# In the Matter of:

MICROSOFT CORPORATION v. SURFCAST, INC.

## RICHARD GEORGE ANDREW BONE February 19, 2014



1325 G Street NW, Suite 200, Washington, DC Phone: 800.292.4789 Fax:202.861.3425

IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295 Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 1

Page 1

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE BEFORE FOR PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD --000--MICROSOFT CORPORATION Petitioner, vs. SURFCAST, INC.

Patent Owner.

Patent No. 6,724,403

Issued: April 20, 2004

Filed: October 30, 2000

Inventors: Ovid Santoro, et al.

Title: SYSTEM AND MOTHOD FOR SIMULATANEOUS DISPLAY

OF INFORMATION SOURCES

Inter Partes Review Nos. IPR2013-00292,

IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294

and IPR2013-00295

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF

RICHARD GEORGE ANDREW BONE

Wednesday, February 19, 2014

Job No.: 0124-245041

REPORTER: COREY W. ANDERSON, CSR 4096 (SF-001020)

Merrill - Washington D.C. 9 www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295 Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 2

800-292-4789

Page 2 INDEX 1 2 INDEX OF EXAMINATIONS 3 EXAMINATION Page 4 7 5 EXAMINATION BY MR. SUH б INDEX TO EXHIBITS 7 8 No. Description Page 9 Exhibit 2008 SurfCast, Inc.'s Declaration Of 24 Richard G. A. Bone Under 35 USC 10 11 Section 317(a)(8)Exhibit 2035 1999 Timesheets, Richard 29 12 13 Bone/Pennie & Edmonds 14 15 Exhibit 2049 August 14, 1999 Invoice 283818 35 (SC0058852 through 58861) 16 17 Exhibit 2050 November 22, 1999 Telefacsimile 35 18 Message to Sandy Reyes from Helen J. D'Alessandro (SC0058862 19 20 through 58866) 21 Exhibit 2010 November 16, 1999 Invoice 296240 35 22 23 (PENY4 - 771034.1) 59 24 Exhibit 2052 Diligence Calendar: June 21, 25 1999 through October 29, 1999

> Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law

800-292-4789

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 3

1	APPEARANCES	
2		
3	FOR THE PETITIONER:	
4	SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP	
5	1501 K Street NW	
6	Washington, DC 20005	
7	BY: WONJOO SUH, ESQ.	
8	202-736-8831	
9	wsuh@sidley.com	
10		
11	SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP (Via Telephone)	
12	1501 K Street NW	
13	Washington, DC 20005	
14	BY: JOSEPH MICALLEF, ESQ.	
15	202-736-8492	
16	jmicallef@sidley.com	
17		
18	FOR THE PATENT OWNER:	
19	DLA PIPER LLP (US)	
20	401 B Street, Suite 1700	
21	San Diego, CA 92101-4297	
22	BY: ERICA J. PASCAL, ESQ.	
23	619-699-2639	
24	erica.pascal@dlapiper.com	
25		

Merrill - Washington D.C.

www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 4

1	APPEARANCES (Cont'd)
2	FOR THE PATENT OWNER:
3	DLA PIPER LLP (US) (Via Telephone)
4	One Fountain Square
5	11911 Freedom Drive
6	Suite 300
7	Reston, VA 20190-5602
8	BY: JAMES HEINTZ, ESQ.
9	703-773-4148
10	jim.heintz@dlapiper.com
11	
12	FOR THE WITNESS:
13	TURNER BOYD
14	202 Marshall Street, Suite 640
15	Redwood City, CA 94063
16	BY: KAREN I. BOYD, ESQ.
17	650-521-5930
18	boyd@turnerboyd.com
19	
20	
21	ALSO PRESENT:
22	VIDEO SOLUTIONS, a Merrill Legal
23	Solutions Company
24	PATRICIA GUERRERO, VIDEOGRAPHER
25	

1 --000--2 BE IT REMEMBERED that pursuant to notice 3 and on Wednesday, February 19, 2014 commencing at 9:01 4 A.M. thereof, at the Law Offices of DLA PIPER, 2000 5 University Avenue, Palo Alto, California, before me, Corey W. Anderson, a Certified Shorthand Reporter 6 7 and Realtime Reporter, personally appeared 8 RICHARD GEORGE ANDREW BONE 9 called as a witness by the PETITIONER, who, having 10 11 been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as 12 follows: 13 --000--14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

> Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law

IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 6

Page 6

1	PALO ALTO, CALIFORNIA
2	Wednesday, February 19, 2014
3	9:01 A.M.
4	000
5	PROCEEDINGS
б	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Here begins volume one,
7	videotape number one in the deposition of Richard
8	Bone in the matter of Microsoft Corporation versus
9	SurfCast, Inc., Patent Owner, in the United States
10	Patent And Trademark Office before the Patent Trial
11	And Appeal Board.
12	The Inter Partes Review Numbers are
13	IPR2013-00292, et al.
14	Today's date is February 19th, 2014. The
15	time on the video monitor is 9:01.
16	The videographer today is Patricia
17	Guerrero, a notary public employed by the Merrill
18	Corporation, San Francisco, California.
19	This video deposition is taking place at
20	the Law Offices of excuse me, DLA Piper, 1900
21	excuse me, 2000 University Avenue, East Palo Alto,
22	California.
23	Counsel, please voice identify yourselves
24	and state whom you represent.
25	MR. SUH: Wonjoo Sun at Sidley Austin

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law

800-292-4789

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 7

representing Microsoft Corporation. 1 2 MS. BOYD: And this is Karen Boyd of Turner 3 Boyd representing the witness. 4 MS. PASCAL: And Erica Pascal of DLA Piper on behalf of SurfCast, Inc., Patent Owner. 5 6 MR. MICALLEF: On the telephone, Joe 7 Micallef from the firm Sidley Austin representing 8 Microsoft. 9 MR. HEINTZ: And Jim Heintz from DLA Piper representing SurfCast. 10 11 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Thank you. 12 The court reporter is Corey Anderson of 13 Merrill Court Reporting. 14 Would the court reporter please swear in 15 the witness? RICHARD GEORGE ANDREW BONE 16 17 having been sworn by the Reporter, testified as follows: 18 19 THE WITNESS: I do. 20 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Thank you. Please 21 begin. 22 EXAMINATION 23 BY MR. SUH: 24 Could you please state your full name and Ο. residence address for the record, please? 25

Merrill - Washington D.C.

Page 8

1	Α.	Richard George Andrew Bone, 777 San	
2	Antonio R	oad, No. 60, Palo Alto, California, 94303.	
3	Q.	Do you understand that you are under oath	
4	today?		
5	Α.	I do.	
б	Q.	Have you ever been deposed before?	
7	Α.	Yes.	
8	Q.	When?	
9	Α.	July of last year.	
10	Q.	Is that it?	
11	Α.	That's one time.	
12	Q.	What was it about?	
13	Α.	It was in connection with Microsoft	
14	sorry, Su	rfCast versus Microsoft in the District	
15	Court of	Maine, case that's pending at the moment.	
16	Q.	Have you ever testified at trial before?	
17	Α.	No.	
18	Q.	Other than these, have you ever testified	
19	under oath?		
20	Α.	I don't believe so.	
21	Q.	Are you on any medications that might	
22	impact your ability to testify today?		
23	Α.	No.	
24	Q.	Are there any reasons you cannot testify	
25	truthfull	У?	

1	A. No.
2	Q. Seems like you are already familiar with
3	the rules since you already were deposed, but I'd
4	like to go over the rules again just to make sure we
5	are on the same page.
6	A. Okay.
7	Q. Your answers are recorded by a court
8	reporter, so please answer verbally. That means no
9	shaking heads or nodding.
10	A. Uh-huh.
11	Q. When I ask a question, could you wait for
12	me to finish my question before you start answering?
13	A. Okay.
14	Q. If you don't understand the question,
15	please ask for a clarification. Otherwise I will
16	assume you heard it, understood it, and gave me your
17	best answer.
18	Is that fair?
19	A. Okay.
20	Q. We'll try to take short breaks every hour.
21	But if you need a break at any time for any reason,
22	you should tell me or your counsel.
23	A. Okay.
24	Q. All that I ask is that if we are in the
25	middle of a question we can take a break after you

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law

800-292-4789

-	- 1	$\sim$
Page	1	( )
raye		v

1	finish your answer.
2	Is that fair?
3	A. Yes.
4	Q. Now that this deposition has begun, you
5	are not permitted to speak with your attorney about
6	the substance or conduct of this deposition unless
7	you have legitimate questions about privilege.
8	Do you understand that?
9	A. Understood.
10	Q. Understand that you are the lead counsel
11	in this case?
12	A. Correct.
13	Q. But today you are here as a fact witness,
14	so you should not be making any objections to my
15	question. Your counsel will do that for you.
16	Do you understand?
17	A. I understand.
18	Q. Could you tell me about your educational
19	background beginning after high school?
20	A. I took a Bachelor's degree at University
21	of Cambridge in the United Kingdom. It's called
22	Bachelor's of a Bachelor's of natural science.
23	And then I stayed at Cambridge and did a
24	Ph.D. there in theoretical chemistry.
25	Q. Chemistry?

Page 11

1	A. Yes.
2	After that, I did a post doctoral
3	fellowship, it's called a NATO fellowship from the
4	U.K. I spent a year in Canada and a year in the
5	United States.
6	And then I spent a few years in industry.
7	Q. So you said natural science. What was
8	that about?
9	A. Natural science is is the name that
10	Cambridge gives that basically their pure science
11	educational curriculum. So you take three sciences
12	in the first year and then most people, as did I,
13	take two subjects in the second year, I took
14	chemistry and mathematics, and in the final year you
15	take one subject, and I took chemistry.
16	Q. Did you take any computer science classes?
17	A. I took one, one computer yes, computer
18	programming class in the first year. It was an
19	accelerated class.
20	Q. And that's the only computer science class
21	you took?
22	A. As a formal class, that's correct. Except
23	I actually did take a C programming class later on
24	after I left Cambridge when I was working in
25	industry.

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295 Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 12

800-292-4789

Page 12

1	Q. And when was that?		
2	A. That was in 1995, I think.		
3	Q. So before June 1999, did you have any		
4	formal training in the programming of graphical user		
5	interfaces?		
6	A. Formal		
7	MS. PASCAL: Object.		
8	MR. SUH: You can answer.		
9	THE WITNESS: Okay. Formal training, no.		
10	BY MR. SUH:		
11	Q. What about programming in general?		
12	A. So from the beginning of my Ph.D. which		
13	was in began in 1988, which is in theoretical		
14	chemistry, I would say more than half of that time		
15	as a graduate student I was writing computer		
16	programs.		
17	And then when I left Cambridge and was a		
18	post doc for I think I would say for three to four		
19	years as a post doc, I would say more than 75		
20	percent of what I was doing was writing computer		
21	programs in a variety of languages.		
22	And then when I stayed in industry after		
23	that from around 1994 to 1999, my job was almost		
24	exclusively writing computer programs.		
25	Q. Which languages, may I ask?		

Page 13

1	A. So beginning in my Ph.D. it would be
2	Fortran, principally, and then a number of the UNIX
3	based languages, the scripting languages that are
4	common on the UNIX platforms.
5	And then for the balance of the time in
6	industry mixture of Fortran, C, UNIX languages, and
7	then some proprietary programming languages to the
8	company that I worked at immediately up until 1999.
9	Q. Did you have any training in software
10	architecture?
11	A. Formal training, I would say no. But the
12	programs I was writing were quite extensive, so
13	required some design, yes.
14	Q. Could you tell me about your employment
15	history?
16	A. Okay. So beginning from the time my post
17	doctoral fellowship finished in 1994, I worked for a
18	small company called it was called Provin
19	Terrapin, and that was a position I held as a
20	computational chemist for about two-and-a-half
21	years. That was writing some of the software I
22	previously described.
23	And then when I left that company I went
24	back to the U.K. for about two and a half years and
25	I worked at a company there also writing software in

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law

800-292-4789

Page 14

1	the commutational chemisture field
1	the computational chemistry field.
2	And then after that I came back to the
3	States and joined Pennie and Edmonds as a law clerk.
4	Q. When was that?
5	A. June of 1999.
б	Q. And then?
7	A. So I remained as a law clerk at Pennie and
8	Edmonds up until basically the time I graduated from
9	law school. And in 2002 I took the bar exam at the
10	beginning of 2003 and I became an associate at
11	Pennie and Edmonds at that time.
12	Pennie and Edmonds dissolved at the end of
13	2003. I moved with a group of attorneys from Pennie
14	and Edmonds to Morgan, Lewis & Bockius in Palo Alto.
15	I stayed there for almost 18 months as an associate.
16	I left Morgan Lewis in basically the end
17	of June of 2005, I went to Fish & Richardson as an
18	associate. I became a principal there in I think
19	the beginning of 2008.
20	And I left Fish & Richardson in April 2010
21	and joined my current firm, VLP Law Group, at that
22	time.
23	Q. So when you were at Pennie Edmonds, so
24	before June 1999, have you ever prosecuted a patent
25	application?
1	

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295 Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 15

800-292-4789

-	1 -
Paqe	e 15
Faye	

1	A. No, I have not.
2	Q. So while you were at Fish & Richardson,
3	did you ever work on any Microsoft matters?
4	A. No, I did not.
5	Q. Okay. So we can step back to when you
б	were a law clerk at Pennie and Edmonds.
7	A. That's correct.
8	Q. And you were not an attorney. Correct?
9	A. Not initially, correct.
10	Q. Until 2003 you were not an attorney?
11	A. That's correct.
12	Q. And you were not a member of the U.S.
13	Patent Bar before 2003.
14	Is that correct?
15	A. I took and passed the Patent Bar
16	registration exam in November or rather October
17	of 2000 I think October-November 2000. At that
18	time because I was not a U.S. permanent resident,
19	under the rules that the OED promulgates, they
20	couldn't give me a full reg number, but they could
21	give me something called limited recognition. At
22	the time it was under CFR 10.39 A, I think. Maybe
23	В.
24	So that meant that I was qualified to
25	practice in terms of being able to sign papers at

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 16

Page 16

1	the PTO as long as I accompanied whatever I signed
2	with that certificate. And that was tied to my
3	employment at Pennie and Edmonds, or essentially at
4	a firm where I was employed under the terms of my
5	visa to engage in patent related matters.
б	And then when I got a U.S. green card and
7	became a permanent resident, I was given a reg
8	number. And that was in I think March of 2004.
9	Q. So when you were holding your license
10	under limited recognition, you couldn't hold
11	yourself out as a patent agent.
12	Is that correct?
13	A. That is correct. So I had to explain to
14	people that, the actual qualification that I had,
15	that is correct.
16	Q. And of course, you couldn't hold yourself
17	out as a patent attorney.
18	Correct?
19	
20	Q. And you said you passed passed the
21	patent par in November of 2000. So prior to
22	November 1999, you were not licensed to practice
23	before the United States Patent Office at all.
24	Correct?
25	A. That's correct.

Page 17

1	Q. Were you working full time as a law clerk?
2	A. I was required to under the terms that
3	Pennie had, I was required to I think in the first
4	year bill 1500, 1500 billable hours in the system.
5	So effectively I was working full time in the sense
6	that I was there five days a week during the day
7	time. But once I started law school I had to spend
8	evenings in law school.
9	So the actual billable hour requirement
10	would be less than associate, but I consider it a
11	full time job.
12	Q. Was it listed as a full time job in your
13	employment agreement?
14	A. I believe it was, yes.
15	Q. And you say you never drafted a patent
16	application before joining Pennie.
17	Is that correct?
18	A. That's correct.
19	Q. And you never received any training on how
20	to draft a patent application before joining Pennie.
21	Is that correct?
22	A. That's correct, other than reading that I
23	had done. I had done some introductory reading
24	about the subject before I joined the firm.
25	Q. When was that?

