IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
AUSTIN DIVISION

NETWORK SYSTEM TECHNOLOGIES, LLC,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	Civil Action No. 1:22-CV-01331-DAE
v.	)	
	)	**JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**
QUALCOMM INCORPORATED;	)	
QUALCOMM TECHNOLOGIES, INC.;	)	
ARTERIS, INC.,	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	
	)	
	)	

PLAINTIFF NETWORK SYSTEM TECHNOLOGIES, LLC'S RESPONSES TO QUALCOMM'S FIRST SET OF REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION (NOS. 1-9)

Pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 26 and 36, Plaintiff Network System Technologies, LLC ("NST" or "Plaintiff"), by and through its undersigned counsel, hereby responds to the First Set of Requests for Admission from Qualcomm Incorporated and Qualcomm Technologies, Inc. ("Qualcomm" or "Defendants") as follows:

GENERAL OBJECTIONS

NST objects to each Request on the following grounds, each of which is hereby incorporated by reference into NST's individual responses as if fully stated therein.

1. These responses are made solely for this action. Each and every response herein is subject to all objections as to relevance, materiality, and admissibility, and any and all other objections and grounds that would require the exclusion of any statement made herein if such statement were made by a witness present and testifying in court, all of which objections and grounds are hereby reserved and may be interposed at the time of trial.

2. No incidental or implied admissions are intended by the responses herein. The fact that NST responds to or objects to any Request should not be taken as an admission that NST accepts or admits the existence of any facts assumed by such Request, or that such response or objection constitutes admissible evidence as to any such assumed facts. The fact that NST responds to part or all of any Request is not intended to be, and shall not be construed as, a waiver by NST of any part of any objection to any request.

3. NST objects to each Request on the grounds and to the extent that it seeks to impose obligations or requires information beyond the requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or the Local Rules of the Western District of Texas.

4. NST objects to each Request on the grounds and to the extent that it requests information or documents prepared or procured in anticipation of litigation, or protected by the attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine, or any other privilege or immunity.

5. NST objects to each Request on the grounds and to the extent that it is undefined, vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and/or unduly burdensome.

6. NST objects to each Request on the grounds and to the extent that it requests the disclosure of information not relevant to the claims or defenses of any party and/or is not proportional to the needs of the case.

7. NST's investigation of the factual issues raised by this litigation is continuing and has not yet been completed. NST's responses herein are based upon and reflect the current state of its knowledge and are made without prejudice to NST's right to utilize subsequently discovered facts. As such, NST reserves the right to supplement its responses to the following requests.

REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 1:

Admit that "*An efficient on-chip network interface offering guaranteed services, shared-memory abstraction, and flexible network configuration*" by Radulescu et al. was publicly available on or before the end of February 2004 as indicated by the Goossens Publication Website.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 1:

NST objects to this Request on the basis that the undefined term "publicly available" is vague and ambiguous. NST further objects that the Request lacks foundation and that the referenced document speaks for itself. NST also objects to the extent that the Request seeks a conclusion of law and is therefore not improper under Fed. R. Civ. P. 36. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, NST responds as follows:

NST admits that "*An efficient on-chip network interface offering guaranteed services, shared-memory abstraction, and flexible network configuration*" by Radulescu et al. was publicly available as of the end of February 2004. NST denies that "*An efficient on-chip network interface offering guaranteed services, shared-memory abstraction, and flexible network configuration*" by Radulescu et al. was publicly available before the end of February 2004.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 2:

Admit that "*Concepts and Implementation of the Philips Network-on-Chip*" by Dielissen et al. was publicly available on or before the end of November 2003 as indicated by the Goossens Publication Website.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 2:

NST objects to this Request on the basis that the undefined term "publicly available" is vague and ambiguous. NST further objects that the Request lacks foundation and that the referenced document speaks for itself. NST also objects to the extent that the Request seeks a

conclusion of law and is therefore not improper under Fed. R. Civ. P. 36. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, NST responds as follows:

NST lacks sufficient information or knowledge to admit or deny this Request. Further responding, NST admits that "*Concepts and Implementation of the Philips Network-on-Chip*" by Dielissen et al. was presented only to conference attendees at IP-Based SOC Design in November 2003.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 3:

Admit that "*Trade-offs in the design of a router with both guaranteed and best-effort services for networks on chip*" by Rijpkema et al. was publicly available on or before the end of March 2003 as indicated by the Goossens Publication Website.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 3:

NST objects to this Request on the basis that the undefined term "publicly available" is vague and ambiguous. NST further objects that the Request lacks foundation and that the referenced document speaks for itself. NST also objects to the extent that the Request seeks a conclusion of law and is therefore not improper under Fed. R. Civ. P. 36. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, NST responds as follows:

