM 3DS INNOVATIONS, LLC, Plaintiff, v. MICRON TECHNOLOGY, INC., et al., Defendants.	C.A. No. 14-cv-1431-LPS-CJB JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
ELM 3DS INNOVATIONS, LLC, Plaintiff, v. SK HYNIX INC., et al., Defendants.	C.A. No. 14-cv-1432-LPS-CJB JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

JOINT CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF

Of Counsel:

Adam K. Mortara
Matthew R. Ford
BARTLIT BECK LLP
54 West Hubbard Street, Suite 300
Chicago, IL 60654
Tel: (312) 494-4400
adam.mortara@bartlitbeck.com
matthew.ford@bartlitbeck.com

John M. Hughes
Nosson D. Knobloch
Katherine L.I. Hacker
BARTLIT BECK LLP
1801 Wewatta Street, Suite 1200
Denver, CO 80202
Tel: (303) 592-3100

Brian E. Farnan (#4089)
Michael J. Farnan (#5165)
FARNAN LLP
919 North Market Street
12th Floor
Wilmington, DE 19801
Tel: (302) 777-0300
bfarnan@farnanlaw.com
mfarnan@farnanlaw.com

*Counsel for Plaintiff ELM 3DS
INNOVATIONS, LLC*

john.hughes@bartlitbeck.com
nosson.knobloch@bartlitbeck.com
kat.hacker@bartlitbeck.com

Of Counsel:

L. Howard Chen
Harold H. Davis
Nicholas A. Brown
GREENBERG TRAUERIG, LLP
Four Embarcadero Center, Suite 3000
San Francisco, CA 94111
(415) 655-1300
chenh@gtlaw.com
davish@gtlaw.com

Vishesh Narayan
GREENBERG TRAUERIG, LLP
101 East Kennedy Boulevard, Suite 1900
Tampa, FL 33602
(813) 318.5700
narayenv@gtlaw.com

Of Counsel:

Allan M. Soobert
Naveen Modi
Phillip W. Citroën
PAUL HASTINGS LLP
875 15th Street, N.W. Telephone:
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 551-1700
allansoobert@paulhastings.com
naveenmodi@paulhastings.com
phillipcitroen@paulhastings.com

Of Counsel:

John Kappos
Hana Oh Chen
O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP
610 Newport Center Drive

Benjamin J. Schladweiler (#4601)
GREENBERG TRAUERIG, LLP
The Nemours Building
1007 North Orange Street, Suite 1200
Wilmington, DE 19801
(302) 661-7352
schladweilerb@gtlaw.com

*Attorneys for Defendants SK hynix Inc., SK
hynix America Inc., hynix Semiconductor
Manufacturing America Inc., and SK Hynix
Memory Solution Inc.*

Adam W. Poff (#3990)
Pilar G. Kraman (#5199)
YOUNG CONAWAY STARGATT &
TAYLOR, LLP
Rodney Square
1000 North King Street
Wilmington, DE 19801
(302) 571-6600
apoff@ycst.com
pkraman@ycst.com

*Attorneys for Defendants Samsung
Electronics Co., Ltd., Samsung
Semiconductor, Inc., Samsung Electronics
America, Inc., and Samsung Austin
Semiconductor, LLC*

Frederick L. Cottrell, III (#2555)
Travis S. Hunter (#5350)
Tyler E. Cragg (#6398)
RICHARDS, LAYTON & FINGER, PA
920 North King Street
One Rodney Square

Newport Beach, California 92660-3823
(949) 823-6900
jkappos@omm.com
hoh@omm.com

Brian Cook
Xin-Yi Zhou
O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP
400 South Hope Street
Los Angeles, California 90071-2899
(213) 430-6000
bcook@omm.com
vzhou@omm.com

Wilmington, DE 19801
Telephone: (302) 651-7700
cottrell@rlf.com
hunter@rlf.com
cragg@rlf.com

*Counsel for Defendants Micron Technology,
Inc.; Micron Semiconductor Products, Inc.;
and Micron Consumer Products Group, Inc.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTIONS 1