Merrill - Washington D.C.

1	A. Well, in the 1998, 1999 timeframe.
2	Q. Other than
3	A. Oh, sorry, I would add one more thing.
4	When I was at the company called Terrapin, I had in
5	fact been listed as an inventor on a patent
б	application. So I worked quite closely with a
7	patent attorney and outside counsel there who took
8	me through the process.
9	Q. Did you draft the patent application
10	yourself?
11	A. I did not.
12	Q. Do you have any relationship with SurfCast
13	other than being outside counsel?
14	A. Can you define relationship?
15	Q. I mean were you ever an employee or
16	in-house counsel or consultant for SurfCast?
17	A. No.
18	Q. Do you have any interest in the outcome of
19	the litigation?
20	A. This has been made of record, I have some
21	stock options that SurfCast has granted me.
22	Q. How many shares?
23	A. I don't know the precise, I don't know the
24	precise number in my head.
25	Q. Do you know roughly how, what the

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law

800-292-4789

1	percentag	e is?
2	Α.	Percentage of what?
3	Q.	Of shares you have.
4	Α.	I believe it amounts to .4 percent, maybe
5	.39 perce	nt.
6	Q.	So you would have gained financially if
7	SurfCast	obtained a money judgment against
8	Microsoft	, wouldn't you?
9	Α.	I believe I would.
10	Q.	And do you have an interest in the outcome
11	of the IP	R?
12		MS. PASCAL: Objection.
13		THE WITNESS: I do not have an interest in
14	the outco	me of the IPR.
14 15	the outco	me of the IPR. BY MR. SUH:
15	Q.	BY MR. SUH:
15 16	Q.	BY MR. SUH: Do you have any type of contingency fee
15 16 17	Q.	BY MR. SUH: Do you have any type of contingency fee nts with SurfCast?
15 16 17 18	Q.	BY MR. SUH: Do you have any type of contingency fee nts with SurfCast? THE WITNESS: This may be privileged.
15 16 17 18 19	Q.	BY MR. SUH: Do you have any type of contingency fee nts with SurfCast? THE WITNESS: This may be privileged. MS. PASCAL: Yeah.
15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. arrangeme	BY MR. SUH: Do you have any type of contingency fee nts with SurfCast? THE WITNESS: This may be privileged. MS. PASCAL: Yeah.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. arrangeme advice.	BY MR. SUH: Do you have any type of contingency fee nts with SurfCast? THE WITNESS: This may be privileged. MS. PASCAL: Yeah. THE WITNESS: I will ask my counsel for
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. arrangeme advice.	BY MR. SUH: Do you have any type of contingency fee nts with SurfCast? THE WITNESS: This may be privileged. MS. PASCAL: Yeah. THE WITNESS: I will ask my counsel for MS. PASCAL: I think at this point we'll
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. arrangeme advice.	BY MR. SUH: Do you have any type of contingency fee nts with SurfCast? THE WITNESS: This may be privileged. MS. PASCAL: Yeah. THE WITNESS: I will ask my counsel for MS. PASCAL: I think at this point we'll privilege.

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 20

1 based on privilege. 2 Correct? 3 MS. PASCAL: You'll have to ask him if he 4 wants to follow advice of counsel. 5 THE WITNESS: Actually, I can ask -- answer correctly and say that my fee agreement with 6 7 SurfCast has no contingency based on the outcome of 8 the IPR. 9 BY MR. SUH: What about the litigation? 10 Q. 11 Α. I think that's priveledged. 12 MS. PASCAL: Objection. Same objection 13 from all of us. 14 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Speak up. 15 THE REPORTER: Could we go off the record, 16 Counsel? 17 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Off the record, the time 18 is 9:17. 19 (Whereupon, a recess was taken 20 commencing at 9:17 A.M. and 21 concluding at 9:23 A.M.) THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the 22 record. The time is 9:23. 23 BY MR. SUH: 24 Q. So if you can go back to the previous 25

question you asserted privilege objection to, the 1 2 question was whether you do have a contingency fee 3 arrangement. 4 Is that --MS. PASCAL: Which are you asking? 5 MR. SUH: I'm not interested in the term. 6 7 I'm just interested in --8 MS. PASCAL: No, no. Just so we are clear 9 on the question, you asked him about his fee agreement with the IPR and you asked him about his 10 11 fee agreement with respect to the litigation. MR. SUH: Yes. 12 13 Whether or not you do have a fee, Ο. contingency fee arrangement. 14 15 MS. PASCAL: In which matter? MR. SUH: In either one. 16 17 MS. PASCAL: I'll object to compound. But --18 MR. SUH: Okay. First the District Court 19 20 Maine litigation. Do you have any contingency fee 21 0. arrangement, whether or not you have it --22 Can you define contingency? 23 Α. 24 MS. BOYD: If it's privileged you are --25 hang on just a minute.

Page 22

1	MS. PASCAL: Hang on just a second.
2	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Shall we go off the
3	record?
4	MS. BOYD: Yeah.
5	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Off the record, the time
6	is 9:24.
7	(Whereupon, a recess was taken
8	commencing at 9:24 A.M. and
9	concluding at 9:25 A.M.)
10	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the
11	record. The time is 9:25.
12	MR. MICALLEF: Can I say something? This
13	Joe Micallef for Microsoft. I explicitly want to
14	make sure everybody in this deposition understands
15	the rules of the Board as far as defense counsel
16	objecting are extremely strict. What I have heard
17	already was a discussion about which question are
18	you asking and isn't that privileged. If that goes
19	on again in front of the witness we are going to
20	have to call the Board because that's actually not
21	permitted in the deposition.
22	MS. BOYD: We have heard your comment, Joe.
23	MR. MICALLEF: Thank you.
24	BY MR. SUH:
25	Q. Are there documents that you reviewed in

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law

800-292-4789

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 23

1	order to prepare for this deposition?	
2	A. Yes.	
3	Q. What are they?	
4	A. I reviewed my the declarat	on that I
5	submitted, and I have reviewed some case	e law, some
6	cases, and I have reviewed the time entr	ry logbook, a
7	copy of it that I have submitted as an e	exhibit.
8	Q. Anything else?	
9	A. That's all.	
10	Q. And you are represented by cou	unsel today.
11	Correct?	
12	A. I am.	
13	Q. Are you represented by DLA Pip	per as well,
14	or	
1 5		
15	A. DLA Piper counsel is sorry	DLA Piper
16	A. DLA Piper counsel is sorry has an attorney here representing patent	_
	-	
16	has an attorney here representing patent	owner
16 17	has an attorney here representing patent SurfCast.	owner
16 17 18	has an attorney here representing patent SurfCast. Q. So DLA Piper is not represent	owner
16 17 18 19	has an attorney here representing patent SurfCast. Q. So DLA Piper is not represent Is that correct?	a owner
16 17 18 19 20	has an attorney here representing patent SurfCast. Q. So DLA Piper is not represent Is that correct? A. That is correct.	a owner
16 17 18 19 20 21	<pre>has an attorney here representing patent SurfCast. Q. So DLA Piper is not represent: Is that correct? A. That is correct. Q. Are you paying your counsel for</pre>	ng you.
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<pre>has an attorney here representing patent SurfCast. Q. So DLA Piper is not represent Is that correct? A. That is correct. Q. Are you paying your counsel for representation?</pre>	ng you.
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<pre>has an attorney here representing patent SurfCast. Q. So DLA Piper is not represent Is that correct? A. That is correct. Q. Are you paying your counsel for representation? A. I believe my client SurfCast is</pre>	owner ing you. or the

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law

1	A. I can't say anything about the
2	relationship, the fee agreement between SurfCast and
3	DLA Piper, but SurfCast had told me they would pay
4	for my counsel.
5	Q. Okay.
б	A. Sorry, I want to add one more thing.
7	Technically my counsel is also representing my firm,
8	VLP Law Group.
9	Q. Okay.
10	So I'm handing you Exhibit 2008, take a
11	look at it.
12	A. Okay.
13	(Whereupon, Exhibit 2008 was marked
14	for identification)
15	(Pause)
16	BY MR. SUH:
17	Q. Do you recognize this document?
18	A. I do.
19	Q. If you can turn to page 5? You mentioned
20	Andrew Gray?
21	A. Yes.
22	Q. Brett Lovejoy?
23	A. Yes.
24	Q. Paul DeStefano?
25	A. Stefano.

1	Q.	Stefano?
2	Α.	Yes.
3	Q.	And William S. Galliani?
4	Α.	Yes.
5	Q.	Who are they?
6		MS. PASCAL: Objection, form.
7		THE WITNESS: Andrew Gray at the time was
8	an attorn	ey at Pennie and Edmonds.
9		Dr. Lovejoy at the time was a law clerk at
10	Pennie and	d Edmonds.
11		Mr. DeStefano was an attorney at Pennie
12	and Edmon	ds at that time, as was Mr. Galliani.
13		BY MR. SUH:
14	Q.	Mr. Galliani was an attorney too?
15	Α.	That's correct.
16	Q.	What were their titles?
17	Α.	I believe at the time Mr. Gray was an
18	associate	, Dr. Lovejoy was a law clerk,
19	Mr. DeSte	fano was a partner, and Mr. Galliani was a
20	partner.	
21	Q.	Did they have were they licensed to
22	practice 1	before the United States Patent Office?
23		MS. BOYD: Objection, form.
24		BY MR. SUH:
25	Q.	Was Mr. Andrew Gray licensed to practice

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law

800-292-4789

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 26

1	before the United States Patent Office?
2	A. Yes.
3	Q. Was Mr. Lovejoy?
4	A. I believe he was at the time, yes.
5	Q. What about Paul DeStefano?
6	A. No.
7	Q. William S. Galliani?
8	A. Yes.
9	Q. What is Mr. Andrew Gray's technical
10	background?
11	A. I don't know specifically what his
12	technical background is other than I know that at
13	the time I was working with him he had quite some
14	experience with software related matters, software
15	related inventions.
16	Q. What is Mr. Brett Lovejoy's technical
17	background?
18	A. He had a Ph.D. in some type of protein
19	chemistry, protein crystallography, I think. I
20	don't remember more specifically than that.
21	Q. What was Paul's technical background?
22	A. I don't know that he has a technical
23	background. He is a corporate attorney.
24	Q. Corporate?
25	A. Correct.

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 27

1	Q. What was Mr. Galliani's technical
2	background?
3	A. I don't know specifically, but I believe
4	it's something in electrical engineering or computer
5	science, because his practice was almost entirely in
б	software related patent, patent practice.
7	Q. Are there any reasons why Mr. Andrew Gray,
8	Mr. Lovejoy, and Mr. Galliani could not draft a
9	patent application?
10	MS. PASCAL: Objection, form.
11	THE WITNESS: I don't know that there is a
12	reason why they why they I mean, do you mean
13	could not as a matter of capability or could not as
14	a matter of time?
15	BY MR. SUH:
16	Q. Let's start with capability.
17	A. I believe that either of them could have
18	drafted the application.
19	Q. They could?
20	A. Could have.
21	Q. Could have?
22	A. Yes.
23	Q. What about time?
24	A. I think that is, you know, that is
25	that the answer to that is they might have had

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 28

1	the time. At that time in the office there were a
2	lot of new projects coming in.
3	Q. Do you know that they did not have time,
4	or are you guessing?
5	A. No. From my best recollection of the
6	time, everybody was extremely busy.
7	Q. How many lawyers or patent agents did
8	Pennie have?
9	MS. BOYD: Objection, form.
10	THE WITNESS: Do you mean in the entire
11	firm?
12	MR. SUH: Entire firm.
13	THE WITNESS: I don't remember
14	specifically, although my recollection, it could
15	have been around 200.
16	BY MR. SUH:
± •	BI MR. SUR.
17	Q. And they could all have drafted a patent
17	Q. And they could all have drafted a patent
17 18	Q. And they could all have drafted a patent application.
17 18 19	Q. And they could all have drafted a patent application. Is that correct?
17 18 19 20	Q. And they could all have drafted a patent application. Is that correct? MS. PASCAL: Objection, form.
17 18 19 20 21	Q. And they could all have drafted a patent application. Is that correct? MS. PASCAL: Objection, form. THE WITNESS: I don't know. Are you asking
17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. And they could all have drafted a patent application. Is that correct? MS. PASCAL: Objection, form. THE WITNESS: I don't know. Are you asking could any of them could have drafted any patent
17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. And they could all have drafted a patent application. Is that correct? MS. PASCAL: Objection, form. THE WITNESS: I don't know. Are you asking could any of them could have drafted any patent application?

Merrill - Washington D.C.

www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 29

1	case. In	mean, for example, one of the one of the
2	attorneys	in the firm who does exclusively
3	litigatior	n I believe probably would not have held
4	themselves	s out as somebody to draft a patent
5	applicatio	on, and for example, somebody whose
б	practice w	was exclusively in biotechnology probably
7	would not	have drafted a software application, and
8	vice versa	a.
9		BY MR. SUH:
10	Q.	So how many lawyers or patent agents do
11	you think	Pennie had back in the 1990 timeframe that
12	could draf	It a patent application?
13	Α.	1990 or 1999?
14	Q.	1999.
15	Α.	Draft any patent application?
16	Q.	Yes.
17	Α.	Best guess, at least a hundred.
18	Q.	Okay. So I'm handing you out
19	Exhibit 20	)35.
20		(Whereupon, Exhibit 2035 was marked
21		for identification)
22		BY MR. SUH:
23	Q.	Actually, can you this is single-sided.
24	Α.	Okay.
25	Q.	And double-sided ones are for the counsels

Merrill - Washington D.C.

www.merrillcorp.com/law

```
Page 30
```

1 just to save trees. 2 Do you recognize this document? 3 I do. Α. 4 Ο. Did you write these entries each day? Yes, I did. 5 Α. Did anybody see you write these entries 6 Q. 7 each day? If you mean literally was somebody in the 8 Α. room as I was writing them, I think that's highly 9 unlikely. 10 11 Do you have copies of the drafts that you Q. were working on? 12 13 MS. PASCAL: Objection, form. 14 THE WITNESS: Sorry, drafts of what? 15 BY MR. SUH: Drafts of the patent application, SurfCast 16 Ο. 17 patent application. 18 I -- I do not, no. Α. There is no evidence of your work product 19 0. 20 during this period. 21 Correct? MS. BOYD: Objection. 22 23 MS. PASCAL: Objection, lacks foundation. THE WITNESS: I don't believe that's 24 25 correct.

1	BY MR. SUH:
2	Q. Why?
3	A. I believe that there are in existence some
4	e-mails that contain copies of drafts that were sent
5	from Pennie and Edmonds to one or more persons at
6	SurfCast.
7	Q. Those e-mails included drafts, did you
8	say?
9	A. Either e-mails or faxes. I believe that
10	those exist. I have not reviewed them.
11	Q. But you don't have any copies of the
12	drafts?
13	A. I personally do not, no.
14	Q. Do you know if anybody has copies of that?
15	A. If they have been produced in connection
16	with the concurrent litigation, then I believe they
17	are there.
18	Q. Can you tell me under oath that you
19	specifically remember what you did on each day?
20	A. I think for the majority of days I could
21	not say I specifically remember.
22	Q. Are there any days that you can
23	specifically remember?
24	MS. PASCAL: Objection.
25	THE WITNESS: I believe there are, yes.

