

United States District Court,
C.D. California.

HON HAI PRECISION INDUSTRY CO., LTD., a Taiwanese Corporation,
Plaintiff.

v.

PSC COMPUTER PRODUCTS, INC., a California Corporation,
Defendant.

Hon Hai Precision Industry Co., Ltd., a Taiwanese Corporation,
Plaintiff.

v.

Asia Vital Components Co., Ltd., a Taiwanese Corporation; and Thermo-Link Technology, Inc., a California Corporation,
Defendants.

Nos. CV 03-0093-SVW (Mcx), CV 03-0094-SVW (Mcx)

July 21, 2003.

David E. Reynolds, James C. Tran, Kenneth D. Watnick, Lewis Brisbois Bisgaard and Smith, Los Angeles, CA, for Plaintiff.

Christina S. Loza, Loza and Loza, Long Beach, CA, Paul Adams, Peacock Myers & Adams, San Diego, CA, Ryan Ken Yagura, O'Melveny & Myers, Los Angeles, CA, William J. O'Brien, Alschuler Grossman Stein and Kahan, Santa Monica, CA, for Defendants.

TENTATIVE ORDER RE: CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.

STEPHEN V. WILSON, District Judge.

I. INTRODUCTION

Plaintiff Hon Hai Precision Industry Co. Ltd. ("Plaintiff" or "Hon Hai") brings suit against Defendants Asia Vital Components Co. Ltd. ("AVC"), Thermal-Link Technology, Inc. ("Thermal-Link") and PSC Computer Products, Inc. ("PSC") (collectively, "Defendants") for infringement of one or more claims of Plaintiff's patent, U.S. Patent No. 6,049,458 (the "'458 Patent'").

Pursuant to a claim construction schedule set by the Court at the March 24, 2003 status conference and in the Court's April 1, 2003 Order, the parties submitted a Joint Claim Construction Statement ("Joint Statement"), FN1 and each party thereafter filed a Reply to the Joint Statement in support of its proposed construction of each patent claim at issue and in opposition to the constructions proffered by the opposing party. In these papers, the parties identified four disputed limitations.

FN1. In the Joint Statement, Hon Hai merely stated that the claim language "is clear and that the claim terms can be understood by their ordinary and customary meaning. Accordingly, Hon Hai does not propose that the Court construe any *specific* claim terms." (Joint Statement at 2 (emphasis in original).) Defendants take issue with this because in Hon Hai's Reply, Hon Hai proceeded to not only discuss Defendants' proposals, but also provided the Court with its own suggestions.

While Defendants have not had an opportunity to address Plaintiff's arguments, Plaintiff's proposals merely track the ordinary meaning of the claim terms. Thus, Defendants will not be disadvantaged by Plaintiff's alleged maneuvering. Furthermore, Defendants will have a full opportunity to argue their proposed claim construction at the Markman hearing scheduled for July 28, 2003.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE PATENT-IN-SUIT

As Plaintiff explains, the '458 Patent "is directed to a heat sink assembly for dissipating heat from computer devices. The claimed heat sink assembly in one embodiment includes a heat sink, thermal grease applied to the bottom face of the heat sink, and a protective cap that shields the thermal grease so that it does not smear onto other objects and so that it does not become contaminated by foreign materials." (Pl.'s Reply at 2.)

A CPU generates high amounts of heat that must be efficiently removed so as to avoid overheating and causing damage to the microscopic components that make up the computer unit. (*Id.* at 4.) In the field of computer technology, a heat sink is attached to the CPU to provide the surface area needed to remove heat from the computer unit. (*Id.*) The heat is transferred from the CPU to the heat sink where the heat is quickly dissipated. (*Id.*)

Thermal grease is often used as part of the design to (1) reduce the imperfections between the surfaces of the CPU and the heat sink, and (2) improve heat flow. Thermal grease is often spread on the surface of the heat sink before attaching it to the computer unit. (*Id.* at 4.) The thermal grease, however, can smear onto and contaminate other objects, and the thermal grease itself can be contaminated by dust or other foreign material. (*Id.* at 4-5.)

