

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
WACO DIVISION**

REED SEMICONDUCTOR CORP., Plaintiff. v. MONOLITHIC POWER SYSTEMS INC., Defendant.	Case No. 6:25-cv-00449-ADA-DNM
---	--------------------------------

PLAINTIFF’S PRELIMINARY INVALIDITY CONTENTIONS

Pursuant to the Court’s Order Governing Proceedings (OGP) 4.4–Patent Cases (January 23, 2024) (“Order Governing Proceedings” or “OGP(s)”), Plaintiff Reed Semiconductor Corp (“Plaintiff” or “Reed”) hereby makes the following disclosure of asserted claims, preliminary infringement contentions, and associated document production to Defendant Monolithic Power Systems Inc. (“Defendant” or “MPS”).

Reed makes this disclosure based on the information presently available to it. Discovery in this case has not started, and Reed reserves its right to amend and/or supplement these disclosures as permitted by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the local rules of the Western District of Texas, and/or by Order of the Court, including as provided in the Order Governing Proceedings.

I. IDENTIFICATION OF ASSERTED CLAIMS AND ACCUSED INSTRUMENTALITIES

MPS directly and indirectly infringes at least claims 1, 2, 7, 8, and 9 (“Asserted Claims”) of U.S. Patent No. 7,960,955 (“955 Patent” or “patent-in-suit”) through making, using, offering

for sale, and selling in the United States, and/or importing into the United States, power management products that include a linear regulator used to stabilize an input voltage based on a reference voltage (“MPS Accused Products”), and inducing others to do the same, including MPS’s downstream distributors and customers. In addition to the power management products themselves, the MPS Accused Products include evaluation boards that have MPS power management products implemented on a systems-level board in combination with other necessary electronic components that MPS makes, uses, offers for sale and sells in the United States, and/or imports into the United States, for use in evaluation of MPS’s step-down converter products, including as part of the design-in process.

Without limitation, the MPS Accused Products include MPS’s NB680, NB680A, NB670, MP2225, MP2229, MP2317, MP2329, MP2384, MP2497, MP2905, MP2918, MP4420, MP4420A, MP4420H, MP4423, MP4473, MP8606, MP8756, MP8758, MP8758H, MP8770, MP8770C, MP8774, MP8795, MP8795H, MP9447, MP9473, MP9942, MP9942A, MP29296, MP38891, MPQ4420A, MPQ4470, MPQ4470A, MPQ4473, MPQ8623, MPQ8626, MPQ8632, MPQ8633A, MPQ8633B, MPQ8634A, MPQ8634B, MPQ8636, MPQ8645P, MPQ8655, MPM3690, MPM3810, MPM3814, MPM3860, MPM3864 products, and all other MPS power management products that constitute or include a linear regulator used to stabilize an input voltage based on a reference voltage, as well as any MPS products, including future products, that operate in the same manner as stated above or are structurally the same as the products listed above.

As shown in the attached chart, MPS’s NB680 product infringes at least the Asserted Claims, literally and under the doctrine of equivalents. In addition, on information and belief, the NB680’s operation and structure are representative of the other MPS Accused Products identified above, at least as it relates to the requirements of the Asserted Claims, and therefore, such other

MPS Accused Products infringe for substantially the same reasons.

Reed identifies the Accused Products and Asserted Claims based on its preliminary understanding of information currently available to it. This preliminary understanding is obtained through Reed's investigation of MPS's products to date, including through Reed's analysis of information MPS has published on its website or elsewhere, and public information regarding certain structures that MPS represents that its products have and/or functions that MPS represents that its products support. Additional information relating to the design, structure, and operation of the MPS Accused Products is uniquely in MPS's possession, custody, and control. Reed reserves the right to supplement its infringement contentions as discovery proceeds and MPS produces documents or other evidence, as required under the Court's rules or responsive to discovery requests. Reed may identify additional accused products which infringe one or more claims of the patent-in-suit. Additionally, Reed reserves the right to supplement its identification of infringed claims, including by identifying additional claims infringed by one or more MPS Accused Product, as discovery proceeds.

Pursuant to the Order Governing Proceedings, Reed provides the attached claim chart (Appendix A) illustrating how the representative NB680 product infringes the Asserted Claims of the '955 Patent.

Based on its current understanding of the accused instrumentalities, Reed presently contends that the MPS Accused Products and/or the users of those MPS Accused Products literally infringe at least the above-identified Asserted Claims of the patents-in-suit. Further, to the extent that MPS contends that a limitation of the Asserted Claims is not literally met by the MPS Accused Products, or to the extent that the difference between any component or functionality of a MPS Accused Products is insubstantial, Reed contends that the MPS Accused Products and/or the users

of those MPS Accused Products infringe at least above-identified Asserted Claims under the Doctrine of Equivalents. To the extent that literal infringement is purportedly absent, the MPS Accused Products identified above (and MPS products that operate in a similar manner to them) perform substantially the same function of the invention recited in the claims in substantially the same way to achieve substantially the same result. Additional information relating to the Doctrine of Equivalents is provided in the attached claim chart (Appendix A).

Further, Reed reserves the right to amend its allegations to change or add allegations regarding infringement of the MPS Accused Products under the Doctrine of Equivalents in response to discovery, MPS's claim construction, invalidity, and/or non-infringement positions, if any, the Court's claim construction rulings, and/or rulings by other courts in related cases or in proceedings before the U.S. Patent & Trademark Office ("USPTO") regarding the patent-in-suit or related patents.