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 32

Page 32

1		BY MR. SUH:
2	Q.	Could you point me to an example?
3	A.	Okay. I have a copy of this document
4	which has	fewer redactions in it
5	Q.	I think
6	A.	and which was served on you a few days
7	ago. May	I refer to that?
8	Q.	We objected to that as untimely.
9	Α.	Okay.
10		MS. BOYD: I don't think you answered the
11	question,	though. He is asking if he can refer to
12	it, not ma	ake it in evidence.
13		MR. SUH: No.
14		THE WITNESS: Okay. So
15		MS. PASCAL: I'm going to object as best
16	evidence.	
17		You can continue.
18		THE WITNESS: Okay. July 29, Thursday.
19		BY MR. SUH:
20	Q.	So what did you do?
21	Α.	That was a meeting that took place in New
22	York City	, mostly at the New York office of Pennie
23	and Edmon	ds. I do remember that meeting.
24		I believe there is also
25	Q.	No, back to that meeting.

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law

800-292-4789

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 33

1	Α.	Sorry.
2	Q.	Do you know what was discussed during the
3	meeting s	pecifically?
4	Α.	We
5		MS. PASCAL: Objection to the no.
6		THE WITNESS: I believe that aspects of
7	that woul	d be covered by attorney-client privilege.
8		BY MR. SUH:
9	Q.	The question was do you remember what was
10	specifica	lly discussed.
11	Α.	I remember some things that were
12	specifica	lly discussed.
13	Q.	Are there any non-privileged discussions
14	you had w	ith during that meeting?
15	Α.	I don't believe so, and certainly not that
16	I remembe	r.
17		I can provide another day that I remember
18	also, if	you are finished with this day.
19	Q.	Sure.
20		Actually, back to July 29th
21		MS. PASCAL: I'm sorry, he is in the middle
22	of an ans	wer.
23		MR. SUH: Is that an objection?
24		MS. PASCAL: Yes.
25		THE WITNESS: I would just relate to you

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law

Petitioner Microsoft	Corporation -	Ex.	1102,	p. 34
----------------------	---------------	-----	-------	-------

1	that I also remember October 19.
2	MR. SUH: Okay.
3	THE WITNESS: There are a couple of entries
4	there that reference a meeting with Mr. Carberry. I
5	remember I remember meeting with Mr. Carberry.
6	BY MR. SUH:
7	Q. Other than remembering a meeting with
8	Mr. Carberry, do you specifically remember what you
9	did this day?
10	A. Not based on the narratives that are in
11	front of me here. The other narratives are
12	redacted. So you know
13	Q. Do you know what you discussed during that
14	meeting?
15	A. I do remember some things that I discussed
16	with Mr. Carberry, but I believe they are covered by
17	the attorney-client privilege.
18	Q. At the beginning of the deposition I asked
19	you not to make any objections, that's for counsel
20	the make that okay.
21	A. Okay. Understood.
22	Q. So could you answer my question?
23	MS. BOYD: I no.
24	MS. PASCAL: We
25	MS. BOYD: I think we'll both make the

Merrill - Washington D.C.

IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 35

1	objection that and the instruction to respect
2	attorney-client privilege. And that wasn't an
3	objection that the witness made, it was an
4	observation in his role as an attorney saying that
5	something is privileged.
6	BY MR. SUH:
7	Q. And you are here as a fact witness. Is
8	that correct? Not as a lead counsel?
9	A. That is correct.
10	Q. Okay. Let's turn to Exhibit 2049, 2050,
11	and 2010.
12	(Whereupon, Exhibit 2049 was marked
13	for identification)
14	(Whereupon, Exhibit 2050 was marked
15	for identification)
16	(Whereupon, Exhibit 2010 was marked
17	for identification)
18	BY MR. SUH:
19	Q. Do you recognize these documents?
20	MS. BOYD: Objection, form.
21	THE WITNESS: I will answer document by
22	document.
23	MR. SUH: Sure.
24	THE WITNESS: So Exhibit 2050, I reviewed
25	this document in connection with preparing my

Merrill - Washington D.C.

Page 36

1	declaration, Exhibit 2008, although as you can
2	probably tell from the actual document itself this
3	is not a document that I prepared personally or
4	transmitted at the time it was at the time it was
5	sent. It's a facsimile. But I mean, I recognize
6	the overall form of the contents and where it came
7	from.
8	For Exhibit 2049 and Exhibit 2010, I can
9	answer in the same way. I mean, I know what these
10	documents are.
11	But again, other than review them in
12	connection with preparing my declaration, I was not
13	the author of them or reviewer of them at the time
14	they were created.
15	BY MR. SUH:
16	Q. Are you finished answering?
17	A. Yes.
18	Q. So did you produce all the invoices that
19	were in your possession for the period of June 29th
20	to October 29th, 1999?
21	MS. BOYD: Objection, form.
22	THE WITNESS: Are you asking me personally?
23	BY MR. SUH:
24	Q. Yes. I could only find these three. Are
25	there others that I missed?

Merrill - Washington D.C.

800-292-4789

www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 37

Page 37

1	A. I have no invoices in my possession, and I
2	never had any invoices in my possession.
3	Q. So where did this come from?
4	MS. BOYD: Objection to form.
5	MS. PASCAL: Objection.
6	THE WITNESS: I believe they were produced
7	by other persons involved in either the litigation
8	in Maine or in connection with this inter partes
9	review.
10	BY MR. SUH:
11	Q. So you are not aware of any invoices that
12	exist other than these three.
13	Correct?
14	A. Me personally, no, that's correct.
15	Q. If you could turn to page 11 of
16	Exhibit 2010? Do you see an entry from Mr. Galliani
17	on October 30th, 1999?
18	A. I do.
19	Q. Do you agree that this time has nothing to
20	do with the reduction to practice of the provisional
21	application filed on October 29th?
22	A. If that
23	MS. PASCAL: Objection.
24	THE WITNESS: If that is an accurate time
25	entry, I agree with you.

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law

BY MR. SUH: 1 2 Let's then turn to page 5 of Ο. 3 Exhibit No. 2050. 4 Α. Yes. Do you see that you billed 34.1 hours from 5 Q. September 14th to September 30th in the Total 6 7 amount? 8 MS. PASCAL: Objection. 9 THE WITNESS: I haven't added up all these numbers, but I don't know that the 34.1 hours begins 10 11 at September 14th. BY MR. SUH: 12 13 Q. Okay. 14 MS. PASCAL: Excuse me, can he finish his 15 answer, please? 16 MR. SUH: Sorry. 17 THE WITNESS: These invoices are typically generated on a monthly billing cycle, and I would 18 assume that the summary for each person is based on 19 20 a complete month, although I don't know that that's 21 absolutely the case for this invoice. 22 I mean, the first page, page 3, says "Legal services rendered for the period ending 23 24 September 30th." 25 BY MR. SUH:

1	Q.	Are you done?
2	Α.	Yes.
3	Q.	So in the bottom of page 5, do you see the
4	number 34	.1 hours next to your name?
5	Α.	I do.
б	Q.	And your time was written off down to 26
7	hours.	
8		Correct?
9		MS. PASCAL: Objection, lacks foundation.
10		THE WITNESS: I believe that is probably
11	what happo	ened here.
12		BY MR. SUH:
13	Q.	That means your work should have only
14	taken 26 1	hours rather than 34.1 hours.
15		Correct?
16		MS. BOYD: Objection.
17		MS. PASCAL: Objection.
18		THE WITNESS: If you ask me to look at this
19	document	in total, then my understanding of this
20	document	is that there are some entries on the
21	initial pa	art of it that are being struck because
22	they were	ended on the wrong matter and should not
23	have been	billed to SurfCast.
24		BY MR. SUH:
25	Q.	Do you have evidence showing that?

800-292-4789

1	A. Yes. There is a billing number which says
2	in the middle of the of page 3, it says
3	09555.0003999. That is for another client matter
4	that I worked on.
5	I believe that it's possible in that
6	timeframe some matters were entered in the time
7	system on the wrong I'm sorry, some entries were
8	entered in the time system on the wrong matter and
9	they appeared on the SurfCast bill and they should
10	not have done.
11	This fax is being sent from
12	Mr. DeStefano's secretary to somebody in the
13	accounting department at Pennie and Edmonds, and I
14	believe it's for the purposes of correcting the
15	invoice.
16	BY MR. SUH:
17	Q. So you pointed to page 3. And I see 0.75
18	hours, 0.25 hours, 0.25 hours and 0.25 hours. If
19	you add that up, that's only 1.5 hours.
20	A. Okay.
21	Q. What is your basis for saying that this is
22	what was struck down from 34.1 hours down to 26
23	hours? That's almost 25 percent.
24	MS. BOYD: Objection.
25	BY MR. SUH:

Q. Write-off? 1 2 MS. BOYD: Objection. 3 MS. PASCAL: Objection, lacks foundation. 4 Argumentative. 5 THE WITNESS: There is a blank page 4, and I can't tell you what happened on that page 4. 6 7 If you give me a minute, I will add up the entries on page 5. 8 9 Okay. So the entries on page 5 for me, they total 17.6 hours. 10 11 MR. SUH: Okay. THE WITNESS: Which is less than 34.1. 12 So 13 there is some incompleteness in the document in front of us. 14 15 BY MR. SUH: 16 So you would agree that this Exhibit 2550 Ο. 17 is incomplete. 18 Correct? Well, there is a redacted page, there is a 19 Α. 20 blank page here. And none of us sitting here can 21 tell you what's on that blank page. Okay. Were you responsible for billing? 22 Q. 23 MS. PASCAL: Objection. 24 THE WITNESS: Can you explain the question? BY MR. SUH: 25

Merrill - Washington D.C.

1	Q. Were you responsible for billing these to
2	SurfCast?
3	MS. BOYD: Objection.
4	THE WITNESS: I did not personally review,
5	edit, or send out bills from Pennie and Edmonds.
6	BY MR. SUH:
7	Q. And you don't have any personal knowledge
8	as to whether these bills were in fact billed.
9	Correct?
10	MS. PASCAL: Objection, form.
11	THE WITNESS: I find that a peculiar
12	question. In a large complex organization like a
13	law firm there is lots of things I may not have
14	personal knowledge of, but I believe they actually
15	happened. I mean, I believe the firm sends out
16	bills, even though I don't personally do that
17	myself.
18	BY MR. SUH:
19	Q. So the bills that I'm talking about are
20	Exhibit Nos. 2010, 2049 and 2050. And you don't
21	have personal knowledge as to whether these were in
22	fact billed.
23	Correct?
24	MS. PASCAL: Objection, form. And
25	objection, relevance.

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295 Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 43

800-292-4789

Page 43

1	THE WITNESS: I mean, I'll answer the
2	question using what I believe is common sense. Yes,
3	it's correct, I did not personally supervise the
4	process of sending these bills out.
5	But I think it would strain credulity if I
6	were to say these bills didn't get sent out, you
7	know, if that follows from me having no personal
8	knowledge of these documents being prepared.
9	BY MR. SUH:
10	Q. And you don't have you don't have
11	personal knowledge as to whether SurfCast paid these
12	bills, Exhibit Nos. 2010, 2049, and 2050, in 1999.
13	Correct?
14	MS. BOYD: Objection.
15	MS. PASCAL: Objection.
16	MS. BOYD: Relevance.
17	MS. PASCAL: And form.
18	THE WITNESS: Again, my role at Pennie and
19	Edmonds, I was not concerned with accounting
20	matters.
21	So again, I have no personal I have no
22	personal knowledge of almost any client actually
23	transmitting money into the firm, although again,
24	I'm, you know, working in an operating business. I
25	assume that the firm is getting paid on the invoices

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law

800-292-4789

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 44

it sends out. It has ways of taking appropriate 1 2 action if that's not the case. 3 And SurfCast remained a client of the firm 4 throughout the years I spent there. 5 BY MR. SUH: Q. Okay. Thank you. б 7 So if you can turn back to Exhibit 2008? If you turn to page 9, you mention a lot of numbers 8 related to SurfCast, and I'll read the numbers: 9 9982-0009-999, and the second number is 10 11 9982-0009-888, and the third number is 9982-0005-999, and the fourth number I see is 12 13 9982-0002-999. 14 Were there any other numbers for SurfCast, 15 or is this it? There were other matter numbers for 16 Α. 17 SurfCast that I personally did not work on. 18 And page 9 says, page 9 of Exhibit 2008 Q. says "Pennie firm's unique client number for 19 SurfCast is 09982." 20 21 Correct? MS. BOYD: Objection. 22 23 THE WITNESS: We would write either four 24 digits, 9982, or with a leading zero making five digits. Either is used interchangeably. 25

> Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law

800-292-4789

IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 45

1	BY MR. SUH:
2	Q. Okay. And the numbers following 9982,
3	were these numbers for different tasks that SurfCast
4	asked Pennie to undertake?
5	MS. BOYD: Objection, form.
6	THE WITNESS: Yes. The numbers following
7	the hyphen after 9982 relate to different matters.
8	BY MR. SUH:
9	Q. So what were the different tasks?
10	MS. PASCAL: Objection.
11	MS. BOYD: Objection.
12	MS. PASCAL: Form.
13	THE WITNESS: Are you asking me about these
14	numbers or any number?
15	BY MR. SUH:
16	Q. The four numbers that you mention in your
17	declaration.
18	A. Okay. So 9982-00 0009-999 referred to
19	a utility patent application. 9982-0009-888
20	referred to a provisional patent application.
21	9982-0005-999 related I think to an opinion matter.
22	9982-0002-999 related to a general billable matter,
23	and sometimes sometimes called general corporate.
24	Q. So your task, Pennie's task included
25	general corporate matters. Is that correct? Just

Merrill - Washington D.C.

www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 46

1	wanted to	understand what you just said when you
2	said gener	cal corporate.
3	Α.	That is correct.
4	Q.	And did it also include trademark matters?
5	Α.	Yes, it did.
6	Q.	What about financing?
7	Α.	I don't know specifically.
8	Q.	Let's go to Exhibit 2010 2010 on page
9	13. And t	the second description is "series of
10	financing	. "
11		Do you see that?
12	Α.	You see page 13?
13	Q.	Page 13.
14	Α.	Oh, "Series." It's highlighted. Okay.
15	"Series A	financing," it says.
16	Q.	What was this about?
17		MS. BOYD: Objection, relevance.
18		MS. PASCAL: Lacks foundation.
19		THE WITNESS: I don't know. I have no
20	specific 1	recollection of working on that matter.
21		BY MR. SUH:
22	Q.	Is this matter for SurfCast?
23		MS. PASCAL: Same objection.
24		THE WITNESS: I believe it is.
25		BY MR. SUH:

Page 47

```
So you agree that SurfCast engaged Pennie
 1
           Q.
 2
      for other matters in addition to preparing a patent
 3
      application.
 4
                 Is that correct?
                That is correct.
 5
           Α.
                In page 9, if you can go back to
 6
           Q.
 7
      Exhibit 2008? Page 9? On page 9 you say 9982 --
           Α.
                Yes.
 8
 9
           Ο.
                -- dash 0009-999 is for preparation of
      patent application.
10
11
                Do you see that?
                Second -- second and third line of the
12
           Α.
13
      page?
                And you agree that other matter numbers
14
           Ο.
15
      are not for preparation of patent application.
                Correct?
16
17
                MS. PASCAL: Objection, form, lacks
      foundation.
18
                MS. BOYD: Irrelevant.
19
                THE WITNESS: The matter that ends in 888
20
      would have been used for preparation of a
21
      provisional patent application.
22
23
                BY MR. SUH:
24
                So I can rephrase my question.
           Q.
25
                Do you agree that matter numbers other
```

