

1 KEKER & VAN NEST LLP
ROBERT A. VAN NEST - #84065
rvannest@kvn.com
2 CHRISTA M. ANDERSON - #184325
canderson@kvn.com
3 633 Battery Street
4 San Francisco, CA 94111-1809
Telephone: 415.391.5400
5 Facsimile: 415.397.7188

KING & SPALDING LLP
DONALD F. ZIMMER, JR. - #112279
fzimmer@kslaw.com
CHERYL A. SABNIS - #224323
csabnis@kslaw.com
101 Second St., Suite 2300
San Francisco, CA 94105
Tel: 415.318.1200
Fax: 415.318.1300

6 KING & SPALDING LLP
7 SCOTT T. WEINGAERTNER (*Pro Hac Vice*)
sweingaertner@kslaw.com
8 ROBERT F. PERRY
rperry@kslaw.com
9 BRUCE W. BABER (*Pro Hac Vice*)
1185 Avenue of the Americas
10 New York, NY 10036
Tel: 212.556.2100
11 Fax: 212.556.2222

IAN C. BALLON - #141819
ballon@gtlaw.com
HEATHER MEEKER - #172148
meekerh@gtlaw.com
GREENBERG TRAUIG, LLP
1900 University Avenue
East Palo Alto, CA 94303
Tel: 650.328.8500
Fax: 650.328-8508

12 Attorneys for Defendant
13 GOOGLE INC.

14
15 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
16 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
17 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

18 ORACLE AMERICA, INC.,

19 Plaintiff,

20 v.

21 GOOGLE INC.,

22 Defendant.
23
24
25
26
27
28

Case No. 3:10-cv-03561-WHA

**GOOGLE'S RESPONSE TO THE
COURT'S ORDER REQUESTING CASE
MANAGEMENT STATEMENTS**

Judge: Hon. William Alsup

Date Comp. Filed: October 27, 2010

Trial Date: October 31, 2011

1 Pursuant to the Court’s September 26, 2011 Order Requesting Case Management
2 Statements (Dkt. 458) (“Order”), Defendant Google, Inc. (“Google”) responds as follows:

3 **I. Factual Background**

4 On September 29, 2011, Plaintiff Oracle America, Inc. (“Oracle”) submitted a case
5 management statement in which it selected the following 26 separate patent claims to be asserted
6 at trial:

- 7 • U.S. Patent No. RE38,104: Claims 11, 27, 29, 39, 40, 41.
- 8 • U.S. Patent No. 6,061,520: Claims 1, 8, 12, 20.
- 9 • U.S. Patent No. 5,966,702: Claims 1, 6, 7, 12, 13, 15, 16.
- 10 • U.S. Patent No. 6,910,205: Claims 1, 2.
- 11 • U.S. Patent No. 7,426,720: Claims 1, 6, 10, 19, 21, 22.
- 12 • U.S. Patent No. 6,192,476: Claim 14.

13 Per the Order, any claims other than those listed above “will be deemed foregone as to all
14 accused matters.” (Dkt. No. 458, at 1.) In response to the Order, and to Oracle’s selection of the
15 above-listed claims, Google provides the following statements regarding concession of alleged
16 infringement and, claim by claim, any and all invalidity defenses that Google will assert at trial.

17 **II. Statement Regarding Concession of Alleged Infringement**

18 Google does not concede to infringing any of the above-asserted claims.

19 **III. Selection of Invalidity Defenses**

20 With Oracle continuing to assert 26 separate patent claims across six unrelated patents, it
21 remains unclear which claims will actually be tried in the jury trial scheduled to start on October
22 31. What is clear: it will be impossible to try 26 separate claims in the amount of time the Court
23 has allotted for the trial. In light of the large number of remaining patents and claims, however,
24 it is difficult for Google to narrow the number of prior art defenses it may assert at trial.
25 Nevertheless, Google has in good faith narrowed the number of prior art defenses it will pursue
26 so that, for all but one patent, there are three or fewer prior-art-based invalidity defenses per
27 asserted claim (and in the case of the one exception, there are only four).

