

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

POWER INTEGRATIONS, INC., a Delaware corporation,

No. C 09-5235 MMC

Plaintiff,

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR FINDING OF UNENFORCEABILITY DUE TO INEQUITABLE CONDUCT

v.

FAIRCHILD SEMICONDUCTOR INTERNATIONAL, INC., a Delaware Corporation, FAIRCHILD SEMICONDUCTOR CORPORATION, a Delaware Corporation, and FAIRCHILD (TAIWAN) CORPORATION, a Taiwanese corporation,

Defendants.

Before the Court is the “Motion for a Finding that U.S. Patent No. 6,538,908 is Unenforceable Due to Power Integrations’ Inequitable Conduct,” filed May 9, 2014, by defendant Fairchild Semiconductor International, Inc., Fairchild Semiconductor Corporation, and Fairchild (Taiwan) Corporation (collectively “Fairchild”). On January 26, 2015, the Court conducted a bench trial on the matter, Blair M. Jacobs, Leigh J. Martinson, and Christina A. Ondrick of McDermott Will & Emery LLP appearing on behalf of Fairchild and Howard G. Pollack and Michael R. Headley of Fish & Richardson P.C. appearing on behalf of Power Integrations. That same date, after the close of evidence, the Court stated on the record its findings of fact and conclusions of law.

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

For the reasons stated on the record, the Court finds Fairchild has failed to show the patent is unenforceable due to inequitable conduct, and accordingly, Fairchild's motion is hereby DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 26, 2015


MAXINE M. CHESNEY
United States District Judge