



**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA
RICHMOND DIVISION**

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD. and
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA,
INC.,

Plaintiffs,

-v.-

NVIDIA CORPORATION, OLD MICRO,
INC. F/K/A VELOCITY MICRO, INC., AND
VELOCITY HOLDINGS, LLC,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 3:14-cv-757-REP



**DEFENDANTS' MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO SAMSUNG'S MOTION FOR
PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT OF INFRINGEMENT**



TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. RESPONSE TO STATEMENT OF UNDISPUTED FACTS..... 2

III. DEFENDANTS’ ADDITIONAL STATEMENT OF UNDISPUTED FACTS..... 6

IV. ARGUMENT 7

 A. Relevant Legal Standards 7

 1. Legal Standard for Summary Judgment 7

 2. Legal Standard for Patent Infringement..... 7

 B. There are Genuine Disputes of Material Fact Precluding Summary Judgment Under the Proper Interpretation of Claim 15 of the ’902 Patent 8

 1. There is a Genuine Dispute of Material Fact Under the Proper Construction of “Forming a First Patterned Layer on Said Active Region of Said Substrate *Spaced Apart* From Said Field Region” 8

 a. “Spaced Apart” Should be Given its Plain and Ordinary Meaning, Which is Not Limited to a Cross-Sectional View 9

 b. Defendants’ Plain Meaning Construction of “Spaced Apart” is Correct 11

 c. Defendants’ Plain Meaning Construction of “Spaced Apart” Does Not Exclude Preferred Embodiments 13

 d. Applying the Plain Meaning of “Spaced Apart,” A Genuine Dispute of Material Fact Precludes Summary Judgment..... 14

 2. There is a Genuine Dispute of Material Fact Under the Proper Construction of “Forming a Second Patterned Layer on Said Field Isolation Layer Adjacent Said Active Region of Said Substrate, the Active Region Including the First Patterned Layer” 17

 a. Controlling Precedent Contradicts Samsung’s Argument That Claim 15’s “Second Patterned Layer” Need Not be Etch Inhibiting Because Claim 1 Recites an “Etch Inhibiting Layer” 17

 b. The Specification Expressly States That the “Second Patterned Layer” in Claim 15 Must Inhibit or be Capable of Inhibiting an Etch..... 19



- c. Under the Proper Interpretation of “Second Patterned Layer,” There is a Genuine Dispute of Material Fact Precluding Summary Judgment21
- C. There are Genuine Disputes of Material Fact Precluding Summary Judgment Under the Proper Interpretation of Claim 12 of the ’675 Patent21
 - 1. There Is a Genuine Dispute of Material Fact as to Whether Manufacturing Involves “Depositing a Third Metal Gate Electrode Layer onto the Second Metal Gate Electrode Layer to Thereby Fill a Space Between the Inner Sidewalls of the Spacers”22
 - 2. There Is a Genuine Dispute of Material Fact as to Whether the Accused Devices Are Made by “Planarizing the Third Metal Gate Electrode Layer and the Second Metal Gate Electrode Layer to Thereby Define a Composite Metal Gate Electrode of a PMOS Transistor Between the Inner Sidewalls of the Spacers”23
 - 3. There Is a Genuine Dispute of Material Fact as to Whether the Accused Devices Have a “Composite Metal Gate Electrode Comprising a Portion of the Third Metal Gate Electrode Layer, a Portion of the Second Metal Gate Electrode Layer Having a U-Shaped Cross-Section and the Patterned First Metal Gate Electrode Layer”25
 - 4. There Is a Genuine Dispute of Material Fact as to Whether “the Portion of Third Metal Gate Electrode Layer of the PMOS Transistor and the Upper Metal Gate Electrode of the NMOS Transistor Comprise Different Metals” in the Accused Devices26
 - a. Dr. Fair’s Testimony Refutes Samsung’s Infringement Theory27
 - b. Samsung Improperly Seeks to Re-Write the Claim Language from “Different Metals” to “Different Materials”28
- V. CONCLUSION.....30



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.,
477 U.S. 242 (1986) 7

Augme Techs., Inc. v. Yahoo! Inc.,
755 F.3d 1326 (Fed. Cir. 2014) 28

Beckson Marine, Inc. v. NFM, Inc.,
292 F.3d 718 (Fed. Cir. 2002) 8

C.R. Bard, Inc. v. U.S. Surgical Corp.,
388 F.3d 858 (Fed. Cir. 2004) 19, 20

EMD Millipore Corp. v. AllPure Tech., Inc.,
768 F.3d 1196 (Fed. Cir. 2014) 8

Engel Indus., Inc. v. Lockformer Co.,
96 F.3d 1398 (Fed. Cir. 1996) 14

Hamilton Beach Brands, Inc. v. Sunbeam Prods., Inc.,
No. 3:11-cv-345, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 97923 (E.D. Va. July 13, 2012) 7

Hologic, Inc. v. SenoRx,
639 F.3d 1329 (Fed. Cir. 2011) 19

Imaginal Systematic, LLC v. Leggett & Platt, Inc.,
No. 2014-1845, --- F.3d ---, 2015 U.S. App. LEXIS 19555 (Fed. Cir. Nov. 10, 2015)..... 10, 11

Nazomi Commc’ns, Inc. v. ARM Holdings, PLC,
403 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2005) 9

Nystrom v. TREX Co.,
424 F.3d 1136 (Fed. Cir. 2005) 17, 19

Retractable Tech., Inc. v. Becton, Dickinson & Co.,
653 F.3d 1296 (Fed. Cir. 2011), *denying en banc reh’g*, 659 F.3d 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2011) . 18, 19

Selva & Sons, Inc. v. Nina Footwear, Inc.,
705 F.2d 1316 (Fed. Cir. 1983) 7

Silicon Graphics, Inc. v. ATI Techs., Inc.,
607 F.3d 784 (Fed. Cir. 2010) 19, 20

Star Scientific, Inc. v. R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.,
655 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2011) 8



Tandon Corp. v. U.S. Int’l Trade Comm’n,
831 F.2d 1017 (Fed. Cir. 1987) 18

Taurus IP, LLC v. DaimlerChrysler Corp.,
726 F.3d 1306 (Fed. Cir. 2013) 17

TI Grp. Auto. Sys. (N. Am.) v. VDO N. Am. LLC,
375 F.3d 1126 (Fed. Cir. 2004) 9, 10, 11

Va. Innovation Scis., Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.,
11 F. Supp. 3d 622 (E.D. Va. 2014) 7

V-Formation, Inc. v. Benetton Grp. SpA,
401 F.3d 1307 8

RULES

Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(c) 7

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.