28 Specifically, Google may assert the following invalidity defenses at trial.

- 1
- U.S. Patent No. RE38,104
- 2
- Claim 11:
- 3
- Invalid in view of D. Gries, “Compiler Construction for Digital
- 4
- Computers,” John Wiley & Sons, Inc. (1971).
- 5
- Invalid in view of U.S. Pat. No. 4,571,678 to Chaitin, issued Feb.
- 6
- 18, 1986.
- 7
- Invalid in view of J.W. Davidson, “Cint: A RISC Interpreter for
- 8
- the C Programming Language,” SIGPLAN ‘87 Papers of the
- 9
- Symposium on Interpreters and Interpretive Techniques (1987),
- 10
- and further in view of AT&T, System V Application Binary
- 11
- Interface Motorola 68000 Processor Family Supplement, Prentice
- 12
- Hall Int’l (1990).
- 13
- Claim 27:
- 14
- Invalid in view of D. Gries, “Compiler Construction for Digital
- 15
- Computers,” John Wiley & Sons, Inc. (1971).
- 16
- Invalid in view of J.W. Davidson, “Cint: A RISC Interpreter for
- 17
- the C Programming Language,” SIGPLAN ‘87 Papers of the
- 18
- Symposium on Interpreters and Interpretive Techniques (1987),
- 19
- and further in view of AT&T, System V Application Binary
- 20
- Interface Motorola 68000 Processor Family Supplement, Prentice
- 21
- Hall Int’l (1990).
- 22
- Claim 29:
- 23
- Invalid in view of D. Gries, “Compiler Construction for Digital
- 24
- Computers,” John Wiley & Sons, Inc. (1971).
- 25
- Invalid in view of J.W. Davidson, “Cint: A RISC Interpreter for
- 26
- the C Programming Language,” SIGPLAN ‘87 Papers of the
- 27
- Symposium on Interpreters and Interpretive Techniques (1987),
- 28
- and further in view of AT&T, System V Application Binary
- Interface Motorola 68000 Processor Family Supplement, Prentice
- Hall Int’l (1990).

- 1 ○ Claim 40:
- 2 ▪ Invalid in view of D. Gries, “Compiler Construction for Digital
- 3 Computers,” John Wiley & Sons, Inc. (1971).
- 4 ▪ Invalid in view of J.W. Davidson, “Cint: A RISC Interpreter for
- 5 the C Programming Language,” SIGPLAN ‘87 Papers of the
- 6 Symposium on Interpreters and Interpretive Techniques (1987),
- 7 and further in view of AT&T, System V Application Binary
- 8 Interface Motorola 68000 Processor Family Supplement, Prentice
- 9 Hall Int’l (1990).
- 10 ○ Claim 41:
- 11 ▪ Invalid in view of D. Gries, “Compiler Construction for Digital
- 12 Computers,” John Wiley & Sons, Inc. (1971).
- 13 ▪ Invalid in view of J.W. Davidson, “Cint: A RISC Interpreter for
- 14 the C Programming Language,” SIGPLAN ‘87 Papers of the
- 15 Symposium on Interpreters and Interpretive Techniques (1987),
- 16 and further in view of AT&T, System V Application Binary
- 17 Interface Motorola 68000 Processor Family Supplement, Prentice
- 18 Hall Int’l (1990).
- 19 ○ All asserted claims: Invalid for failure to comply with 35 U.S.C. § 251
- 20 (reissue statute).
- 21 • U.S. Patent No. 6,061,520
- 22 ○ Claim 1:
- 23 ▪ Invalid in view of B.T. Lewis et al., “Clarity MCode: A
- 24 Retargetable Intermediate Representation for Compilation,” ACM,
- 25 IR ’95, 1/95, San Francisco, California, USA (1995).
- 26 ▪ Invalid in view of M. Cierniak et al., “Briki: an Optimizing Java
- 27 Compiler,” IEEE Compcon ’97 Proceedings (1997).
- 28 ▪ Invalid in view of Cierniak, and further in view of Lindholm, Java
- virtual machine Specification, Release 1.0 Beta DRAFT (1995).
- Claim 8:
- Invalid in view of B.T. Lewis et al., “Clarity MCode: A
- Retargetable Intermediate Representation for Compilation,” ACM,
- IR ’95, 1/95, San Francisco, California, USA (1995).
- Invalid in view of M. Cierniak et al., “Briki: an Optimizing Java
- Compiler,” IEEE Compcon ’97 Proceedings (1997).
- Claim 12:
- Invalid in view of B.T. Lewis et al., “Clarity MCode: A
- Retargetable Intermediate Representation for Compilation,” ACM,

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

IR '95, 1/95, San Francisco, California, USA (1995).

