Limin Zheng (zheng@fr.com) (CA #226875)
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
500 Arguello Street, Suite 500
Redwood City, CA 94063
Telephone: (650) 839-5070
Facsimile: (650) 839-5071

Juanita Brooks (brooks@fr.com) (CA #75934)
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
12390 El Camino Real
San Diego, CA 92130
Telephone: (858) 678-5070
Facsimile: (858) 678-5099

Michael J. Kane (Kane@fr.com) (*pro hac vice*)
William R. Woodford (woodford@fr.com) (*pro hac vice*)
Sarah J. Bray (Bray@fr.com) (*pro hac vice*)
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
3300 RBC Plaza
60 South Sixth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 335-5070
Facsimile: (612) 288-9696

Attorneys for Plaintiff
Halo Electronics, Inc.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

(SAN JOSE DIVISION)

HALO ELECTRONICS, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

BEL FUSE INC., ELEC & ELTEK (USA) CORPORATION, WURTH ELEKTRONIK MIDCOM, INC., and XFMRS, INC.,

Defendants,

Civil Case No. 07-6222 RMW

ANSWER TO COUNTERCLAIMS OF DEFENDANT ELEC & ELTEK (USA) CORPORATION

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff Halo, Inc., by its attorneys, Fish & Richardson P.C., answers the Counterclaims of Defendant Elec & Eltek (USA) Corporation. Except as expressly admitted below, Plaintiff denies each and every allegation in Defendant's Counterclaims. Specifically, Plaintiff answers as follows:

1. In response to paragraph 37, Plaintiff incorporates the allegations in its Complaint as if set forth herein. To the extent Defendant's allegation requires any response with respect to the Affirmative Defenses set forth in Defendant's Answer, Plaintiff denies the allegations of paragraphs 31, 32, 33, 35, and 36 in their entirety. With respect to paragraph 34, Plaintiff does not seek damages for infringement more than six years before it filed the Complaint. Plaintiff denies any remaining allegations of paragraph 34.

2. In response to paragraph 38, Plaintiff admits that it has alleged that the patents-in-suit were duly and legally issued by the United States Patent & Trademark Office and that Defendant E&E has infringed them. Plaintiff also admits that through its Answer to Plaintiff's Complaint, Defendant E&E has denied the allegations of infringement and also contends that the patents-in-suit are invalid and unenforceable. Plaintiff denies that a "justifiable" controversy exists between the parties, as the term is vague and ambiguous, and denies any remaining allegations of paragraph 38.

3. In response to paragraph 39, Plaintiff denies that any judicial declaration in favor of Defendant is necessary or appropriate at this time. Plaintiff also denies any remaining allegations of paragraph 39.

4. Plaintiff admits that Defendant E&E's Counterclaims purport to arise under 35 U.S.C. § 271 and 28 U.S.C. § 2201, and that the Court has jurisdiction over the Counterclaims under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1338(a), and/or 1367. However, Plaintiff denies that Defendant is entitled to any relief.

5. Plaintiff denies the allegations of paragraph 41.

6. Plaintiff denies the allegations of paragraph 42.

7. Plaintiff denies the allegations of paragraph 43.

8. Plaintiff denies the allegations of paragraph 44.

9. Plaintiff denies the allegations of paragraph 45.

10. Plaintiff denies the allegations of paragraph 46.

11. Plaintiff denies the allegations of paragraph 47.

12. Plaintiff denies the allegations of paragraph 48.

13. Plaintiff denies the allegations of paragraph 49.

14. Plaintiff denies the allegations of paragraph 50.

15. Plaintiff denies the allegations of paragraph 51.

16. Plaintiff denies the allegations of paragraph 52.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Halo respectfully requests that this Court:

A. Dismiss Defendant's Counterclaims in their entirety with prejudice;

B. Enter judgment that Defendant is not entitled to any of the relief requested in its Answer and Counterclaims;

C. Enter judgment that Defendant has infringed the '985, '720, '721, '489, '785, and '431 patents;

D. Enter an order permanently enjoining Defendant and its officers, agents, employees, attorneys, and all persons in active concert or participation with any of them, from infringing the '985, '720, '721, '489, '785, and '431 patents;

E. Award Halo damages in an amount sufficient to compensate it for Defendant's infringement of the '985, '720, '721, '489, '785, and '431 patents;

F. Treble the damages awarded to Halo under 35 U.S.C. § 284 by reason of Defendant's willful infringement of the '985, '720, '721, '489, '785, and '431 patents;

G. Declare this case to be "exceptional" under 35 U.S.C. § 285 and award Halo its attorney fees, expenses, and costs incurred in this action; and

H. Award Halo such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Halo demands a jury trial on all issues so triable.

Dated: April 30, 2008

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.

By: */s/ Sarah J. Bray*
Sarah J. Bray
Attorneys for Plaintiff
HALO ELECTRONICS, INC.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I am employed in the County of Hennepin. My business address is Fish & Richardson P.C., 60 South Sixth Street, Suite 3300, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the foregoing action.

I am readily familiar with the business practice at my place of business for collection and processing of correspondence for personal delivery, for mailing with United States Postal Service, for facsimile, and for overnight delivery by Federal Express, Express Mail, or other overnight service.

I certify that on April 30, 2008, a true and correct copy of Plaintiff's ANSWER TO COUNTERCLAIMS OF DEFENDANT ELEC & ELTEK (USA) CORPORATION was served as specified below:

D. Shane Brun
Morrison & Foerster, LLP
425 Market Street
San Francisco, CA 94105-2482
sbrun@mofo.com
Attorneys for Defendant Elec Eltek (USA) Corporation
(Via ECF)

A. Neal Seth
Kenneth Sheehan
Baker & Hostetler LLP
1050 Connecticut Ave., N.W., Ste 1100
Washington, DC 20036-5304
nseth@bakerlaw.com
ksheehan@baker.com
Attorneys for Defendant Wurth Elektronik Midcom, Inc.
(Via ECF)

Martin C. Fliesler
Fliesler Meyer LLP
Four Embarcadero Center, Fourth Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111-4158
mcf@fdmml.com
Attorneys for Defendant Bel Fuse, Inc**.**
(Via ECF)

Joshua L. Raskin
Wolf Block Schorr & Solis-Cohen LLP
250 Park Avenue, 10th Floor
New York, NY 10177
jraskin@steinbergraskin.com
Attorneys for Defendant Bel Fuse, Inc.
(Via ECF)

Harold C. Moore
Maginot Moore & Beck LLP
Chase Tower
111 Monument Circle, Ste. 3250
Indianapolis, IN 46204-5109
hcmoore@maginot.com
Attorneys for Defendant XMFRS, Inc.
(Via ECF)

I declare under penalty of perjury that the above is true and correct. Executed on April 30, 2008, at Minneapolis, MN.

/s/ Sarah J. Bray
Sarah J. Bray