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 48

Page 48

```
than 9982-0009-999 or 9982-0009-888, other than
 1
 2
      these two numbers, the other matter numbers are not
      for preparation of patent application.
 3
 4
                Is that correct?
                MS. PASCAL: Objection, form, lacks
 5
      foundation.
 6
 7
                THE WITNESS: That is correct.
                BY MR. SUH:
 8
 9
                Do you agree that matter numbers that do
           0.
      not start with 9982-0009 are not related to patents
10
11
      at all.
12
                Correct?
13
                MS. BOYD: Objection.
                MS. PASCAL: Objection, form.
14
15
                THE WITNESS: Can you repeat the question,
16
      please?
17
                BY MR. SUH:
                Matter numbers that do not start with
18
           Q.
19
      9982-0009 are not related to preparing patents at
20
      all?
21
                MS. PASCAL: Objection, form.
                THE WITNESS: I don't agree with that
22
23
      statement.
                BY MR. SUH:
24
25
           Q.
                Why is that?
```

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295 Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 49

800-292-4789

1	A. Because that statement encompasses almost
2	any other matter that the firm has. If it does not
3	start with 9982 it pertains to other clients and
4	therefore
5	Q. No, no. 9982-0009.
6	MS. PASCAL: Objection, form.
7	THE WITNESS: Of the numbers that are
8	referenced in this document, the only ones that
9	pertain to patent applications are the ones that
10	begin with 9982-0009.
11	BY MR. SUH:
12	Q. Okay. Thank you.
13	Was it your practice to enter the time
14	under the correct billing number?
15	A. That was my habit. I mean, I can't say
16	that I did not make occasional clerical errors, but
17	I think the overwhelming majority of the time that
18	is what I did.
19	Q. Did you review your time entries before
20	they were sent out to the client?
21	A. I reviewed them before they were sent to
22	the partner for review, the partner being the person
23	who sends out the bill.
24	Q. And do you have any reason to believe that
25	any of these entries in your notebook are

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law

800-292-4789

IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 50

```
Page 50
```

1	inaccurate?
2	A. I do not.
3	Q. Page 8 of, if we can go back to
4	Exhibit 2035, if you go the page 8? It's the entry
5	for June 22nd, 1999.
6	MS. PASCAL: I'm sorry, Counsel, what page?
7	MR. SUH: Page 8.
8	THE WITNESS: May I just modify my previous
9	answer? You asked me if I believe any of these are
10	inaccurate, other than for a minor clerical error.
11	MR. SUH: Okay.
12	THE WITNESS: Yes.
13	BY MR. SUH:
14	Q. And page 8 of Exhibit 2035 has an entry
15	under 992-0005?
16	A. Yes.
17	Q. 999. And the description is "Writing"
18	plus "Web searching."
19	A. Yes.
20	Q. And if you turn to page 9 of the same
21	exhibit, it has an entry under 9982-0009-999 with a
22	description "Writing/Web Searching."
23	Do you see that?
24	A. Yes.
25	Q. Is there any difference between writing

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law

800-292-4789

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 51

1	plus Web searching and writing hyphen Web searching?
2	MS. PASCAL: Objection, form.
3	THE WITNESS: I don't have a recollection
4	of why those terms were written differently, or
5	whether there was an intent that there was a
6	different meaning from writing them differently.
7	BY MR. SUH:
8	Q. You agree that what you did on June 22nd
9	and June 23rd were different enough to be billed
10	under different matter numbers?
11	A. I believe this may be either either one
12	of the minor clerical errors that I previously
13	referred to or it may be that at that time I had
14	been with the firm for looks like six or seven days,
15	I may have just lacked clarity about which matter I
16	was working on.
17	Q. Looking at these two entries, you can't
18	say, tell whether these are accurate entries.
19	Correct?
20	A. No, I disagree.
21	MS. BOYD: Objection.
22	BY MR. SUH:
23	Q. Why is that?
24	A. Because I was not in the habit of writing
25	things down inaccurately.

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 52

Page 52

1	Q. So can you so then why did you use
2	different billing numbers for what appears to be
3	identical activities?
4	MS. BOYD: Objection. Argumentative.
5	THE WITNESS: I think I have already
6	answered this question, but I'll say this, I will
7	say it again.
8	MR. SUH: Okay.
9	THE WITNESS: I think that as you can see
10	from the dates, this, you know, this actually is the
11	fifth working day I'm with the firm. It's possible
12	that I didn't fully understand at that time how to
13	apportion my time for different projects, and you
14	know, I may not have actually been aware that there
15	was a separate number at that time for the patent
16	application from the opinion matter, and that may
17	have been clarified to me literally overnight from
18	the 22nd or 23rd of June.
19	But again, I'm speculating a little bit
20	here. But I don't looking at these entries have
21	cause to believe that these are, you know,
22	fundamentally inaccurate.
23	BY MR. SUH:
24	Q. You agree that you can't tell what you did
25	on these dates based on these descriptions alone,

Merrill - Washington D.C.

800-292-4789

www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 53

1	then.
2	Correct?
3	A. I disagree.
4	MS. BOYD: Objection.
5	THE WITNESS: I disagree.
б	BY MR. SUH:
7	Q. So can you tell me what you specifically
8	did on these two dates?
9	MS. BOYD: Caution the witness not to
10	reveal attorney-client communications or attorney
11	work product.
12	MR. SUH: You can answer.
13	THE WITNESS: I believe in general terms
14	that I was writing portions of a patent application
15	and I was also carrying out some searching on the
16	Internet related to that.
17	BY MR. SUH:
18	Q. Do you have any evidence of what you
19	specifically did on this date?
20	MS. BOYD: Objection.
21	THE WITNESS: I believe this logbook is
22	evidence of what I did on that day.
23	BY MR. SUH:
24	Q. Other than this logbook, do you have any
25	evidence of what you did on this day?

Page 54

1	MS. PASCAL: Same objection.
2	THE WITNESS: Me personally? I don't
3	believe I have other materials from that time.
4	BY MR. SUH:
5	Q. Did you have any communications with
6	SurfCast on these two dates?
7	A. I don't specifically recall.
8	Q. Is there any reason you would be looking
9	for patents that are not prior art to that
10	application?
11	MS. PASCAL: Objection, lacks foundation,
12	form.
13	THE WITNESS: I don't have a specific
14	recollection.
15	BY MR. SUH:
16	Q. When you were looking for prior art, you
17	did determine whether the SurfCast application
18	included patentable subject matter.
19	Is that correct?
20	MS. BOYD: Objection.
21	THE WITNESS: I believe that's covered by
22	attorney-client privilege and attorney work product.
23	BY MR. SUH:
24	Q. Your counsel have not objected based on
25	attorney-client privilege.

Page 55

1	MS. BOYD: Sir, if we have to get the Board
2	on the phone to clarify that an attorney witness can
3	assert attorney-client privilege, we can certainly
4	do that. But I doubt that you would like to do
5	that.
6	MR. MICALLEF: Excuse me, this is Joe
7	Micallef. I don't have any problem if you'd like to
8	do that. I think it's important for a clear record
9	of whether or not a privilege is being asserted. I
10	don't think it's a lot to ask for the counsel who is
11	defending to actually assert a privilege.
12	MS. BOYD: Okay.
13	MR. MICALLEF: Do you want to go off the
14	record and discuss it?
15	MS. PASCAL: No. If you want us to echo
16	it, as long as it's clear that
17	MR. SUH: I want the record to be clear.
18	MS. PASCAL: Can I finish my sentence?
19	All I'm saying, so we are all on the same
20	page, is it's, you know, clear that Mr. Bone or
21	Dr. Bone, excuse me can make his record when he
22	feels he needs to protect privilege of one or more
23	of his clients. And if you want his counsel or
24	SurfCast counsel or both to echo it, as long as we
25	are on that same page, we shall do so.

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law

800-292-4789

IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 56

1 MR. MICALLEF: That's what I'm asking for. 2 Thank you. 3 MS. PASCAL: Okay. Objection, privilege. 4 MS. BOYD: Objection and instruction privilege. 5 б BY MR. SUH: 7 Did you work on any non-patent application Ο. matters for SurfCast? 8 9 MS. BOYD: Objection, form. THE WITNESS: I believe that you can say 10 11 that some of these entries under 9982-0005-999 I probably characterized or may have characterized at 12 13 the time as being more closely related to the -- the opinion matter than to the patent application. 14 15 But to the best of my recollection, I considered those activities to be essentially 16 17 unified in my head. BY MR. SUH: 18 19 Ο. You say opinion matter. Can you explain 20 more about that? 21 MS. BOYD: Objection, privilege. THE WITNESS: I believe it's listed in one 22 of the invoices, and that is the only description I 23 24 can really give you. 25 Well, actually, it's in my -- excuse me.

> Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law

800-292-4789

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 57

1	BY MR. SUH:
2	Q. Are you talking about
3	MS. PASCAL: Excuse me, let him finish.
4	THE WITNESS: I'm talking about in fact
5	Exhibit 2008, my declaration. If you look at
6	paragraph 18 on page 9, this basically states what
7	that matter referred to.
8	BY MR. SUH:
9	Q. So if I understand correctly, the opinion
10	was for a patentability assessment and prior art
11	search.
12	Is that correct?
13	A. That's correct.
14	Q. And you prepared an opinion on that.
15	Correct?
16	A. I did not personally prepare an opinion.
17	Q. And why is that an opinion matter? I'm
18	just confused.
19	MS. PASCAL: Objection.
20	THE WITNESS: The matter was opened and
21	established before I joined Pennie and Edmonds, and
22	that is how the matter was designated when it was
23	opened and established.
24	BY MR. SUH:
25	Q. Well, do you know the purpose of that

1	matter?
2	MS. BOYD: Objection.
3	MS. PASCAL: Objection, and objection to
4	the extent it calls for privilege.
5	THE WITNESS: I can repeat to you what I
6	put in my declaration. It's a separate matter
7	number established for a patentability assessment
8	and prior art search carried out for the invention
9	described in the patent application.
10	BY MR. SUH:
11	Q. Okay. Other than that, did you work on
12	any other non-patent application matters for
13	SurfCast?
14	A. There may be some entries under this
15	0002-999 matter, and I may have put time on that if
16	for instance I was sitting in a meeting for SurfCast
17	where the discussion may not have been about the
18	patent or something like that.
19	But that's not very much of the time that
20	I spent.
21	Q. So you mentioned 9982-0002-999. And if
22	you can turn to Exhibit 2010, page 1, I think this
23	is what you are referring to.
24	A. Yes.
25	Q. You agree that this number is not the

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 59

1	number for preparation of patent application.
2	Correct?
3	MS. PASCAL: Objection.
4	THE WITNESS: That's correct.
5	BY MR. SUH:
6	Q. The same activity appears in what I'm
7	going to hand out to you, which is Exhibit 2052.
8	(Whereupon, Exhibit 2052 was marked
9	for identification)
10	MR. SUH: It seems thicker. Thicker page.
11	MS. BOYD: Here.
12	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
13	BY MR. SUH:
14	Q. So I just handed out to you
15	Exhibit No. 2052. And can you please turn to page 8
16	of Exhibit 2052?
17	A. Okay.
18	Q. On October 26 there is this entry "Met
19	with Mr. Dechaene, Dr. Lovejoy to discuss current
20	status of patent filings."
21	Do you see that?
22	A. I see that.
23	Q. You agree that Exhibit 2052 includes
24	activities that cannot be categorized as preparation
25	of patent application.

Merrill - Washington D.C.

```
Page 60
```

Correct? 1 2 MS. BOYD: Objection. 3 MS. PASCAL: Objection. 4 MS. BOYD: Argumentative, form, calls for legal conclusion. 5 б THE WITNESS: What's your basis for that 7 question? BY MR. SUH: 8 You just -- I think you just testified 9 Ο. that 9982-0002-999 is not a number for, quote, 10 11 preparation of patent application, end quote. MS. BOYD: Objection, form. 12 13 Mischaracterization. 14 THE WITNESS: That's correct. 15 BY MR. SUH: 16 And this entry seems to correspond to what Ο. was listed in Exhibit 2052. 17 18 Yes, that's correct. But if you look on Α. the same day in Exhibit 2052, I have -- I have an 19 20 entry for revised figures and streamlined claims, spoke with Mr. Galliani, and that clearly is 21 connected with preparing the patent application. 22 And that's on the same day. 23 24 Ο. No, that's not my question. My question is, Exhibit 2052 includes 25

> Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295 Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 61

800-292-4789

activities that cannot be categorized as preparation 1 2 of patent application. 3 MS. BOYD: Objection. 4 MS. PASCAL: Objection. Form. MS. BOYD: Argumentative. 5 MS. PASCAL: Relevance. 6 7 THE WITNESS: It seems to include this one activity. I don't know of any other activities that 8 9 meet your description. BY MR. SUH: 10 11 Q. So you agree that this activity cannot be 12 categorized as preparation of patent application. 13 Correct? MS. BOYD: Can you please just read which 14 15 activity you are talking about? Because I have lost track of it. 16 17 MR. SUH: Okay. I can repeat. It's page 8 of Exhibit 2052, the entry under October 26th where 18 19 it says "Met with Mr. Dechaene, Dr. Lovejoy, to 20 discuss current status of patent filings." 21 MS. BOYD: Thank you. THE WITNESS: So I believe I do have memory 22 23 of that meeting where Mr. Dechaene came to our 24 office, and I believe that speaking with him and 25 discussing, you know, the status and progress of the

Merrill - Washington D.C.

800-292-4789

IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

www.merrillcorp.com/law

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 62

Page 62

patent application, although I made a judgment call 1 2 at the time to put it on matter 0002, I don't believe that's separate and distinct from working on 3 4 the patent application. 5 BY MR. SUH: So what did you say during the meeting? 6 Q. 7 MS. BOYD: Objection. MS. PASCAL: Objection. Privileged. 8 MS. BOYD: Calls for attorney-client 9 privileged communication. Instruct the witness not 10 11 to answer. THE WITNESS: That's correct. That would 12 13 be an attorney-client privileged communication. 14 BY MR. SUH: 15 Q. So why did you bill this entry under general billing matter rather than under the matter 16 17 number specifically for preparation of patent 18 application? MS. PASCAL: Objection, relevance. 19 20 MS. BOYD: Objection, argumentative. THE WITNESS: I don't have a specific 21 22 recollection of why, but I can only speculate that I just decided I would do that based maybe on the 23 24 majority of discussion. I don't exactly remember. 25 BY MR. SUH:

> Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 63

800-292-4789

```
Page 63
```

MS. BOYD: If there is a convenient time to 1 2 take a short break? 3 MR. SUH: Yeah. Can we --4 THE WITNESS: Well, I would add one sentence to my answer, then we can break. 5 MR. SUH: Sure. 6 7 THE WITNESS: I mean, it is clear from my recollection that Mr. Dechaene stopped by the office 8 in large part to discuss the patent application, and 9 therefore I think that this is appropriately 10 11 considered as something connected with the filing 12 and preparation of the patent application. 13 BY MR. SUH: So during the meeting, did you actually 14 Ο. 15 draft the patent application with him? MS. PASCAL: Objection. 16 Form. 17 THE WITNESS: I have told you I don't have -- or rather, the content of what was discussed 18 19 at the meeting is protected by the attorney-client 20 privilege. 21 BY MR. SUH: 22 No, my question was not asking you the Q. 23 content of what was discussed. Did you draft the patent application during the meeting, was the 24 25 question.

> Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law

IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 64

Page 64

1	MS. BOYD: Objection.
2	THE WITNESS: Based on the best of my
3	recollection, I was not sitting in that room with
4	him drafting the patent application.
5	BY MR. SUH:
б	Q. Okay. Are you done?
7	A. I'm done.
8	MR. SUH: Okay. We can take a break.
9	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Okay. Off the record,
10	the time is 10:15 10:16.
11	(Whereupon, a recess was taken
12	commencing at 10:16 A.M. and
13	concluding at 10:30 A.M.)
14	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the
15	record. This is the beginning of volume one,
16	videotape number two in the deposition of
17	Dr. Richard Bone. The time is 10:30.
18	BY MR. SUH:
19	Q. So I want to go back the our previous
20	question and revisit whether you had any type of
21	contingency fee arrangement with SurfCast for the
22	main litigation.
23	MS. PASCAL: Objection, relevance.
24	THE WITNESS: Okay. So I believe I have
25	permission to waive the privilege on this.

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law

800-292-4789

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 65

Page 65

1	MS. BOYD: It's not a waiver of privilege,
2	it's it's a non-assertion of privilege.
3	MS. PASCAL: Correct.
4	THE WITNESS: Thank you. Okay.
5	My fee agreement with SurfCast is
6	structured in this way. I bill my services out
7	month by month at my regular hourly rate.
8	If SurfCast is successful in litigation in
9	Maine in collecting an award based on patent
10	infringement, then I would then be eligible for a
11	bonus which is tied to the number of hours that I
12	have billed for SurfCast for the duration of my
13	representation.
14	So it has a multiplying factor on my
15	billable hour rate.
16	BY MR. SUH:
17	Q. Do you have a similar contingency fee
18	arrangement with SurfCast in connection with the
19	IPR?
20	A. Not separately. My fee agreement with
21	SurfCast is for all my services, regardless of what
22	it's in connection with.
23	Q. Thank you.
24	So if you can turn back to Exhibit 2008?
25	You list a number of matters that you worked on.

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law

800-292-4789

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 66

1	And the first one shows, appears on page 11, the
2	invalidity opinion.
3	A. Yes, I see that.
4	Q. Can you explain generally what this matter
5	relates to?
6	MS. BOYD: I'll caution the witness to not
7	disclose any attorney-client privileged
8	communications.
9	THE WITNESS: Understood. Thank you.
10	I can say generally that it was a an
11	opinion for a client of invalidity of a third party
12	U.S. patent.
13	BY MR. SUH:
14	Q. Was it related to SurfCast?
15	A. Not at all.
16	Q. When did you finish this project?
17	MS. PASCAL: Objection, form.
18	THE WITNESS: I will refresh my memory of
19	that by looking at Exhibit 2008.
20	(Pause)
21	THE WITNESS: In paragraph 38 on page 17 it
22	looks like the opinion was finalized on October
23	18th, 1999.
24	BY MR. SUH:
25	Q. And if you can turn to page 12, you

1	mentioned the Hydrogen Exchange Portfolio.
2	A. Yes.
3	Q. Can you explain generally what this matter
4	related to?
5	A. It's a portfolio of patent applications
6	that was owned by a client of Pennie and Edmonds.
7	Q. Was it related to SurfCast?
8	A. No.
9	Q. When did you finish this project?
10	A. It's not a single project. It's it's a
11	patent portfolio. It has multiple matters within
12	it. And I continued to work on it until well,
13	two or three years later, I think.
14	Q. So you said multiple matters. Do you know
15	roughly how many matters were in that portfolio?
16	MS. BOYD: Objection.
17	MS. PASCAL: Objection.
18	MS. BOYD: Relevance.
19	MS. PASCAL: Objection, relevance.
20	MS. BOYD: And I'll caution the witness on
21	attorney-client privilege.
22	THE WITNESS: Uh-huh.
23	I believe that most of the patent matters
24	in that portfolio became published through the U.S.
25	PTO. Recollection is there were six to ten matters.

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 68

1	BY MR. SUH:
2	Q. Six to ten matters.
3	And on page 13 you mentioned
4	Antimicrobials Portfolio. Can you generally explain
5	what this matter related to?
б	A. The Antimicrobials Portfolio? It is
7	another portfolio of patent applications owned by
8	another client of Pennie and Edmonds.
9	Q. Was this related to SurfCast?
10	A. No.
11	Q. And when did you finish this project?
12	A. Same answer. It's a portfolio of patent
13	applications in this case U.S. and foreign, lot of
14	ongoing matters were in it. So there isn't a finish
15	point. It was ongoing.
16	Q. Do you recall roughly how many matters
17	there were in this project?
18	A. That portfolio was quite large. Possibly
19	50 or more matters.
20	Q. Now, the last one you mentioned was on the
21	same page, the Macromolecular Design Application.
22	A. Yes.
23	Q. Can you explain what this matter generally
24	related to?
25	A. That was a patent application owned by

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law

800-292-4789

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 69

1	a I think I say here a European research
2	laboratory.
3	Q. And was this related to SurfCast?
4	A. No.
5	Q. And when did you finish this project?
б	A. I will refer to my declaration. Paragraph
7	30 on page 14, the application was filed on August
8	31st, 1999.
9	Q. So these four, among these four different
10	matters that are not related to SurfCast, did
11	anybody tell you to work on one rather than the
12	other on a given date?
13	MS. PASCAL: Objection, form.
14	THE WITNESS: I don't specifically recall
15	anybody saying to me you have to work on project X,
16	but not on project Y.
17	However, at various time periods it became
18	necessary to work on one project due to an imminent
19	or urgent deadline, and therefore work on other
20	projects could not be carried out with the same
21	level of commitment on that day or several days.
22	BY MR. SUH:
23	Q. So similar, but slightly different. Did
24	anybody tell you to work on these matters rather
25	than the SurfCast matter on any given day?

Merrill - Washington D.C.

800-292-4789

MS. PASCAL: Objection. 1 2 MS. BOYD: Objection, form. 3 THE WITNESS: I have no recollection of 4 anybody ever saying that to me. 5 BY MR. SUH: From June 29th to October 29th, 1999, did 6 Q. 7 you have an unreasonable backlog of work that prevented you to diligently draft the SurfCast 8 patent application? 9 MS. PASCAL: Objection, form, lacks 10 11 foundation. THE WITNESS: I don't believe I had an 12 13 unreasonable backlog. I want to refer you to my declaration again, if you just give me a minute, 14 15 refresh my memory. 16 (Pause) 17 Α. Paragraphs 14 and 15 on pages 6 and 7. 18 Q. Page --19 Α. Paragraphs 14 and 15. 20 Ο. 14 and 15. These explain that, in paragraph 14 I 21 Α. explain that the types of projects I was working on 22 had different types of due dates on them. 23 24 And paragraph 15 explains that during that 25 period of time from the day I started at Pennie and

Merrill - Washington D.C.

IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

www.merrillcorp.com/law

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 71

1	Edmonds on June 16th onwards, at least for several
2	months I was essentially ramping up and taking on a
3	lot of different projects in order to fill my docket
4	out.
5	Q. So if I understand correctly, from June
б	29th to October 29th you did not have an
7	unreasonable backlog.
8	Is that correct?
9	MS. PASCAL: Objection, form.
10	THE WITNESS: Can you define what you mean
11	by unreasonable backlog?
12	BY MR. SUH:
13	Q. Did you have a backlog of work?
14	MS. BOYD: Objection.
15	MR. SUH: Ask that.
16	THE WITNESS: I don't think there was a
17	backlog, no.
18	BY MR. SUH:
19	Q. So you mentioned page 7, paragraph 14.
20	You say "It was not necessarily possible to take on
21	work strictly chronologically in the sense of
22	managing an initial influx of work."
23	So here you agree that the SurfCast
24	application invalidity opinion on page 11, the
25	Hydrogen Exchange Portfolio on page 12, the

Page 72

1	Antimicrobials Portfolio on page 13, and the
2	Macromolecular Design Application on page 13, were
3	not taken up in chronological order.
4	Correct?
5	MS. BOYD: Objection.
б	MS. PASCAL: Objection. Lacks foundation,
7	form.
8	THE WITNESS: The way you are putting it is
9	an oversimplification. As I explained at least with
10	respect to the two portfolios, each of those
11	portfolios has within it a number of matters with a
12	number of due dates. Many of those due dates were
13	set prior to my involvement with the project.
14	BY MR. SUH:
15	Q. So why did you make the statement where
16	you say "Work on a given project can often be"
17	I'm sorry, I'm looking at something else.
18	"It was not necessarily possible to take
19	on work strictly chronologically in the sense of
20	managing an initial influx of work." Why did you
21	make that statement?
22	MS. BOYD: Objection, form, calls for
23	attorney work product. Caution the witness not to
24	disclose that work product.
25	THE WITNESS: It's consistent with

Merrill - Washington D.C.

800-292-4789

www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295 Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 73

everything else I'm telling you in the sense that I 1 2 could be given projects on two consecutive days, but 3 the due dates for each of them may be different from 4 one another. BY MR. SUH: 5 So these were not taken up in 6 Q. 7 chronological order. 8 Correct? MS. BOYD: Objection. 9 MS. PASCAL: Objection, form and 10 11 foundation, mischaracterizes testimony. 12 THE WITNESS: What do you mean by 13 chronological order? 14 BY MR. SUH: 15 Q. What I mean is your first assignment at Pennie was a SurfCast patent application. 16 17 Is that correct? I would have to check my logbook and see 18 Α. if that's correct. 19 Do you know if the invalidity opinion was 20 Ο. assigned to you before the SurfCast patent 21 22 application? 23 I know that my first discussion on that Α. project was after I started work on SurfCast, but it 24 may have been assigned to me before that. I don't 25

Merrill - Washington D.C.

IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

www.merrillcorp.com/law

1	know.
2	Q. Do you have any records showing that this
3	was assigned to you before you were assigned the
4	SurfCast patent application?
5	A. I do not.
6	Q. So did you start the invalidity opinion
7	before you finished drafting the SurfCast
8	application?
9	A. I started work on that project, yes,
10	before the SurfCast application was complete.
11	Q. So you agree that the SurfCast application
12	and the invalidity opinion were not taken up in
13	chronological order.
14	Correct?
15	MS. BOYD: Objection, form.
16	MS. PASCAL: Objection, form, lacks
17	foundation, mischaracterizes testimony, asked and
18	answered.
19	THE WITNESS: I don't understand the
20	question. I have could you please restate?
21	BY MR. SUH:
22	Q. Okay. Let's go back to page 7 of your
23	declaration. What did you mean when you say
24	chronological?
25	A. I can read back to you what it says here.

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law

IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 75

1	Q.	No. My question is, what did you mean
2	when you	say, chose the word "chronological"?
3	Α.	Again, the meaning is provided by the
4	second ha	lf of the sentence in the sense of managing
5	an initia	l influx of work according to the most
6	immediate	e due dates.
7	Q.	So chronological order means in time order
8	as they o	ome in.
9		Is that correct?
10		MS. BOYD: Objection.
11		MS. PASCAL: Objection.
12		THE WITNESS: Well, I'll think about that.
13		(Pause)
14		THE WITNESS: I don't talk here about the
15	time they	come in. What do you mean by the time
16	they come	in?
17		BY MR. SUH:
18	Q.	Well, you mentioned initial influx.
19	Α.	Yes.
20	Q.	That means the time they come in?
21	Α.	Does it?
22		MS. BOYD: Objection.
23		BY MR. SUH:
24	Q.	What does it mean, then?
25	Α.	I believe that means time it is assigned

Merrill - Washington D.C.

www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

1	to me.
2	Q. Okay. So did you work on these five
3	matters, the SurfCast application, invalidity
4	opinion, Hydrogen Exchange Portfolio, Antimicrobials
5	Portfolio, and Macromolecular Design Application in
б	a chronological order in the sense of managing an
7	initial influx of work?
8	MS. BOYD: Objection, form.
9	THE WITNESS: I think I have already stated
10	that in this paragraph of the declaration. I said
11	it was not necessarily possible to do that.
12	BY MR. SUH:
13	Q. So is that a no? Just wanted to clarify
14	for the record.
15	A. I can't tell you about the absolute
тJ	
16	ordering of any one project relative to the others.
	ordering of any one project relative to the others. But I can say that in in in general terms that
16	
16 17	But I can say that in in in general terms that
16 17 18	But I can say that in in in general terms that I might have started work on a later project before
16 17 18 19	But I can say that in in in general terms that I might have started work on a later project before completing an earlier project. That's correct.
16 17 18 19 20	But I can say that in in in general terms that I might have started work on a later project before completing an earlier project. That's correct. BY MR. SUH:
16 17 18 19 20 21	<pre>But I can say that in in in general terms that I might have started work on a later project before completing an earlier project. That's correct. BY MR. SUH: Q. So you said might have. So you agree that</pre>
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<pre>But I can say that in in in general terms that I might have started work on a later project before completing an earlier project. That's correct. BY MR. SUH: Q. So you said might have. So you agree that you don't know as a matter of fact that you worked</pre>
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<pre>But I can say that in in in general terms that I might have started work on a later project before completing an earlier project. That's correct. BY MR. SUH: Q. So you said might have. So you agree that you don't know as a matter of fact that you worked on it in the order it came to you.</pre>

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295 Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 77

Page 77

1	THE WITNESS: You can see from this
2	declaration and the time entry narratives that many,
3	if not most of these projects ongoing and receive
4	attention over several weeks, if not two or three
5	months. And I'm working on each of them over those
6	periods of time.
7	BY MR. SUH: I understand.
8	THE WITNESS: And they get started, they
9	get the first action occurs on different days and
10	they get finished to the extent that finished can be
11	ascribed to some of them on different days.
12	I don't see that as I don't see that as
13	inconsistent with what I'm saying in this
14	declaration.
14 15	declaration. BY MR. SUH:
15	BY MR. SUH:
15 16	BY MR. SUH: Q. Do you know the order in which any of
15 16 17	BY MR. SUH: Q. Do you know the order in which any of these matters were assigned to you?
15 16 17 18	BY MR. SUH: Q. Do you know the order in which any of these matters were assigned to you? MS. PASCAL: Objection, form.
15 16 17 18 19	BY MR. SUH: Q. Do you know the order in which any of these matters were assigned to you? MS. PASCAL: Objection, form. THE WITNESS: By I can tell you by
15 16 17 18 19 20	BY MR. SUH: Q. Do you know the order in which any of these matters were assigned to you? MS. PASCAL: Objection, form. THE WITNESS: By I can tell you by looking at the time entry book what was the first
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	BY MR. SUH: Q. Do you know the order in which any of these matters were assigned to you? MS. PASCAL: Objection, form. THE WITNESS: By I can tell you by looking at the time entry book what was the first day that I might have talked about a given matter.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	BY MR. SUH: Q. Do you know the order in which any of these matters were assigned to you? MS. PASCAL: Objection, form. THE WITNESS: By I can tell you by looking at the time entry book what was the first day that I might have talked about a given matter. BY MR. SUH:
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<pre>BY MR. SUH: Q. Do you know the order in which any of these matters were assigned to you? MS. PASCAL: Objection, form. THE WITNESS: By I can tell you by looking at the time entry book what was the first day that I might have talked about a given matter. BY MR. SUH: Q. So could you</pre>

