

United States District Court,
S.D. California.

SINGLE CHIP SYSTEMS CORPORATION and Neology, S. de R.L. de C.V.,
Plaintiffs.

v.

INTERMEC IP CORP., Transcore, LP and Transcore Holdings, Inc,
Defendants.

Civil No. 04CV1517 JAH(CAB)

April 26, 2006.

Daniel J. O'Connor, Baker and McKenzie, Chicago, IL, Dongkwan James Pak, Howard N. Wisnia, Cynthia A. Freeland, James P. Conley, Baker and McKenzie, San Diego, CA, for Plaintiffs.

Bruce R. Zisser, Quinn Emanuel Urquhart Oliver and Hedges, William J. Robinson, Grant Kinsel, Foley and Lardner, Stephen M. Lobbin, Manatt, Phelps & Phillips, LLP, Los Angeles, CA, Carson P. Veach, Jacob D. Koering, Freeborn and Peters, Chicago, IL, for Defendants.

AMENDED CLAIM CONSTRUCTION ORDER

JOHN A. HOUSTON, District Judge.

On April 14, 2006, this Court issued a claim construction Order in the instant case. On April 20, 2006, counsel for Plaintiffs Single Chip Systems Corp. and Neology, S. de R.L. de C.V. (collectively "Plaintiffs") brought to this Court's attention that the construction for the disputed phrase "data intended to be received and stored by said remote object," although construed in the body of the Order, *see* Doc. No. 211 at 16, was absent in the conclusion section. Accordingly, this Court hereby **AMENDS** its claim construction Order and construes the phrase "data intended to be received and stored by said remote object" as *data that may be included in an RF signal sent by the interrogator which is received and stored by the remote object.*

S.D.Cal.,2006.

Single Chip Systems Corp. v. Intermec IP Corp.

Produced by Sans Paper, LLC.