The '458 Patent is intended to eliminate these problems. The protective cap shelters the thermal grease to avoid contamination when the heat sink assembly is moved or manipulated. (*Id.* at 5.) The protective cap can be removed prior to attaching (i.e., "coupling") the heat sink to the computer unit. (*Id.* at 5.)

The '458 Patent reads as follows (disputed terms underlined and bolded):

(1) A heat sink for dissipating heat generated by a CPU, comprising:

a metallic flat base having a bottom face for contacting the CPU;

a number of metallic *fins* projecting from the base away from the bottom face;

thermal grease spread on the bottom face;

a *protective cap having a periphery removably attached* to the bottom face of the heat sink *around the thermal grease*, and a middle protrusion defining a cavity receiving the thermal grease therein, said protrusion enclosing the thermal grease whereby the thermal grease will not be contaminated by dust or

foreign particles and will not contaminate surrounding articles when the heat sink is transported or handled.

(2) The heat sink in accordance with claim 1, wherein the thermal grease is uniformly spread on the bottom face of the heat sink by a printing process.

(3) The heat sink in accordance with claim 2, wherein the thermal grease is spread on the bottom face of the heat sink by a screen printing process.

(4) The heat sink in accordance with claim 1, wherein both the thermal grease and the protective cap have a rectangular shape.

(5) The heat sink in accordance with claim 4, wherein the protrusion of the cap has a side wall connecting with the flange, and a cover connecting with the side wall.

(6) The heat sink in accordance with claim 1, wherein the protective cap has an *ear integrally formed with the flange* and extending beyond an edge of the bottom face of the base of the heat sink.

(7) The heat sink in accordance with claim 4, wherein the protective cap has an *ear integrally formed with the flange and extending beyond an edge of the bottom face of the base of the heat sink*.

(8) The heat sink in accordance with claim 1, wherein the flange is attached to the bottom face of the base by an adhesive.

(9) The heat sink in accordance with claim 1, wherein the protective cap is made by pressing a plastic sheet.

(10) A heat sink for dissipating heat generated by a CPU, comprising:

a base having a bottom face for contacting with

the CPU; thermal grease applied on the bottom face; and a *protective cap attachably positioned on the*

bottom face and *enclosing the thermal grease* thereby protecting the thermal grease from contamination.

(11) A protective cap for use with a heat sink, comprising a flange and a cover connected by a side wall to commonly define a rectangular shape thereof, and an *ear integrally formed with the flange* wherein said side wall and the cover commonly define a protrusion and corresponding cavity therein to protectively cover thermal grease applied to a base of said heat sink.

III. LEGAL STANDARD

Interpretation of patent claims is a matter of law reserved for the court. *See* Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc., 517 U.S. 370, 372, 116 S.Ct. 1384, 1387 (1996). Claims are to be construed to determine how one with ordinary skill in the relevant art would understand them in the context of the patent. *See, e.g.,* Multiform Dessicants, Inc. v. Madzam, Ltd., 133 F.3d 1473, 1477 (Fed.Cir.1998). "It is well-settled that, in interpreting an asserted claim, the court should look first to the intrinsic evidence of record, i.e., the patent itself, including the claims, the specification, and, if in evidence, the prosecution history." Vitronics Corp. v. Conceptronic, Inc., 90 F.3d 1576, 1582 (Fed.Cir.1996); *see also* Gart v. Logitech, Inc., 254 F.3d 1334, 1339

(Fed.Cir.2001). "In most situations, an analysis of the intrinsic evidence alone will resolve any ambiguity in a disputed claim term. In such situations, it is improper to rely on extrinsic evidence." *Id.* at 1583.

Furthermore, in examining the intrinsic evidence, the Court engages in a "heavy presumption" that claim terms carry their customary meaning as viewed by one of ordinary skill in the art. *CCS Fitness Inc. v. Brunswick Corp.*, 288 F.3d 1359, 1366 (Fed.Cir.2001). Only if ambiguity remains will the Court look to "extrinsic evidence," such as expert testimony. *Id.* at 1583. While technically "extrinsic," "dictionaries, encyclopedias and treatises are particularly useful resources to assist the court in determining the ordinary and customary meaning of claim terms." *Tex. Digital Sys. v. Telegenix, Inc.*, 308 F.3d 1193, 1202 (Fed.Cir.2002).

