

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ENPLAS DISPLAY DEVICE
CORPORATION,

Plaintiff,

v.

SEOUL SEMICONDUCTOR
COMPANY, LTD.,

Defendant.

Case No. 13-cv-05038 NC

AMENDED JUDGMENT

In accordance with the Court's order granting Enplas Display Device Corporation's motion for summary judgment of non-infringement, dkt. no. 244, for (A) infringement allegations concerning claims 1-19, 21-22 of the '209 patent; (B) claims 4-5, 7-29, 32, 38-48 of the '554 patent; (C) all claims of direct infringement under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a); (D) all claims that EDD lens #9827 infringes the patents in suit and lens #4922 infringes the '554 patent; and (E) infringement under 35 U.S.C. § 271(c), judgment is entered in favor of Enplas Display Device Corporation ("EDD") and against Seoul Semiconductor Company, Limited ("SSC") with respect to those claims.

In accordance with the Court's order granting SSC's motion for summary judgment, dkt. no. 321, that the '209 patent is not invalid as anticipated, judgment is entered in favor of SSC and against EDD with respect to that claim.

On March 24, 2016, the jury returned a verdict finding (1) EDD induced
Case No. 13-cv-05038 NC


1 infringement of claims 1, 6, 33, 34, and 35 of the '554 patent; (2) EDD's infringement of
2 these claims met the subjective prong of the willfulness test; (3) claims 1, 6, 30, 31, 33-39,
3 41-43, and 45-48 of the '554 patent were not invalid; (4) SSC is entitled to a one-time
4 freedom to operate payment of \$4,000,000 for all products for the lifetime of the '554
5 patent; (5) EDD induced infringement of claim 20 of the '209 patent; (6) EDD's
6 infringement of this claim met the subjective prong of the willfulness test; (7) claim 20 of
7 the '209 patent was not invalid; and (8) SSC is entitled to a one-time freedom to operate
8 payment of \$70,000 for all products for the lifetime of the '209 patent. Dkt. No. 447. In
9 accordance with the verdict, judgment is entered in favor of SSC and against EDD with
10 respect the those claims in the amount of \$4,070,000 in damages.

11 In accordance with the Court's April 8, 2016, order granting of a directed verdict
12 for SSC on EDD's inequitable conduct defense for the '209 patent, judgment is entered in
13 favor of SSC and against EDD with respect to that defense.

14 In accordance with the Court's August 10, 2016, order finding EDD willfully
15 infringed the '209 and '554 patents, judgment is entered in favor of SSC and against EDD.

16
17 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

18
19 Dated: August 10, 2016

20 
21 NATHANAEL M. COUSINS
22 United States Magistrate Judge
23
24
25
26
27
28