Merrill - Washington D.C.

www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295 Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 78

Page 78

1	A. Worked on a given matter.	
2	Q. Yeah. Could you tell me	the order in
3	which these given matters were assi	gned to you?
4	MS. BOYD: Objection, form	n.
5	THE WITNESS: I would have	e to
6	MS. PASCAL: Objection, be	est evidence.
7	Sorry.	
8	THE WITNESS: I would have	e to look at this
9	declaration and give you the time e	entry.
10	MR. SUH: Sure.	
11	THE WITNESS: All right.	Excuse me.
12	(Pause)	
13	MS. BOYD: Jot down as you	, and figuring
	Mo: DOID: OUE down as you	are riguring
14	things out.	are iiguring
14 15		are iiguring
	things out.	
15	things out. (Pause)	s your question,
15 16	things out. (Pause) THE WITNESS: Is your i	s your question, wanted to know
15 16 17	things out. (Pause) THE WITNESS: Is your i just to refresh my memory, that you	s your question, wanted to know
15 16 17 18	things out. (Pause) THE WITNESS: Is your i just to refresh my memory, that you the first date I worked on each of	ls your question, a wanted to know these projects?
15 16 17 18 19	things out. (Pause) THE WITNESS: Is your is just to refresh my memory, that you the first date I worked on each of MR. SUH: That's right.	ls your question, a wanted to know these projects?
15 16 17 18 19 20	things out. (Pause) THE WITNESS: Is your is just to refresh my memory, that you the first date I worked on each of MR. SUH: That's right. THE WITNESS: Okay. Based	ls your question, a wanted to know these projects?
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	things out. (Pause) THE WITNESS: Is your is just to refresh my memory, that you the first date I worked on each of MR. SUH: That's right. THE WITNESS: Okay. Based book?	s your question, wanted to know these projects? d on the redacted
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<pre>things out.     (Pause)     THE WITNESS: Is your f just to refresh my memory, that you the first date I worked on each of     MR. SUH: That's right.     THE WITNESS: Okay. Based book?     MR. SUH: Yes.</pre>	a wanted to know these projects? d on the redacted
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<pre>things out.     (Pause)     THE WITNESS: Is your i just to refresh my memory, that you the first date I worked on each of     MR. SUH: That's right.     THE WITNESS: Okay. Based book?     MR. SUH: Yes.     THE WITNESS: I can't tell</pre>	a wanted to know these projects? d on the redacted necessarily with

Merrill - Washington D.C.

800-292-4789

www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295 Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 79

Page 79

for the invalidity opinion, July 23rd for the 1 2 Hydrogen Exchange and the Antimicrobials. 3 But I feel confident in my recollection 4 that that date is actually earlier for both of 5 those. б BY MR. SUH: 7 Oh, can you repeat the last date? Ο. July 23rd. 8 Α. July 23rd. And --9 0. And August 4th for the Macromolecular 10 Α. 11 Design Application, which I will clarify it's actually a utility application, it's not a patent 12 13 design application. So these were the dates that you were 14 0. 15 assigned each of these projects. 16 Correct? 17 MS. BOYD: Objection, misstates the witness' testimony. 18 MS. PASCAL: And objection, best evidence. 19 20 THE WITNESS: Again, I'm not saying when they were assigned to me. I'm saying what I believe 21 is the first day I either worked on the project or 22 discussed them with a supervising attorney. 23 BY MR. SUH: 24 So do you know when any of these matters 25 Q.

> Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law

800-292-4789

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 80

Page 80

1	were assigned to you?
2	A. I do not.
3	Q. But you would agree that you were assigned
4	the SurfCast application at least by June 18th.
5	Correct?
6	A. Well, again, I started discussing it on
7	June 18th. You know, whether somebody had assigned
8	it to me before that day, as an example, knowing I
9	was going to join the firm, I don't know.
10	Q. Can you turn to page 4 of Exhibit 2035?
11	A. Yes.
12	Q. I'm sorry, I have got the wrong page
13	number.
14	Page actually, it's page 11 of
15	Exhibit 2008. Here you say you worked on writing
16	initial drafts of the background figures and
17	descriptions of figures for the SurfCast application
18	until June 28th, 1999.
19	Then you say you took on two new projects
20	from June 29th, 1999.
21	Correct?
22	MS. PASCAL: Objection, mischaracterizes
23	document. Best evidence.
24	THE WITNESS: Can you just point me to the
25	sentences you are relying on, please?

Merrill - Washington D.C.

www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295 Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 81

1		BY MR. SUH:
2	Q.	Yeah. So there is, if you go to paragraph
3	23?	
4	Α.	Okay.
5	Q.	"From June 29th to July 1, I worked
6	principal	lly on projects for two clients other than
7	SurfCast	, "
8		Do you see that?
9	Α.	Yes.
10	Q.	And June 29th, 1999 is the first day you
11	worked or	n invalidity opinion and the Hydrogen
12	Exchange	Portfolio.
13		Correct?
14		MS. PASCAL: Objection, best evidence.
15		MS. BOYD: Objection, misstates the
16	witness'	testimony.
17		THE WITNESS: Okay, you're right. So in my
18	answer to	o one of your earlier questions I had said
19	July 23rd	d for the Hydrogen Exchange Portfolio, I
20	missed th	nis, so I would revise that answer to be
21	June 29tł	1.
22		BY MR. SUH:
23	Q.	Thank you.
24		Isn't it correct that you were tasked to
25	draft the	e SurfCast patent application before being

Merrill - Washington D.C.

www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 82

Page 82

1	asked whether you could take on the invalidity
2	opinion and the Hydrogen Exchange Portfolio?
3	A. Again, I have answered this question
4	before. I don't know specifically when a given
5	supervising attorney at Pennie and Edmonds decided
6	they wanted me to work on a project. I can only
7	tell you from my time entry logs when I first have
8	noted that I discussed or entered time related to
9	work on the project.
10	BY MR. SUH:
11	Q. So if I understand, understand correctly,
12	you are telling me that you don't have any records
13	showing the specific dates when any of the cases
14	were assigned to you.
15	Is that correct?
16	MS. PASCAL: Objection.
17	THE WITNESS: I'm sorry.
18	That's correct, yes.
19	BY MR. SUH:
20	Q. And you don't have docketing records
21	showing these dates, the dates in which these five
22	cases were assigned to you.
23	Correct?
24	MS. PASCAL: Objection.
25	MS. BOYD: Objection, form.

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295 Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 83

800-292-4789

1	THE WITNESS: That's correct, I don't know.
2	BY MR. SUH:
3	Q. Can you turn to page 13 of Exhibit 2008?
4	You say "I additionally began with assisting the
5	drafting of a utility patent application for a
6	complex invention in computer simulated prediction
7	of protein structures through a European research
8	laboratory," quote, "The Macromolecular Design
9	Application," end quote. "This application had a
10	bar date of August 31st, 1999, and I worked with law
11	clerks in the Palo Alto and New York offices of the
12	Pennie firm and one attorney in the New York office
13	to complete the application."
14	And you cite to Exhibit 2035 at page 46
15	and 47, which points to August 2nd and 3rd of 1999
16	of your logbook.
17	Is that correct?
18	A. Right. So I would revise also then my
19	answer to the previous question that August 2nd and
20	3rd would be the first day I worked on this as
21	opposed to August 4th.
22	Q. Was it common practice to work with other
23	offices in the 1999 timeframe?
24	MS. PASCAL: Objection, form.
25	THE WITNESS: Yes, it was.

Merrill - Washington D.C.

www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295 Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 84

1	Actually, I'll ask for clarification of
2	your question. Common for me or common for others?
3	MR. SUH: Others.
4	THE WITNESS: Yes.
5	BY MR. SUH:
6	Q. And in fact, you did work with people in
7	the New York office of Pennie.
8	Is that correct?
9	A. Yes.
10	Q. As of August 2nd, 1999, did you finish the
11	SurfCast patent application?
12	A. I don't believe it was complete, no.
13	Q. Isn't it correct that you were tasked to
14	draft the SurfCast patent application before being
15	asked whether you could take on the Macromolecular
16	Design Application?
17	MS. PASCAL: Objection, form,
18	mischaracterizes testimony.
19	THE WITNESS: These cases were asked of me
20	by different people.
21	BY MR. SUH:
22	Q. That's not my question. My question was
23	the dates.
24	A. I started work, me personally, I started
25	work on the Macromolecular Design Application at a

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law

800-292-4789

Page 85

1	later date than I started work on SurfCast. I
2	believe the Macromolecular Design Application had
3	been worked on by the firm, by people at the firm
4	for several months, even prior to my joining the
5	firm. And it was not the work was not
6	MS. BOYD: Let me let me caution the
7	witness not to disclose attorney work product.
8	THE WITNESS: No. Okay.
9	MS. BOYD: Okay?
10	THE WITNESS: Okay.
11	BY MR. SUH:
12	Q. Would you work on a case even though it's
13	not assigned to you?
14	MS. PASCAL: Objection, form.
15	THE WITNESS: What do you mean by assigned
16	to me?
17	BY MR. SUH:
18	Q. Docket it in your docket sheet.
19	MS. PASCAL: Objection, lacks foundation.
20	MS. BOYD: Objection, lacks foundation.
21	THE WITNESS: If that's your definition of
22	assigned, then a number of these cases might not
23	have actually been on my docket sheet.
24	BY MR. SUH:
25	Q. Which cases are those?

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 86

1	A. I it's possible that initially the
2	Macromolecular Design Application might not have
3	been on my docket sheet.
4	Q. But did somebody tell you to work on it?
5	A. Yes.
6	Q. Do you know when?
7	A. It would have been on the first day I
8	started working on it or shortly before that.
9	Q. That would be approximately August 2nd.
10	Is that correct?
11	A. Yes.
12	Q. Why didn't you say no to the
13	Macromolecular Design Application project?
14	MS. PASCAL: Objection.
15	THE WITNESS: I think that's related in my
16	declaration, paragraphs 15, I think, it talks
17	about me having a general need to fill out my
18	docket.
19	BY MR. SUH:
20	Q. So you wanted to build your docket.
21	Is that correct?
22	A. That was certainly something I needed to
23	do at that point.
24	Q. There were other patent attorneys at
25	Pennie that could do this project.

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295 Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 87

1		Correct?
2		MS. BOYD: Objection, form.
3		THE WITNESS: Which project are you talking
4	about?	
5		BY MR. SUH:
6	Q.	I'm sorry about that. Let me clarify.
7		The Macromolecular Design Application?
8	Α.	Actually, that one I felt I would have
9	been the l	best suited person in the firm.
10	Q.	So nobody other than you could work on
11	this proj	ect.
12		Is that correct?
13		MS. BOYD: Objection.
14		THE WITNESS: I would not say that.
15		BY MR. SUH:
16	Q.	So there were other patent attorneys at
17	Pennie who	o were law clerks or patent agents that
18	could wor	k on these projects.
19		Correct?
20		MS. PASCAL: Objection.
21		THE WITNESS: If you are talking about
22	technical	expertise, then certainly probably one or
23	more othe	rs could.
24		In terms of time, I don't know.
25		BY MR. SUH:

Merrill - Washington D.C. 9 www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295 Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 88

1	Q.	And you had the time?
		-
2	Α.	I believe I had the time
3		MS. BOYD: Objection.
4		THE WITNESS: at that point.
5		BY MR. SUH:
6	Q.	So you felt you could push off the
7	SurfCast d	lrafting application since there was no
8	applicatio	on for the SurfCast application.
9		Correct?
10		MS. BOYD: Objection.
11		MS. PASCAL: Objection.
12		MS. BOYD: Foundation.
13		THE WITNESS: I haven't said any of the
14	things tha	at you just put in your question to me.
15		BY MR. SUH:
16	Q.	So
17	A.	So
18	Q.	Let me rephrase.
19	Α.	Yes.
20	Q.	What do you mean, you had time?
21	Α.	I have seven or eight hours each day to
22	work on ma	atters.
23	Q.	Are you done?
24	<u>е</u> . А.	Yes.
25	Q.	So why didn't you finish the SurfCast

Merrill - Washington D.C.

www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 89

1	patent application?
2	MS. BOYD: Objection.
3	MS. PASCAL: Objection, form.
4	THE WITNESS: I believe it's documented
5	through my sequence of time entries that there is a
б	ongoing process of the drafting, there is review and
7	feedback from both SurfCast and the other attorneys
8	I'm working with during that period of time.
9	BY MR. SUH:
10	Q. So was there a due date for the SurfCast
11	patent application?
12	A. I don't recall a specific date being told
13	of me.
14	Q. So you would agree that there were no due
15	dates.
16	Correct?
17	MS. BOYD: Mr. Suh, could I ask you to not
18	put your hand in front of your mouth? Makes it hard
19	for me to hear and understand your questions.
20	Thank you.
21	THE WITNESS: I believe the project was
22	assigned with a view to getting it done quickly. I
23	would not say that there was no due date.
24	BY MR. SUH:
25	Q. What do you mean, quickly?

Merrill - Washington D.C. 800-292-4789 IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295 Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 90

Page 90

1	A. Um
2	Q. As soon as possible?
3	A. Um, I don't recall exactly where that
4	phrase was used. There was certainly a desire to
5	get a patent application prepared and filed.
6	Q. But you accepted the Macromolecular Design
7	Application on August 2nd.
8	Correct?
9	MS. PASCAL: Objection, form.
10	THE WITNESS: Again, that looks like the
11	first day that I worked on it.
12	BY MR. SUH:
13	Q. And why didn't you say no, because you
14	just mentioned that you had to work on the patent,
15	drafting patent application for SurfCast quickly and
16	you haven't finished the SurfCast application as of
17	August 2nd?
18	A. Well, I can refer, I will refer to my
19	declaration and see how I see how I characterize
20	that period of time.
21	(Pause)
22	A. You will see on paragraph 26 on page 12 of
23	Exhibit 2008, in that paragraph I describe that
24	throughout July, in fact well, from July 9th to
25	August 4th I was actually working on the SurfCast

Merrill - Washington D.C.

800-292-4789

www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

Page 91

1	application in some form on each non-weekend day.
2	And on August 4th, I sent to one of the
3	inventors, Mr. Lagermann, by fax a copy of an
4	initial draft and some figures. It's my
5	recollection that I did that in order to provide
6	in order to solicit some feedback from him on those
7	figures.
8	And in the subsequent week, August 5th to
9	10th, I while I was waiting to receive feedback I
10	diverted my attention to the Macromolecular Design
11	Application and the invalidity opinion.
12	I believe there is a record on August 10th
13	or 11th of me asking SurfCast whether they have had
14	a chance to look at the figures, and you can see
15	that from August 11th I then continued to work on
16	the SurfCast matter.
17	So from my point of view, the narrative is
18	pretty clear and consistent.
19	Q. So you said you faxed a copy of initial
20	drafts and figures for the patent applications to
21	Lagermann on August 4th?
22	A. That's what I say here at the end of
23	paragraph 26.
24	Q. Do you recall what you said?
25	MS. PASCAL: Objection. And now objection

Merrill - Washington D.C.