- Invalid in view of M. Cierniak et al., “Briki: an Optimizing Java Compiler,” IEEE Compcn '97 Proceedings (1997).
- Invalid in view of Cierniak, and further in view of Lindholm, Java virtual machine Specification, Release 1.0 Beta DRAFT (1995).

○ Claim 20:

- Invalid in view of B.T. Lewis et al., “Clarity MCode: A Retargetable Intermediate Representation for Compilation,” ACM, IR '95, 1/95, San Francisco, California, USA (1995).
- Invalid in view of M. Cierniak et al., “Briki: an Optimizing Java Compiler,” IEEE Compcn '97 Proceedings (1997).
- Invalid under 35 U.S.C. § 101 (“computer-readable medium” - carrier wave not patentable)

• U.S. Patent No. 5,966,702

○ Claim 1:

- Invalid in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,815,718 to Tock, et al., filed May 30, 1996.
- Invalid in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,613,120 to Palay, filed Oct. 20, 1994.

○ Claim 6:

- Invalid in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,815,718 to Tock, et al., filed May 30, 1996.
- Invalid in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,613,120 to Palay, filed Oct. 20, 1994.

○ Claim 7:

- Invalid in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,815,718 to Tock, et al., filed May 30, 1996.
- Invalid in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,613,120 to Palay, filed Oct. 20, 1994.

○ Claim 12:

- Invalid in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,815,718 to Tock, et al., filed May 30, 1996.
- Invalid in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,613,120 to Palay, filed Oct. 20, 1994.

- 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 13:
 - Invalid in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,815,718 to Tock, et al., filed May 30, 1996.
 - Invalid in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,613,120 to Palay, filed Oct. 20, 1994.
 - Claim 15:
 - Invalid in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,815,718 to Tock, et al., filed May 30, 1996.
 - Invalid in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,613,120 to Palay, filed Oct. 20, 1994.
 - Claim 16:
 - Invalid in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,815,718 to Tock, et al., filed May 30, 1996.
 - Invalid in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,613,120 to Palay, filed Oct. 20, 1994.
 - U.S. Patent No. 6,910,205
 - Claim 1:
 - Invalid in view of P. Tarau et al., “The Power of Partial Translation: An Experiment with the Cification of Binary Prolog,” ACM Symposium on Applied Computing (1995).
 - Invalid in view of P. Magnusson, “Partial Translation,” Swedish Institute of Computer Science Technical Report (T93:5) (Oct. 1993).
 - Invalid in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,842,017, issued on 10/24/1998 to Hookway et al.
 - Invalid in view of B.T. Lewis et al., “Clarity MCode: A Retargetable Intermediate Representation for Compilation,” ACM, IR '95, 1/95, San Francisco, California, USA (1995), and further in view of Magnusson.
 - Claim 2:
 - Invalid in view of P. Tarau et al., “The Power of Partial Translation: An Experiment with the Cification of Binary Prolog,” ACM Symposium on Applied Computing (1995).
 - Invalid in view of P. Magnusson, “Partial Translation,” Swedish Institute of Computer Science Technical Report (T93:5) (Oct. 1993).