NST admits that "*Trade-offs in the design of a router with both guaranteed and best-effort services for networks on chip*" by Rijpkema et al. was publicly available as of the end of March 2003. NST denies that "*Trade-offs in the design of a router with both guaranteed and best-effort services for networks on chip*" by Rijpkema et al. was publicly available before the end of March 2003.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 4:

Admit that "*Guaranteeing the Quality of Services in Networks on Chip*" by Goossens, et al. was publicly available on or before the end of September 2003 as indicated by the Goossens Publication Website.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 4:

NST objects to this Request on the basis that the undefined term "publicly available" is vague and ambiguous. NST further objects that the Request lacks foundation and that the referenced document speaks for itself. NST also objects to the extent that the Request seeks a conclusion of law and is therefore not improper under Fed. R. Civ. P. 36. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, NST responds as follows:

NST admits that "*Guaranteeing the Quality of Services in Networks on Chip*" by Goossens, et al. was publicly available on or before the end of September 2003.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 5:

Admit that "*Networks on Chip*" edited by Axel Jantsch and Hannu Tenhunen was publicly available on or before January 31, 2003.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 5:

NST objects to this Request on the basis that the undefined term "publicly available" is vague and ambiguous. NST further objects that the Request lacks foundation and that the referenced document speaks for itself. NST also objects to the extent that the Request seeks a conclusion of law and is therefore not improper under Fed. R. Civ. P. 36. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, NST responds as follows:

NST admits that "*Networks on Chip*" edited by Axel Jantsch and Hannu Tenhunen was publicly available as of January 31, 2003. NST denies that "*Networks on Chip*" edited by Axel Jantsch and Hannu Tenhunen was publicly available before January 31, 2003.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 6:

Admit that "*Communication Services for Networks on Chip*" by Radulescu et al. was presented at the 2002 Samos Conference.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 6:

NST objects to this Request on the basis that the undefined term "publicly available" is vague and ambiguous. NST further objects that the Request lacks foundation and that the referenced document speaks for itself. NST also objects to the extent that the Request seeks a conclusion of law and is therefore not improper under Fed. R. Civ. P. 36. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, NST responds as follows:

Deny.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 7:

Admit that "*Communication Services for Networks on Chip*" by Radulescu et al. was submitted to the 2002 Samos Conference.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 7:

NST objects to this Request on the basis that the undefined term "publicly available" is vague and ambiguous. NST further objects that the Request lacks foundation and that the referenced document speaks for itself. NST also objects to the extent that the Request seeks a conclusion of law and is therefore not improper under Fed. R. Civ. P. 36. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, NST responds as follows:

Deny.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 8:

Admit that "*Communication Services for Networks on Chip*" by Radulescu et al. was published on or before March 1, 2004.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 8:

NST objects to this Request on the basis that the undefined term "publicly available" is vague and ambiguous. NST further objects that the Request lacks foundation and that the referenced document speaks for itself. NST also objects to the extent that the Request seeks a conclusion of law and is therefore not improper under Fed. R. Civ. P. 36. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, NST responds as follows:

NST admits that "*Communication Services for Networks on Chip*" by Radulescu et al. was published on or before March 1, 2004.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 9:

Admit that the paper entitled "*An efficient on-chip network interface offering guaranteed services, shared-memory abstraction, and flexible network configuration*" by Radulescu et al. was provided to attendees at the February 16-20, 2004 DATE conference in Paris, France.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 9:

NST objects to this Request on the basis that the undefined term "publicly available" and the term "DATE" are vague and ambiguous. NST further objects that the Request lacks foundation and that the referenced document speaks for itself. NST also objects to the extent that the Request seeks a conclusion of law and is therefore not improper under Fed. R. Civ. P. 36. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, NST responds as follows:

NST admits that the paper entitled "*An efficient on-chip network interface offering guaranteed services, shared-memory abstraction, and flexible network configuration*" by Radulescu et al. was provided to attendees at the February 16-20, 2004 conference in Paris, France.

Date: November 9, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ William E. Davis, III

William E. Davis, III
DAVIS FIRM PC
213 N. Fredonia Street, Suite 230
Longview, TX 75601
(903) 235-2588
bdavis@davisfirm.com

Daniel S. Stringfield
Peter Krusiewicz
Allison E. Strong
NIXON PEABODY LLP
70 West Madison St., Suite 5200
Chicago, IL 60602
(312) 977-4130
dstringfield@nixonpeabody.com
pkrusiewicz@nixonpeabody.com
astrong@nixonpeabody.com

Erica J. Van Loon
Vincent Capati
NIXON PEABODY LLP
300 S. Grand Avenue, Suite 4100
Los Angeles, CA 90071
(213) 629-6000
evanloon@nixonpeabody.com
vcapati@nixonpeabody.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Network System Technologies, LLC

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that the foregoing document was served via electronic mail on November 9, 2023 to all opposing counsel of record.

Dated: November 9, 2023

By: */s/ William E. Davis, III*
William E. Davis, III