800-292-4789

www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 92

Page 92

1	to the extent calls for any privileged
2	communications.
3	MR. SUH: Counsel, he opened the door to
4	this subject, so we are entitled to that question.
5	MS. PASCAL: I don't know what you are
б	saying he opened the door to. If you want
7	THE WITNESS: I don't remember which
8	specific figures of the figures that appear in the
9	ultimate patent or that were filed with the patent
10	application I sent to Mr. Lagermann on that day.
11	BY MR. SUH:
12	Q. So you don't recall what figures you sent
13	to Mr. Lagermann on August 4th, 1999.
14	Is that correct?
15	A. I don't recall specifically which figures.
16	However, if you asked me to speculate, my
17	speculation would be that it's all of the figures I
18	had drafted to that point and that I considered to
19	be complete and informed for his review.
20	Q. At this point, did you have a complete
21	draft of the patent application as well?
22	A. I don't recall.
23	I will add, though, certain portions of it
24	had been written by that point as you will note from
25	the various time entries that are not redacted.

Merrill - Washington D.C.

800-292-4789

www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 93

1	Q. On page 14, you say you worked on the
2	Macromolecular Design Application culminating,
3	culminating with its filing on August 31st.
4	A. This is of Exhibit 2008?
5	Q. 2008.
6	A. Sorry, which paragraph?
7	Q. It is 30.
8	A. Ah. Yes, I see.
9	Q. Did you file the Macromolecular Design
10	Application in time?
11	A. In time for what?
12	Q. Well, you mentioned that there was a due
13	date.
14	A. My recollection is that there was a bar
15	date on that application due to either a forthcoming
16	conference presentation by the inventors or due to a
17	prior publication. So there was a date that had to
18	be met.
19	I did not personally file the application.
20	As I recall, it was filed from the New York office
21	of Pennie and Edmonds. But it was filed in order to
22	meet the date.
23	Q. Okay. You also say it was complex. How
24	complex was it?
25	A. That's a rather vague question, I will

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295 Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 94

800-292-4789

Page 94

1	say. I believe that the specification ran to quite
2	possibly a hundred pages. I believe there were a
3	number of equations based on molecular mechanics,
4	which is a subject that's was something I was
5	very familiar with from my prior career as a
6	scientist, but I think most law clerks and attorneys
7	at Pennie and Edmonds would not be familiar with.
8	It was a computer based invention. I
9	believed it was complicated.
10	Q. So you would agree that the SurfCast
11	application was not as complex.
12	Correct?
13	A. I don't know.
14	MS. PASCAL: Objection.
15	THE WITNESS: I don't know that I would
16	make that characterization.
17	BY MR. SUH:
18	Q. How long was the SurfCast patent at the
19	time, do you recall?
20	A. I don't recall, although I think it's 40
21	or 50 pages with I think some 25 or more figures.
22	Q. And you said the Macromolecular Design
23	Application was how long?
24	A. About a hundred, I think.
25	Q. )t took you less than a month to start and
25	Q. )t took you less than a month to start and

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law

800-292-4789

finish drafting the Macromolecular Design 1 2 Application. 3 Correct? 4 MS. PASCAL: Objection, misstates testimony. 5 б THE WITNESS: It's not correct. I actually 7 was starting with a draft that a law clerk in the 8 New York office had worked on. 9 BY MR. SUH: Do you know how long he worked on it? 10 Q. 11 Α. It was a lady. I don't know how much time she spent on it, but the draft was substantial, a 12 13 substantial draft to start with. 14 How many patent applications have you Ο. 15 drafted? Me personally? 16 Α. 17 Ο. Yes. In my entire career? 18 Α. 19 Ο. Yeah. 20 Α. Two or 300 probably. 21 And how long does it normally take to Ο. draft from first to finish? 22 23 MS. BOYD: Objection. MS. PASCAL: Objection. 24 MS. BOYD: Form. 25

Merrill - Washington D.C.

www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295 Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 96

Page 96

1	THE WITNESS: Again, I don't know that
2	there is there is there is a simple answer to
3	that because every one is different.
4	Certainly there are cases I might spend
5	several months on if there is backwards and forwards
6	with inventors and so on, equally there have been
7	cases that I have written in less than a day if they
8	are very simple.
9	BY MR. SUH:
10	Q. Less than a day?
11	A. You have to also factor in that over a
12	15-year career, one actually gets more efficient at
13	doing the same tasks. So a case that might only
14	take me a day this year might well have taken me two
15	or three weeks ten years ago.
16	Q. Back in 1999, could you write a patent
17	application within a week?
18	MS. PASCAL: Objection, form.
19	THE WITNESS: I don't know if I can
20	reasonably answer that question, because as I said
21	in my answer to your previous question, there is a
22	lot of variety of the type of technology that could
23	go into a patent application, and it's difficult for
24	me to project backwards as to what my level of skill
25	was then.

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 97

1	BY MR. SUH:
2	Q. On page 14, you say you worked principally
3	on the Macromolecular Design Application and the
4	invalidity opinion, also "familiarized myself with
5	the aspects of the Hydrogen Exchange Portfolio."
б	And this is from August 5th to 10th, 1999.
7	Do you see that?
8	A. Yes.
9	Q. As of August 15th, did you finish the
10	SurfCast patent application?
11	A. I believe you have already asked me this
12	question. The answer is I don't believe I had
13	finished it.
14	Q. That was August 2nd.
15	A. Well, I'll refer to the logbook just one
16	minute.
17	(Pause)
18	A. So I have some entries on August 3rd and
19	4th for SurfCast.
20	Q. That's what I asked.
21	A. Right. So I believe that as of August 5th
22	I had not finished the SurfCast application.
23	Q. And isn't it correct that you were tasked
24	to draft a patent application for SurfCast before
25	being asked whether you could take on this

Merrill - Washington D.C.

www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 98

Page 98

1	Macromolecular Design Application, invalidity
2	opinion, and Hydrogen Exchange Portfolio?
3	MS. BOYD: Objection, asked and answered.
4	MS. PASCAL: Objection to the extent it
5	lacks foundation.
6	MR. SUH: I agree, I believe we have
7	already covered this ground, but just wanted to make
8	a quick reference.
9	THE WITNESS: I'll answer again. My
10	logbook shows that I started work or first had
11	meetings on those cases after the time that I
12	started working on the SurfCast matter.
13	BY MR. SUH:
14	Q. In fact, you didn't work on drafting the
15	SurfCast patent application at all during the period
16	of August 5th to 10th.
17	Is that correct?
18	A. I'll refer to my logbook.
19	(Pause)
20	A. I don't see any entries for SurfCast
21	during those days. So best that I can tell, yes,
22	that's correct.
23	Q. Still on page 14 of Exhibit 2008, you also
24	say that you worked on some initial matters that
25	required immediate attention in the Antimicrobials

Merrill - Washington D.C.

800-292-4789

www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

```
Page 99
```

1	Portfolio, and point to Exhibit 2035 at pages 70,
2	71, 74, and 75 which corresponds to August 26th,
3	27th, 30, and 31.
4	A. I see that.
5	Q. As of August 26th, did you finish the
б	SurfCast patent application?
7	A. To the best of my recollection, no, though
8	did you did you say August 31?
9	Q. It was August 26th, 27, 30, and 31.
10	A. Yes. So on August 31, I did do some work
11	on the SurfCast patent application.
12	Q. But as of August 26th, did you finish the
13	SurfCast patent application?
14	A. I don't believe I did.
15	Q. And isn't it correct that you were tasked
16	to draft the SurfCast patent application before
17	being asked to take on the Antimicrobials Portfolio?
18	MS. PASCAL: Objection, asked and answered.
19	Argumentative.
20	THE WITNESS: I believe that's true. I
21	have a well, if I refer you to Exhibit 2035 at
22	page 11?
23	MR. SUH: Yes.
24	THE WITNESS: The top entry that says 45
25	minutes, 8067-034?

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295 Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 100

800-292-4789

1	MR. SUH: Yes.
2	THE WITNESS: That refers to the
3	Antimicrobials Portfolio. And you'll see that that
4	is that may not be the earliest entry I have for
5	that matter, but it at least dates back to June
6	25th, which is literally days after I started
7	working on SurfCast.
8	BY MR. SUH:
9	Q. Literally days after you first or
10	literally days after you I didn't hear your
11	A. Sorry. Literally days after I first
12	started working on SurfCast, yes.
13	Q. My recollection is that you first worked
14	on SurfCast way back in June 18th.
15	MS. PASCAL: Objection, argumentative,
16	form.
17	BY MR. SUH:
18	Q. Isn't that correct?
19	A. Yes. But June 18th to June 25 is
20	Q. We are talking about August here, just
21	to
22	A. No, I'm talking about June. So I'm
23	referring you to Exhibit 2035 at page 11.
24	Q. All right.
25	A. There was a time entry narrative for June

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law

800-292-4789

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 101

25, 80 -- excuse me 8067-034, that is the 1 2 Antimicrobials Portfolio. 3 Thank you. Thanks for the clarification. Ο. 4 Α. That is just a few days after starting work on SurfCast. 5 So as of June 25th, had you finished 6 Q. 7 drafting the SurfCast patent application? I don't believe so, no. 8 Α. 9 0. So why didn't you say no to this new project? You testified that it included more than 10 11 one matter. 12 I believe I had answered this previously, Α. 13 but I am new to the firm and with essentially an empty docket, and there is a process of trying to 14 15 get me up to speed on various types of matters and to fill that docket. 16 17 Ο. So you didn't have enough work to do. Is that a fair characterization? 18 MS. PASCAL: Objection, form. 19 20 THE WITNESS: I don't think that's a fair characterization. I think that I am starting off 21 and I am taking in work, you know, to the extent I 22 have time available. 23 BY MR. SUH: 24 25 Q. You also mentioned it required immediate

> Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 102

1	attention. We are back to page 14 of Exhibit 2008.
2	A. Yes.
3	Q. Why did it require immediate attention?
4	MS. PASCAL: Objection, form.
5	MS. BOYD: Caution the witness not to
б	disclose attorney-client privileged communications.
7	THE WITNESS: I don't have a specific
8	recollection, but I can I can speculate, given
9	the types of matters involved.
10	MR. SUH: Please do.
11	THE WITNESS: I will refer also to my
12	logbook.
13	BY MR. SUH: And this is in your
14	declaration. I'd like to note that.
15	THE WITNESS: I understand. But it refers
16	to Exhibit 2035 at some pages.
17	(Pause)
18	THE WITNESS: Again, I don't have a
19	specific recollection of the actual work that I did
20	in that timeframe, but I can but I can speculate
21	based on the type of the portfolio in question.
22	BY MR. SUH:
23	Q. So what is your basis of saying that it
24	required immediate attention?
25	A. So providing speculation for you, I think

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law

that what happened is that one or more patent 1 2 applications in that portfolio had docketed dates 3 that required some action. 4 0. So I'm trying to understand. So you are -- are you saying that your declaration is based 5 on speculation? 6 7 MS. PASCAL: Objection. THE WITNESS: No, because I base the 8 declaration on the original copy of this exhibit, 9 which I do not have in front of me. The original 10 11 copy was not redacted. 12 So I'm speculating as of based on what's 13 in front of me now. 14 BY MR. SUH: 15 Ο. So based on the Exhibit 2035 that was filed, you can't tell me why it required immediate 16 17 attention. Is that correct? 18 I can tell you that it required 19 Α. No. 20 attention because of some due dates. 21 No, no. Why it required immediate Ο. 22 attention. 23 MS. PASCAL: Objection, form, 24 argumentative. 25 THE WITNESS: I believe I just answered the

> Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law

800-292-4789

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 104

1	question.
2	BY MR. SUH:
3	Q. I'm sorry, I thought you answered whether
4	it required immediate attention. But my question
5	was you can't tell me why it required immediate
6	attention based on Exhibit 2035 as filed?
7	A. Based on what I believe to be likely to
8	have happened with that particular matter, I believe
9	there was some due dates in that period that
10	required addressing. That's my best recollection.
11	I can't tell you what specifically.
12	Q. Was there any attorney-client
13	communications that triggered this immediate
14	attention?
15	MS. PASCAL: Objection.
16	THE WITNESS: I don't recall.
17	BY MR. SUH:
18	Q. So you don't recall if there were any
19	attorney-client communications on this matter.
20	Is that correct?
21	MS. PASCAL: Objection to form.
22	THE WITNESS: There were definitely some
23	attorney-client communications in the period covered
24	in this logbook. I don't remember specifically
25	whether it's this exact date.

Merrill - Washington D.C.

1	BY MR. SUH:
2	Q. Isn't it true that you didn't work on
3	drafting the SurfCast patent application at all
4	during the period of August 20 to 30th?
5	A. Let me look at the declaration.
б	(Pause)
7	A. Looks like I had a meeting with Mr. Gray
8	August 24th, 1999, paragraph 31 of Exhibit 2008, and
9	that meeting was to discuss according to my
10	narrative the timing of completing a first draft of
11	the SurfCast application.
12	Q. Which day is this?
13	A. It's August 24th, 1999. So it would be
14	page 68 of Exhibit 2035.
14 15	page 68 of Exhibit 2035. MS. BOYD: Sorry.
15	MS. BOYD: Sorry.
15 16	MS. BOYD: Sorry. (Pause)
15 16 17	MS. BOYD: Sorry. (Pause) THE WITNESS: I don't see any other entries
15 16 17 18	MS. BOYD: Sorry. (Pause) THE WITNESS: I don't see any other entries for SurfCast during the time period you mentioned.
15 16 17 18 19	MS. BOYD: Sorry. (Pause) THE WITNESS: I don't see any other entries for SurfCast during the time period you mentioned. BY MR. SUH:
15 16 17 18 19 20	MS. BOYD: Sorry. (Pause) THE WITNESS: I don't see any other entries for SurfCast during the time period you mentioned. BY MR. SUH: Q. And even on August 24th, it only says
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MS. BOYD: Sorry. (Pause) THE WITNESS: I don't see any other entries for SurfCast during the time period you mentioned. BY MR. SUH: Q. And even on August 24th, it only says "Talked with Andrew Gray regarding timing of
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MS. BOYD: Sorry. (Pause) THE WITNESS: I don't see any other entries for SurfCast during the time period you mentioned. BY MR. SUH: Q. And even on August 24th, it only says "Talked with Andrew Gray regarding timing of SurfCast application." It doesn't say that you
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<pre>MS. BOYD: Sorry. (Pause) THE WITNESS: I don't see any other entries for SurfCast during the time period you mentioned. BY MR. SUH: Q. And even on August 24th, it only says "Talked with Andrew Gray regarding timing of SurfCast application." It doesn't say that you worked on drafting the patent application, does it?</pre>

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law

800-292-4789

1	Gray?
2	MS. BOYD: Objection.
3	MS. PASCAL: Objection. Calls for
4	privileged information.
5	MR. SUH: Are you instructing him not to
6	answer?
7	MS. PASCAL: I am giving I am objecting
8	to privilege.
9	MR. SUH: Just for the record.
10	MS. PASCAL: If you want to ask him if he
11	is going to follow the instructions of counsel you
12	ask can ask him that. I don't believe he testified
13	to that.
14	BY MR. SUH:
15	Q. Are you going to answer?
16	A. I can only state to you what the time
16 17	A. I can only state to you what the time entry log says and what I put in my declaration, and
17	entry log says and what I put in my declaration, and
17 18	entry log says and what I put in my declaration, and they both say the same thing, that the meeting
17 18 19	entry log says and what I put in my declaration, and they both say the same thing, that the meeting discussed the timing of completing the first draft
17 18 19 20	entry log says and what I put in my declaration, and they both say the same thing, that the meeting discussed the timing of completing the first draft of the application.
17 18 19 20 21	entry log says and what I put in my declaration, and they both say the same thing, that the meeting discussed the timing of completing the first draft of the application. Q. Other than this, you don't recall
17 18 19 20 21 22	<pre>entry log says and what I put in my declaration, and they both say the same thing, that the meeting discussed the timing of completing the first draft of the application. Q. Other than this, you don't recall discussing any other matters with Andrew Gray on</pre>
17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<pre>entry log says and what I put in my declaration, and they both say the same thing, that the meeting discussed the timing of completing the first draft of the application. Q. Other than this, you don't recall discussing any other matters with Andrew Gray on this date, do you?</pre>

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 107

1	is no entry on it.
2	Q. On page 15 of Exhibit 2008?
3	A. Yes.
4	Q. And looking at September 5 to 10, 1999,
5	you say you worked on the Hydrogen Exchange
6	Portfolio in order to file an application by a
7	statutory bar date.
8	And you also say this work could not be
9	postponed any later than this period of time due to
10	the statutory bar on claiming benefit of the
11	priority to the provisional application.
12	Do you see that?
13	A. I do.
14	Q. So why didn't you ask others for help on
15	this Hydrogen Exchange Portfolio?
16	MS. PASCAL: Objection, lacks foundation.
17	BY MR. SUH:
18	Q. It could not be postponed, as you stated?
19	A. I don't
20	MS. BOYD: Same objection.
21	THE WITNESS: I don't remember asking
22	others for help. I was supervised by an attorney in
23	that matter.
24	BY MR. SUH:
25	Q. So isn't it correct that you postponed

Merrill - Washington D.C.

