



**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

- I. Introduction..... 1
- II. Overview of Patented Technology..... 3
- III. Relevant Legal Standards ..... 4
- IV. Agreed Constructions..... 7
- V. Terms for Construction ..... 7
  - A. “bus” ..... 7
  - B. “real time” and related terms ..... 10
  - C. “fast bus”..... 14
  - D. “coupled,” “coupleable” and “coupling” ..... 15
  - E. “directly supplied” and “directly supplies” ..... 18
  - F. “display device” and “display adapter ..... 22
  - G. “without requiring a second bus” and “without also requiring a second bus”..... 24
  - H. “control circuit” ..... 26
  - I. “algorithmically translate the noncontiguous addresses to the contiguous addresses” ..... 27
  - J. “video stream input device circuit”..... 28
- VI. Conclusion ..... 29

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>Abtox, Inc. v. Exitron Corp.</i> , 122 F.3d 1019 (Fed. Cir. 1997) .....	6
<i>Avago Techs. U.S., Inc. v. STMicroelectronics, Inc.</i> , 2011 WL 3439929 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 5, 2011) .....	5
<i>Brown v. 3M</i> , 265 F.3d 1349 (Fed. Cir. 2001) .....	4, 25
<i>Eolas Techs., Inc. v. Adobe Sys., Inc.</i> , 810 F. Supp. 2d 795 (E.D. Tex. 2011) .....	5
<i>GSK Tech. Inc. v. Eaton Elec. Inc.</i> , 2008 WL 906713 (E.D. Tex. Apr. 1, 2008) .....	15
<i>Honeywell Int’l, Inc. v. Universal Avionics Sys. Corp.</i> , 493 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2007) .....	6
<i>Innova/Pure Water, Inc. v. Safari Water Filtration Sys., Inc.</i> , 381 F.3d 1111 (Fed. Cir. 2004) .....	4, 6, 20
<i>Liebel-Flarsheim Co. v. Medrad, Inc.</i> , 358 F.3d 898 (Fed. Cir. 2004) .....	6
<i>Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc.</i> , 517 U.S. 370 (1996) .....	4
<i>Nautilus Inc. v. Biosig Instruments, Inc.</i> , 134 S. Ct. 2120, 2129 (2014) .....	12
<i>Negotiated Data Solutions, LLC v. Dell, Inc.</i> , 596 F. Supp. 2d 949 (E.D. Tex. 2009) .....	15
<i>O2 Micro Int’l Ltd. v. Beyond Innovation Tech. Co.</i> , 521 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....	5, 15, 25
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) .....	4, 5, 6, 7
<i>Power Integrations, Inc. v. Fairchild Semiconductor Int’l, Inc.</i> , 711 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....	6
<i>Raytheon Co. v. Roper Corp.</i> , 724 F.2d 951 (Fed. Cir. 1983) .....	6

<i>STMicroelectronics, N.V. v. Motorola Inc.</i> , 327 F. Supp. 2d 687, 711 (E.D. Tex. 2004) .....	2, 5, 11
<i>SuperGuide Corp. v. DirectTV Enterprises, Inc.</i> , 358 F.3d 870 (Fed. Cir. 2004) .....	6
<i>Thomas Swan &amp; Co. v. Finisar Corp.</i> , 2014 WL 2885296 (E.D. Tex. Jun. 25, 2014) .....	12
<i>Tivo, Inc. v. AT&amp;T Inc.</i> , 2011 WL 6961021 (E.D. Tex. Oct. 13, 2011) .....	9
<i>U.S. Surgical Corp. v. Ethicon, Inc.</i> , 103 F.3d 1554 (Fed. Cir. 1997) .....	4
<i>UltimatePointer, L.L.C. v. Nintendo Co., Ltd.</i> , 2013 WL 2325118 (E.D. Tex. May 28, 2013).....	5, 26
<i>Uniloc USA, Inc. v. Inmagine Corp., LLC</i> , 2013 WL 3871360 (E.D. Tex. July 24, 2013) .....	5, 26
<i>Vitronics Corp. v. Conceptronic, Inc.</i> , 90 F.3d 1576 (Fed. Cir. 1996) .....	6, 14

## I. INTRODUCTION

Plaintiff Parthenon Unified Memory Architecture LLC (“PUMA”) proposes constructions for the terms-in-dispute that are based on both the intrinsic and extrinsic evidence and that are consistent with a previous claim construction order signed by Judge Leonard Davis relating to the asserted patents. In contrast, Defendants HTC and LG propose constructions that improperly import limitations from the specification, add extraneous language not contemplated by the claims, and ignore the inventive features of the patents. PUMA’s proposed constructions more accurately convey the meaning of the terms in dispute.

PUMA has asserted nine patents against the Defendants relating to the implementation of shared memory in a computer system. All nine patents were originally assigned to STMicroelectronics, Inc. (“STMicro”), a semiconductor company based in Texas. STMicro filed the patent applications for U.S. Patent No. 5,812,789 and U.S. Patent No. 6,058,459 on the same day, and the two patents substantially overlap in their specifications, figures, and named inventors. Additionally, each of the ’789 Patent and the ’459 Patent explicitly incorporate by reference the specification of the other. Six additional asserted patents—U.S. Patent Nos. 6,427,194; 7,321,368; 7,542,045; 7,777,753; 8,054,315; and 8,681,164—are continuation applications of the ’459 Patent. Together, those eight patents describe inventive systems and methods for selectively allowing multiple devices, such as a CPU and an audio/video decoder, to access a shared memory. The ninth asserted patent, U.S. Patent No. 5,960,464, describes an inventive memory management system that allows a device that typically requires a large contiguous block of memory, such as a video decoder, to share noncontiguous memory with other devices.

STMicro previously asserted the ’789 Patent in a patent infringement suit against Motorola Inc. in the Eastern District of Texas, Sherman Division. As part of that case, on July

# 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.