Limitations from specifications not read into claims—even if only one embodiment described in the specification—do not signify that the claim(s) should be limited to that specification.

IV. DISCUSSION

The '548 Patent consists of three independent claims—Claims 1, 10 and 11—and eight dependent claims—Claims 2 through 9 (which depend from Claim 1). Thus, as Defendants explain, if Claim 1 is not infringed, Claims 2 through 9 are not infringed. And if Claims 1, 10 and 11 are not infringed, none of the claims are infringed.

There are four limitations that the parties argue need to be construed by the Court, and the Court will address each in turn. FN2

FN2. Plaintiff does not believe any of the claims need to be construed—rather, Plaintiff contends that the claims should be given their ordinary meaning.

All three Defendants ask the Court to construe the limitation "protective cap" in Claims 1 and 10. Defendants AVC and Thermal-Link alone ask the Court to construe the other limitations discussed below, namely "ear," "enclosing thermal grease," and "fins."

A. "Protective Cap ..." (Claims 1 and 10)

Claim 1 of the '458 Patent reads in relevant part: "[A] protective cap having a periphery removably attached to the bottom face of the heat sink." And Claim 10 states in relevant part: "[A] protective cap attachably positioned on the bottom face."

1. "Protective Cap"

AVC and Thermal-Link ask the Court to construe the term "protective cap" as follows: "a structure that is open on one side and that covers some or all of the bottom face of the heat sink, but does not completely surround the heat sink." (Joint Statement at 4.)

Furthermore, Defendant PSC suggests the following construction for "protective cap": "[a] structure ... that is open on one side, covers a portion of the bottom face of the base and heat sink on which the grease is applied." (Joint Statement at 41.)

As Plaintiff explains, however, the ordinary meaning of the term "cap" needs no clarification. In *The American Heritage College Dictionary*, "cap" is defined as "[a] protective cover or seal, esp. one that closes

off an end or a tip." *American Heritage College Dictionary* at 207. Furthermore, in the *Webster's Third New International Dictionary*, "cap" is defined as, *inter alia*, "something that serves as a cover or protection esp. for a tip, knob, or end[;] something designed to cover and to protect, preserve, or close (as over a camera lens, fountain pen, automobile hub, or narrow-mouthed bottle)[.]" *Webster's Third New International Dictionary* at 330.

Defendants PSC and Thermal-Link argue that "cap" as used in the '548 Patent should not be given its ordinary meaning because "the drawings clearly show" that the cap sits on top of the base and does not cover it entirely. (Joint Statement at 42-43.) However, the drawings merely illustrate the preferred embodiment of the '458 Patent.

As the Federal Circuit teaches, "the analytical focus must begin and remain centered on the language of the claims themselves." *Texas Digital*, 308 F.3d at 1201. "In the absence of an express intent to impart a novel meaning to claim terms, an inventor's claim terms take on their ordinary meaning. [Citation.] We indulge a 'heavy presumption' that a claim term carries its ordinary and customary meaning." *Teleflex, Inc. v. Ficoso North America Corp.*, 299 F.3d 1313, 1325 (Fed.Cir.2002).

Among the intrinsic evidence the Court can use, "the specification is always highly relevant to the claim construction analysis. Usually it is dispositive; it is the single best guide to the meaning of a disputed term." *Vitronics*, 90 F.3d at 1582. The Court cannot "limit[] the claimed invention to preferred embodiments or specific examples in the specification." *Texas Instruments, Inc. v. United States Int'l Trade Comm'n*, 805 F.2d 1558, 1563 (Fed.Cir.1986). Thus, while the claims must be read in light of the specification, "limitations from the specification are not to be read in to the claims." *Teleflex*, 299 F.3d at 1325.

Here, the limitation, "protective cap," should be given its ordinary meaning, particularly in light of the specification, which states: "A protective cap is removably attached to the bottom face to enclose the thermal grease so that during transportation or handling of the heat sink, the grease will not contaminate surrounding articles or be contaminated by dust or foreign particles ." There is nothing in the claim language or in the specification that calls for Defendants' construction(s), and there is no reason why "protective cap" should not be given its ordinary meaning.

The Court therefore will not construe the term beyond its ordinary meaning.