- 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
- Invalid in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,842,017, issued on 10/24/1998 to Hookway et al.
 - Invalid in view of B.T. Lewis et al., “Clarity MCode: A Retargetable Intermediate Representation for Compilation,” ACM, IR '95, 1/95, San Francisco, California, USA (1995), and further in view of Magnusson.
 - U.S. Patent No. 7,426,720
 - Claim 1:
 - Invalid in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,823,509 to Webb et al., filed Dec. 20, 2000, further in view of U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0088604 to Kuck et al., filed Nov. 7, 2002, and further in view of M. J. Bach, The Design of the Unix Operating System, Bell Telephone Labs., Inc. (1986).
 - Invalid in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,405,367 to Bryant et al., filed June 5, 1998, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,313,793 to Traut et al., filed July 11, 2002.
 - Claim 6:
 - Invalid in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,823,509 to Webb et al., filed Dec. 20, 2000, further in view of U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0088604 to Kuck et al., filed Nov. 7, 2002, and further in view of M. J. Bach, The Design of the Unix Operating System, Bell Telephone Labs., Inc. (1986).
 - Invalid in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,405,367 to Bryant et al., filed June 5, 1998, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,313,793 to Traut et al., filed July 11, 2002.
 - Claim 10:
 - Invalid in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,823,509 to Webb et al., filed Dec. 20, 2000, further in view of U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0088604 to Kuck et al., filed Nov. 7, 2002, and further in view of M. J. Bach, The Design of the Unix Operating System, Bell Telephone Labs., Inc. (1986).
 - Invalid in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,405,367 to Bryant et al., filed June 5, 1998, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,313,793 to Traut et al., filed July 11, 2002.
 - Claim 19:
 - Invalid in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,823,509 to Webb et al., filed Dec. 20, 2000, further in view of U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0088604 to Kuck et al., filed Nov. 7, 2002, and further in view of M. J. Bach, The Design of the Unix Operating System, Bell Telephone Labs., Inc. (1986).

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

- Invalid in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,405,367 to Bryant et al., filed June 5, 1998, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,313,793 to Traut et al., filed July 11, 2002.
- Invalid under 35 U.S.C. §§ 101/102 (printed matter).
- Claim 21:
 - Invalid in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,823,509 to Webb et al., filed Dec. 20, 2000, further in view of U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0088604 to Kuck et al., filed Nov. 7, 2002, and further in view of M. J. Bach, The Design of the Unix Operating System, Bell Telephone Labs., Inc. (1986).
 - Invalid in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,405,367 to Bryant et al., filed June 5, 1998, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,313,793 to Traut et al., filed July 11, 2002.
- Claim 22:
 - Invalid in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,823,509 to Webb et al., filed Dec. 20, 2000, further in view of U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0088604 to Kuck et al., filed Nov. 7, 2002, and further in view of M. J. Bach, The Design of the Unix Operating System, Bell Telephone Labs., Inc. (1986).
 - Invalid in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,405,367 to Bryant et al., filed June 5, 1998, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,313,793 to Traut et al., filed July 11, 2002.
- U.S. Patent No. 6,192,476
 - Claim 14:
 - Invalid in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,412,717 to Fischer, filed May 15, 1992.
 - Invalid under 35 U.S.C. § 101 (“computer-readable medium” - carrier wave not patentable).
 - Invalid under 35 U.S.C. §§ 101/102 (printed matter).

Google reserves the right to narrow its list of invalidity defenses if and when Oracle further reduces the number of asserted claims to a manageable number for trial.

1 DATED: October 3, 2011

2 **KEKER & VAN NEST, LLP**

3 By: /s/ Robert A. Van Nest

4 ROBERT A. VAN NEST - #84065
rvannest@kvn.com
5 CHRISTA M. ANDERSON - #184325
canderson@kvn.com
6 KEKER & VAN NEST LLP
7 710 Sansome Street
San Francisco, CA 94111-1704
8 Telephone: (415) 391-5400
Facsimile: (415) 397-7188

9
10 SCOTT T. WEINGAERTNER (*Pro Hac Vice*)
sweingaertner@kslaw.com
11 ROBERT F. PERRY
rperry@kslaw.com
12 BRUCE W. BABER (*Pro Hac Vice*)
bbaber@kslaw.com
13 KING & SPALDING LLP
1185 Avenue of the Americas
14 New York, NY 10036-4003
Telephone: (212) 556-2100
15 Facsimile: (212) 556-2222

16 DONALD F. ZIMMER, JR. (SBN 112279)
fzimmer@kslaw.com
17 CHERYL A. SABNIS (SBN 224323)
csabnis@kslaw.com
18 KING & SPALDING LLP
101 Second Street – Suite 2300
19 San Francisco, CA 94105
Telephone: (415) 318-1200
20 Facsimile: (415) 318-1300

21 IAN C. BALLON (SBN 141819)
ballon@gtlaw.com
22 HEATHER MEEKER (SBN 172148)
meekerh@gtlaw.com
23 GREENBERG TRAUIG, LLP
1900 University Avenue
24 East Palo Alto, CA 94303
Telephone: (650) 328-8500
25 Facsimile: (650) 328-8508

26
27 *Attorneys for Defendant*
28 GOOGLE INC.