Plaintiff further asserts that MPS has indirectly infringed and continues to indirectly infringe by actively inducing the direct infringement of the '955 Patent by one or more third-parties and/or contributing to the direct infringement of one or more of the claims of the '955 Patent by one or more third-parties. Plaintiff also asserts that these third parties directly infringe at least one or more of the Asserted Claims of the '955 Patent through the use of, implementation of, and/or integration of the MPS Accused Products into additional products.

For example, MPS has actively induced infringement by encouraging the use of the MPS Accused Products in ways that infringe each Asserted Claim. MPS knew or should have known that such encouragement would induce its downstream customers and distributors to infringe. Further, upon information and belief, MPS has taken active steps with the specific intent to encourage and cause others to use and offer the MPS Accused Products in ways that infringe each

Asserted Claim. Such active steps by MPS have included, among other things, advertising, promoting, marketing, making available for use, offering to sell, and/or selling the MPS Accused Products to others; encouraging and influencing others to make, import, offer to sell, and/or sell the MPS Accused Products; directing and instructing others to use the MPS Accused Products in infringing ways; providing the MPS Accused Products to others for use in an infringing manner; and offering evaluation boards, design tools, and other support resources intended to assist and encourage customers to use the MPS Accused Products in an infringing manner.

MPS has performed the aforementioned active steps with the knowledge of the '955 Patent at least as of the date when the Complaint in this case was filed. For example, upon information and belief, after the filing of the Complaint in this action, MPS continues to market, offer to sell, sell, and promote the MPS Accused Products through, for example, its website, including offering a number of design tools and other support resources intended to assist and encourage customers to use the MPS Accused Products in an infringing manner.¹ MPS has known or should have known that these acts have induced and are continuing to induce infringement of the '955 Patent because, for instance, it has been aware that, for example, its customers and/or partners will purchase or obtain the MPS Accused Products and use them in an infringing manner. For example, as shown in Exhibit A for the representative product(s), to the extent that the MPS Accused Products are sold, offered for sale, or otherwise provided to its customers or partners, those products infringe the Asserted Claims of the '955 Patent. Further, MPS encourages its customers and partners to, for example, calculate the appropriate inductor size to enhance the functionality of the MPS Accused Products and provides the customer with other design and technical support through at

¹ See, e.g., https://www.monolithicpower.com/en/nb680.html?srltid=AfmBOortn-PHockAOLr4dR_XF3s-yRyflQFsyLo_p5v38KxrTmXE0SR (last accessed December 8, 2025).

least the resources and technical forum located on the website pages advertising the MPS Accused Products.

Further, the MPS Accused Products are specially made or especially adapted for use in a manner that infringes the '955 Patent and are not staple articles or commodities of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing uses. MPS therefore contributes to the infringement of the '955 Patent by making available for use, offering for sale, selling the MPS Accused Products in the United States, and/or importing the MPS Accused Products to or for third parties, such as its customers and/or partners, who use the MPS Accused Products to practice one or more claims of the '955 Patent. Moreover, MPS has had notice of the '955 Patent at least as early as the filing of the Complaint in this case.

II. PRIORITY DATES

Pursuant to the Order Governing Proceedings, Plaintiff identifies the priority date for the Asserted Claims. These Preliminary Infringement Contentions identify the priority date of the Asserted Claims based on Reed's present knowledge. Reed reserves the right to amend these contentions based upon discovery, MPS's claim construction, invalidity, and/or non-infringement positions, if any, the Court's claim construction rulings, and/or rulings by other courts in related cases or in proceedings before the USPTO regarding the patent-in-suit or related patents. The Asserted Claims are entitled to a priority date at least as early as the December 09, 2005 filing of Japanese Application No. 2005-356077.

III. DOCUMENT PRODUCTION ACCOMPANYING INFRINGEMENT CONTENTIONS

Pursuant to the Order Governing Proceedings, Reed produces "[a] copy of the file history for each patent in suit" concurrently herewith. Reed also produces foreign priority documents supporting Reed's contention regarding the '955 Patent's priority date. At this time, Reed is

unaware of any additional documents corresponding to conception and reduction to practice in its possession, custody, and control. Reed's efforts to obtain such documents are ongoing. Should Reed obtain or otherwise become aware of any such documents, Reed reserves the right to supplement its production pursuant to the Order Governing Proceedings.

Dated: December 8, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Rick L. Rambo

Rick L. Rambo
Texas Bar No. 00791479
Rick.Rambo@morganlewis.com
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP
1000 Louisiana Street, Suite 4000
Houston, Texas 77002-5005
Telephone: (713) 890-5000
Facsimile: (713) 890-5001

Andrew J. Gray IV
California Bar No. 202137
1400 Page Mill Road
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1124
Tel.: (650) 843-4000
Email: andrew.gray@morganlewis.com

Jason C. White*
Illinois Bar No. 6238352
Jason.White@morganlewis.com
Nicholas Restauri*
Illinois Bar No. 6309995
nicholas.restauri@morganlewis.com
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP
110 North Wacker Drive, Floor 30
Chicago, IL 60606
Telephone: (312) 324-1000
Facsimile: (312) 324-1001

* Admitted *pro hac vice*

**Attorneys for Plaintiff,
REED SEMICONDUCTOR CORP.**