2. "Periphery Removably Attached" (Claim 1) and "Attachably Positioned" (Claim 10)

AVC and Thermal-Link suggest that in Claim 1, "removably attached" should be construed as follows: "[t]he outer perimeter of the cap is fastened to the bottom surface of the base in such a manner that the cap can be detached from the surface[.]" and in Claim 10, "attachably positioned on" should be construed as "[t]he cap is fastened to the bottom surface of the base." (Joint Statement at 4.)

PSC, on the other hand, argues that "removably attached" in Claim 1 should be construed as: "a flange directly adhered to the bottom face of the heat sink base in a manner that allows the cap to be detached from the bottom face." (Joint Statement at 41.) And in Claim 10, PSC suggests that "attachably positioned" should mean: "directly adhered to the bottom face of the heat sink." (*Id.*)

Again, the Court should look first to the language of the claim itself to determine the meaning of the terms. *See Vitronics*, 90 F.3d at 1582. Thus, the Court should construe these limitations in light of their ordinary

meanings. There is no reason to limit the claim so that the protective cap must be "fastened" to the heat sink (as AVC and Thermal-Link argue), or so that the protective cap must be "directly adhered" to the bottom of the heat sink (as PCS suggests).

Rather, the Court agrees with Plaintiff that "periphery removably attached to the bottom face of the heat sink" should be construed in accordance with its ordinary meaning as follows: "periphery that is attached to the bottom face of the heat sink in such a way that it can be removed." This construction is in line with the specification.

Furthermore, in accordance with the ordinary meaning (which controls because there is no indication the inventor intended anything other than the ordinary meaning), "attachably positioned on the bottom face" should be construed as "attached to the bottom face." FN3

FN3. Even though the specification suggests using an adhesive to attach the heat sink to the CPU, the Court should not limit the claims in light of the specification. *See Teleflex*, 299 F.3d at 1325. While the heat sink can be attached using an adhesive, there are other ways in which the heat sink can be attached, all of which would be covered by the '548 Patent.

B. "Ear Integrally Formed with the Flange" (Claims 6, 7 and 11)

Claims 6, 7 and 11 of the '548 Patent state: "an ear integrally formed with the flange."

AVC and Thermal-Link construe "ear" as "a tab of material that extends from and is substantially narrower in width than the adjoining edge of the protective cap's flange." (Joint Statements at 5.) AVC and Thermal-Link argue that just as a human ear is narrower than a person's head, the "tab is narrower relative to the adjoining side of the flange." (*Id.*)

However, as Plaintiff explains, "ear" should be construed in accordance with its ordinary meaning. "[D]ictionaries, encyclopedias and treatises are particularly useful resources to assist the court in determining the ordinary and customary meaning of claim terms." *Tex. Digital Sys. v. Telegenix, Inc.*, 308 F.3d 1193, 1202 (Fed.Cir.2002).

"Ear" is defined in the *American Heritage College Dictionary* as, *inter alia*, "a projecting handle, as on a vase ." *American Heritage College Dictionary* at 430. Similarly, in the *Webster's Third New International Dictionary*, an "ear" is defined as "something resembling in shape or position a mammalian ear[, such as] a projecting part (as a lug, plate, or handle) or either of a pair of such parts that is suitable for lifting, transporting, adjusting or fixing in position the object of which it is a part (as the handle of a pitcher or platter ...)[" *Id.* at 713. Moreover, in the same dictionary, "handle" is defined as "a part that is designed especially to be grasped by the hand (as for lifting or steering [.])" *Id.* at 1027.

While there is no reason the Court should construe "ear" beyond its ordinary meaning, "integrally formed with the flange" needs further clarification. AVC and Thermal-Link construe "integrally formed with" to mean that "the ear must extend from the edge of the flange in a continuous, co-planar manner." (Joint Statement at 5.) There is no limitation within the claim language or specification, however, that calls for a construction that requires the ear to be on the same plane as the flange.

Furthermore, "integral" is defined in the *Webster's Third New International Dictionary* as "organically joined or linked[;] ... formed as a unit with another part[;] ... composed of constituent parts making a whole[.]" *Webster's Third New International Dictionary* at 1173. Furthermore, "join" is defined as "to put or bring together and fasten, connect, or relate so as to form a single unit, a whole, or a continuity[.]" *Id.* at 1218. There is nothing in the definition that requires the objects that are "integrally formed" to be on the same level/plane. Nor does the specification call for such a construction.