 A. Introduction from Plaintiff’s Opening Brief..... 1

 B. Introduction from Defendant’s Responsive Brief..... 2

 C. Introduction from Defendants’ Opening Brief 3

 D. Introduction from Plaintiff’s Responsive Brief 4

II. BACKGROUND 4

 A. Statement of Facts from Plaintiff’s Opening Brief..... 4

 B. Technology Background from Defendant’s Opening Brief..... 5

III. LEGAL STANDARDS 7

 A. Legal Standards for Claim Construction from Plaintiff’s Opening Brief..... 7

 B. Legal Standards for Indefiniteness from Plaintiff’s Opening Brief..... 9

IV. DISPUTED CLAIM CONSTRUCTIONS 9

 A. The “Substantially Flexible Terms”..... 9

 1. Plaintiff’s Opening Position: “Substantially Flexible” Terms—
 Terms 1, 2, and 3..... 9

 2. Defendant’s Responsive Position: The “Substantially Flexible”
 Terms (D.I. 166, Disputed Terms 1-3) 11

 a. The Federal Circuit’s Construction Did Not Resolve
 Indefiniteness 11

 b. Elm’s Argument Against “Low Tensile Stress” Should Be
 Rejected..... 12

 3. Defendant’s Opening Position: The “Substantially Flexible” Terms
 (D.I. 166, Disputed Terms 1-3)..... 13

 a. The Federal Circuit Construed The “Substantially Flexible”
 Terms 13

 b. The “Largely Able To Bend Without Breaking”
 Requirement Renders All “Substantially Flexible” Terms
 Indefinite 14

 c. The Federal Circuit Did Not Address Indefiniteness Under
 § 112..... 18

 4. Plaintiff’s Responsive Position: The Federal Circuit’s construction
 of “substantially flexible” is not indefinite 19

 B. The “Stress Terms” 23

1.	Plaintiff’s Opening Position: “Low Stress” and “Stress of 5×10^8 dynes/cm ² ” Terms—4 and 5	23
a.	A person of skill in the art would have understood how and when to measure stress.....	24
b.	Meaning of “low stress”.....	27
c.	Alternative constructions of “low stress”	29
2.	Defendants’ Responsive Position: The “Stress” Terms (D.I. 166, Disputed Terms 4-5)	32
a.	The “Stress” Terms Are Indefinite (Disputed Terms 4-5).....	32
b.	The “Low Stress” Terms Without A Numeric Restriction Are Further Indefinite (Disputed Term 5)	35
c.	To The Extent Not Indefinite, All “Stress” Terms (Disputed Terms 4-5) Should Be Construed According to Micron/Samsung’s Alternative Construction (This Section Is Not Joined By Hynix)	37
3.	Defendants’ Opening Position: The “Stress” Terms (D.I. 166, Disputed Terms 4-5)	39
a.	The “Stress” Terms Are Indefinite (Disputed Terms 4-5).....	39
b.	The “Low Stress” Terms Without A Numeric Restriction Are Further Indefinite (Disputed Term 5)	42
c.	The Intrinsic Evidence Disclaims Compressive Stress and Stress Balancing.....	44
d.	To The Extent Not Indefinite, All “Stress” Terms (Disputed Terms 4-5) Should Be Construed According to Micron/Samsung’s Alternative Construction (This Section Is Not Joined By Hynix)	47
4.	Plaintiff’s Responsive Position: Understanding dielectric stress is central to semiconductor manufacturing.....	48
a.	The Defendants ignore the patent, industry practice, and their own PTAB experts in arguing that “stress” is an unknown concept in semiconductor manufacturing	48
b.	The Defendants ignore the specification in arguing that “low stress” is an unknowable term of degree.....	52
c.	There was no disclaimer of either compressive stress or stress balancing	53
C.	The “Interconnection,” “Bonding,” and “Conductive Path” Terms	54
1.	Plaintiff’s Opening Position.....	54
a.	“Vertical Interconnection” Terms—6, 7, 8, and 9	54

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.