The specification explains that "a user can conveniently grip the ear to peel the protective cap away from the heat sink." This explanation is in line with the dictionary definition of "ear," which explains that an "ear" is akin to a handle. *See id.* at 713. In the interest of clarity, the Court will thus include this explanation in the claim construction because (1) it may assist the jurors in understanding what the "ear" is, and (2) it does not limit the claim in any way, but rather clarifies the ordinary meaning of the term in light of the specification.

Therefore, the Court construes the limitation as follows: "an ear connected to the flange such that they form a single unit, which a user can grip to peel the protective cap away from the heat sink."

C. "Enclosing Thermal Grease" (Claims 1 and 10)

Claim 1 states in relevant part: "said protrusion enclosing the thermal grease whereby the thermal grease will not be contaminated by dust or foreign particles and will not contaminate surrounding articles when the heat sink is transported or handled." And in Claim 10, "enclosing thermal grease" is stated in the following limitation: "enclosing the thermal grease thereby protecting the thermal grease from contamination."

AVC and Thermal-Link construe "enclosing thermal grease" to mean that "the protective cap covers the thermal grease in a manner that prevents the thermal grease layer from being contacted by other substances and prevents thermal grease particles from coming into contact with surfaces other than the bottom face of the base when the heat sink is moved or manipulated (as Claim 1 requires) or in a manner that prevents the thermal grease layer from being contacted by other substances (as Claim 10 requires)." s. Joint Statement at 6.)

AVC and Thermal-Link point out that this construction supports the specification and prosecution history. While the proposed construction is consistent with the prosecution history and specification, there is no need to add this information to the claim.

The Court declines to construe this limitation beyond its ordinary meaning.

D. "Fins" (Claim 1)

Claim 1 reads in pertinent part: "a number of metallic fins projecting from the base away from the bottom face."

AVC and Thermal-Link construe this term to mean "that two or more thin, flat blades substantially consisting of metal extend perpendicularly from the bottom face of the base." (Joint Statement at 6.)

As AVC and Thermal-Link point out, the *Oxford English Dictionary* provides a definition for "fin" that is specific to the context of heat sinks: a "flattened projection for increasing heat transfer from an object." *The Concise Oxford English Dictionary* at 530.

There is no reason, however, that "away from" should be construed to mean "perpendicularly" (as AVC and Thermal-Link suggest). According to the *Webster's Third New International Dictionary*, "away" is defined as "in another direction; especially] [] in the opposite direction." *Webster's Third New International Dictionary* at 152 (emphasis omitted). The Court should not construe "away" beyond its ordinary meaning.

Furthermore, it is not necessary to narrow the limitation such that a "fin" must be a "thin, flat blade." While a "fin" certainly can be a "thin, flat blade," there is no reason to limit the definition in such a way. To do so, as Plaintiff points out, would limit the claim so as to exclude the preferred embodiment (which depicts the "fins" as rectangular in shape).

"Fins" should thus be construed in accordance with its customary meaning (with regard to heat sinks) as "flattened projections used to increase heat transfer from an object."

V. CONCLUSION

Accordingly, the Court construes the disputed claims as follows:

A. "**Protective cap**"=(ordinary meaning)

1. "**Periphery removably attached to the bottom face of the heat sink**"=" periphery that is attached to the bottom face of the heat sink in such a way that it can be removed"

2. "**Attachably positioned on the bottom face**"="attached to the bottom face"

B. "**Ear integrally formed with the flange**"="ear that is connected to the flange such that they form a single unit, which a user can grip to peel the protective cap away from the heat sink."

C. "**Enclosing thermal grease**"=(ordinary meaning)

D. "**Fins**"="flattened projections used to increase heat transfer from an object"

The parties are to argue in accordance with this Tentative Order at the Markman hearing, which will be held on July 28, 2003 at 1:30 p.m.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

C.D.Cal.,2003.

Hon Hai Precision Industry Co., Ltd. v. PSC Computer Products, Inc.

Produced by Sans Paper, LLC.