800-292-4789

www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 108

work on the SurfCast application because of this 1 2 Hydrogen Exchange Portfolio? 3 MS. PASCAL: Objection, form. 4 THE WITNESS: I will look at my logbook again. 5 6 (Pause) 7 THE WITNESS: I don't have any entries for SurfCast in that period, that's correct. 8 9 BY MR. SUH: 10 Q. And when you say that period, are you 11 talking about September 5th to 10th? Α. I am. 12 13 So you agree that you didn't work on Ο. drafting the SurfCast patent application at all 14 15 during the period of September 5th to 10th. 16 Right? 17 MS. PASCAL: Objection, asked and answered. THE WITNESS: That's correct. I believe I 18 would have said that. 19 20 BY MR. SUH: We can move on to page 16 of Exhibit 2008. 21 Ο. 22 If you look at September 15th to 21, you say you worked on preparing the first draft of the 23 24 invalidity opinion and attended to a number of 25 outstanding matters in the Antimicrobials Portfolio.

> Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law

1	Do you see that?
2	A. Yes.
3	Q. As of September 15th, did you finish the
4	SurfCast patent application?
5	A. I don't specifically recall, but I don't
6	believe so.
7	Q. Was there any due date for the invalidity
8	opinion?
9	MS. BOYD: Caution the witness about
10	attorney-client privileged communications.
11	THE WITNESS: Noted.
12	I don't recall there being a specific due
13	date, but there was a sense of urgency for that
14	project, and although I don't have a specific
15	recollection of the reason for this project, as a
16	general matter projects of that nature are prompted
17	by typically by either a client having been
18	contacted by the patent owner or by the client
19	wanting to release a product, and therefore wanting
20	to have the opinion done before that date.
21	BY MR. SUH:
22	Q. Was there any contact by the client on
23	this matter?
24	MS. BOYD: Objection. Calls for
25	attorney-client privileged communication. Caution

800-292-4789

IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

the witness not to reveal that communication. 1 2 THE WITNESS: There was contact with the 3 client on that project. 4 BY MR. SUH: What was that about? 5 Q. MS. BOYD: Objection and instruction. 6 7 THE WITNESS: I can't reveal attorney-client privilege. All I can say is that I 8 and the other attorneys working on that matter had 9 contact with the client during the period that's 10 11 covered in this logbook. BY MR. SUH: 12 13 If we focus down to September 15th to Ο. 21st, was there any contact with the client? 14 15 Α. I would have to look at my logbook and 16 see. 17 Ο. Please do. (Pause) 18 MS. BOYD: I'll object to this question as 19 20 irrelevant as well. 21 (Pause) THE WITNESS: I can't tell that -- I can't 22 23 tell exactly what was done because those entries are 24 redacted in the copy that's in front of us. I know that there were several, well, I will say more than 25

Merrill - Washington D.C.

800-292-4789

IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

www.merrillcorp.com/law

one visit by the client to our office in the period 1 2 covered in the logbook. It's possible one of those was in that period. I can't say. 3 4 BY MR. SUH: So based on the evidence, evidence of 5 Ο. record, you can't -- you can't tell me whether there 6 7 was a client contact during this period. 8 Is that correct? 9 MS. BOYD: Objection, form. THE WITNESS: I can't tell you based on, 10 11 that's correct, based on what's in front of me. BY MR. SUH: 12 13 Isn't it true that you didn't work on 0. drafting of the SurfCast patent application at all 14 15 during the period of September 15th to 21st? Again, let me look at the chart and the 16 Α. 17 logbook. 18 (Pause) 19 MS. BOYD: Can you read that question back 20 for me, please? 21 (Whereupon, the reporter read back the record as follows: 22 23 "Isn't it true that you didn't work 24 on drafting of the SurfCast patent 25 application at all during the

> Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law

IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

1	period of September 15th to 21st?")
2	MS. BOYD: Thank you.
3	MS. PASCAL: Objection, asked and answered.
4	THE WITNESS: Did you say between September
5	15 and 21?
б	MR. SUH: September 15 and 21. It's a
7	different range.
8	THE WITNESS: No, that's the range I was
9	just talking about in answer to your previous
10	question about the invalidity opinion.
11	MR. SUH: Okay.
12	THE WITNESS: Do you agree?
13	BY MR. SUH:
14	Q. I might have forgotten. But is that a yes
15	or no? I just wanted to clarify the record.
16	A. Well, I would like to clarify it too. I
17	understood your previous question about the
18	invalidity opinion and whether there was a client
19	contact to refer to the period September 15 through
20	21.
21	Q. Is that right?
22	A. 1999. I answered based on that.
23	I understand now you asked what I did for
24	SurfCast during the same period, September 15
25	through 21.

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295 Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 113

1	Q.	That's right. That's why I asked you a
2	different	question.
3	Α.	I thought it was a different period.
4		There is some work for SurfCast on
5	September	15th, and on September 17th.
б		(Pause)
7	Α.	And on that's it, exactly. September
8	15th, Sept	tember 17th.
9	Q.	September 15th you write time entry .1
10	hour. Is	this what you were referring to?
11	Α.	Let me take a look.
12		(Pause)
13	Α.	No. There is there is an item that's
14	actually i	redacted. It's further up the page, one
14 15		redacted. It's further up the page, one our, middle of the page, 9982-009-999.
15	quarter ho	our, middle of the page, 9982-009-999.
15 16	quarter ho Q.	our, middle of the page, 9982-009-999. That's .25 hours?
15 16 17	quarter ho Q. A. there.	our, middle of the page, 9982-009-999. That's .25 hours?
15 16 17 18	quarter ho Q. A. there.	our, middle of the page, 9982-009-999. That's .25 hours? Yes. And September 17 there is an entry
15 16 17 18 19	quarter ho Q. A. there. Q.	our, middle of the page, 9982-009-999. That's .25 hours? Yes. And September 17 there is an entry Are you done?
15 16 17 18 19 20	quarter ho Q. A. there. Q. A.	our, middle of the page, 9982-009-999. That's .25 hours? Yes. And September 17 there is an entry Are you done? I am.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	quarter ho Q. A. there. Q. A. Q.	our, middle of the page, 9982-009-999. That's .25 hours? Yes. And September 17 there is an entry Are you done? I am.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	quarter ho Q. A. there. Q. A. Q. find it.	our, middle of the page, 9982-009-999. That's .25 hours? Yes. And September 17 there is an entry Are you done? I am. Where is that entry on the 17th? Can't
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	quarter ho Q. A. there. Q. A. Q. find it.	our, middle of the page, 9982-009-999. That's .25 hours? Yes. And September 17 there is an entry Are you done? I am. Where is that entry on the 17th? Can't Oh.

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 114

1	from the bottom of the page. It's not redacted.
2	Q. Arrange for a transfer
3	A. Yes.
4	Q of documents to be prepared?
5	A. Yes.
б	Q. This says nothing about drafting a patent
7	application, does it?
8	A. Correct.
9	Q. So other than the .25 hours on September
10	15th well, strike that.
11	From September 16th to September 21st, you
12	didn't work on drafting the SurfCast patent
13	application at all.
14	Is that correct?
15	MS. BOYD: Objection, misstates the
16	witness' testimony, misstates the document.
17	THE WITNESS: I can say there is no time
18	entry that reflects that.
19	So just to be clear, the period you
20	mentioned contains two business days, 16th and 17th,
21	Thursday, Friday, and two weekend days, 18th, 19th,
22	and then two further days, Monday 20 Monday the
23	20th and Tuesday the 21st.
24	BY MR. SUH:
25	Q. You mentioned September 18th and 19th?

1	A. Yes.
2	Q. Isn't it correct that there are six matter
3	entries on these dates?
4	A. It is.
5	Q. So why did you work on these days?
6	MS. PASCAL: Objection. Strike that.
7	THE WITNESS: Again, I mean, without
8	specific recollection, I can only speculate that it
9	would be because I had not completed the work in the
10	prior week and I felt that it needed to be done or
11	had been told that it needed to be done.
12	BY MR. SUH:
13	Q. Did you work on a SurfCast matter during
14	these days?
15	A. There is no entry to reflect that I did on
16	those two days, that's correct.
17	Q. Did you finish drafting the SurfCast
18	patent application as of September 17th?
19	A. Not as far as I recall.
20	Q. Do you recall why you didn't work on the
21	SurfCast patent application rather than these
22	redacted entries which amount to almost seven hours
23	per day each?
24	MS. PASCAL: Objection, form.
25	
	THE WITNESS: I do not recall.

Merrill - Washington D.C.

800-292-4789

www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

1	BY MR. SUH:
2	Q. So if you go to page 14 of Exhibit 2008,
3	you say that you had to attend classes on campus
4	from 6:00 to 9:00 on four nights per week beginning
5	on August 11th.
6	Do you see that?
7	A. Yes.
8	Q. Did Pennie assign anyone else to help you
9	since you had to go to school?
10	A. Not that I am aware.
11	Q. Did you ask for help?
12	A. Did I ask for help with what?
13	Q. To accommodate your going to school
14	schedule.
15	A. I don't believe I did.
16	MR. SUH: So I think this is a good time to
17	have a break. What time is it now?
18	MS. PASCAL: Quarter to 12:00.
19	MR. SUH: You want to have a lunch break?
20	Or
21	MS. BOYD: Sure.
22	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Okay. Going off the
23	record, the time is 11:45.
24	(Whereupon, the lunch recess taken at 11:45 P.M.)
25	000

800-292-4789

IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

12:36 P.M. 1 AFTERNOON SESSION 2 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the The time is 12:36. 3 record. 4 BY MR. SUH: Did you talk to your counsel during the 5 0. break? б 7 We had a conversation. Α. Ο. About what? 8 Schools for our children, where, which 9 Α. firms we had worked at. 10 11 Q. So you didn't talk to your counsel about anything about the case during the break. 12 13 Is that correct? 14 Α. Correct. Yes. 15 0. So let's turn to Exhibit 2035, at page 7. And there is an entry, 0.5 hours of Web searching 16 17 for software patent. You can't tell me specifically what software patents are referred to in this, in 18 19 this entry, can you? 20 Α. I can, actually. Which ones? 21 Q. It's the SurfCast patent application. 22 Α. Do you specifically remember what you did 23 Q. on this date? 24 25 Α. No, beyond what's written here.

Merrill - Washington D.C.

www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

1	Q. So you don't have any evidence of what you
2	specifically did on this date, do you?
3	MS. PASCAL: Objection.
4	THE WITNESS: This is the evidence of what
5	I did on that day.
6	BY MR. SUH:
7	Q. Other than this, you don't have any
8	evidence of what you specifically did on this date,
9	do you?
10	A. Not other than this, me personally, no.
11	Q. On this day you were looking at what
12	existed before, not the SurfCast alleged invention.
13	Is that correct?
14	MS. PASCAL: Objection, form.
15	THE WITNESS: Could you restate the
16	question, please?
17	BY MR. SUH:
18	Q. You were looking at prior art rather than
19	the invention.
20	Is that correct?
21	MS. PASCAL: Objection.
22	THE WITNESS: I think that's likely, yes.
23	BY MR. SUH:
24	Q. Let's go to page 8, this is for June 22nd.
25	Do you specifically remember what you did on this

Merrill - Washington D.C.

www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

1	date?
2	A. Not with greater detail than what is
3	described this logbook.
4	Q. So other than what's written here, you
5	don't remember anything about what you did on this
б	day.
7	Is that correct?
8	A. That's correct.
9	Q. So you don't specifically remember what
10	you talked about on this day it says "Talk with
11	Brett about, talk with Brett and Andrew."
12	Do you remember what you talked about on
13	this date?
14	A. Not specifically.
15	Q. So other than this, you don't have any
16	evidence of what you did on this day, do you?
17	MS. PASCAL: Objection, form.
18	THE WITNESS: I believe you have asked me
19	this. But the answer is no. What is written here
20	is the best description I have of what I did on that
21	day.
22	BY MR. SUH:
23	Q. And there is a billing number here. The
24	billing number 9982-0005-999 appears, and this
25	billing number indicates that these conversations

Merrill - Washington D.C.

800-292-4789

www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

Page 120

1	were related to patentability assessment.
2	Is that correct?
3	A. Based on the matter numbers we have
4	already talked about today that's correct. But I
5	have also already told you in answer to a previous
6	question that particularly in this period of time of
7	the first few days I worked at Pennie there may have
8	been some inaccuracy in the way I characterized, or
9	the way I associated the matter number with a
10	description.
11	Q. This description writing in "Web
12	searching" relates to writing about the
13	patentability assessment.
14	Isn't that right?
15	MS. PASCAL: Objection, overbroad.
16	THE WITNESS: I don't believe it is,
17	because I personally did not write anything in
18	connection with patentability assessment. My
19	writing was on the SurfCast patent application.
20	BY MR. SUH:
21	Q. You mentioned the invalidity opinion
22	before.
23	MS. PASCAL: Objection, form.
24	THE WITNESS: So when did I when did I
25	talk about that? What are you what are you

Merrill - Washington D.C.

800-292-4789

www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

1	referring to?
2	BY MR. SUH:
3	Q. When we were talking about writing and Web
4	searching you mentioned an opinion.
5	Do you recall that?
б	A. No, I don't. Perhaps you can have them
7	read the transcript back.
8	MR. SUH: Yeah, can you find the portion?
9	(Whereupon, the reporter read back
10	the record as follows:
11	"9982-0009-888 referred to a
12	provisional patent application.
13	9982-0005-999 related I think to an
14	opinion matter.")
15	BY MR. SUH:
16	Q. Can you elaborate on that?
17	MS. PASCAL: Objection, form.
18	THE WITNESS: Would you please repeat the
19	exact narrative or the exact answer that I gave to
20	the question?
21	(Whereupon, the reporter read back
22	the record as follows:
23	"Q. Okay. And the numbers
24	following 9982, were these numbers
25	for different tasks that SurfCast

Merrill - Washington D.C.

www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 122

1	asked Pennie to undertake?
2	"MS. BOYD: Objection, form.
3	"THE WITNESS: Yes. The
4	numbers following the hyphen after
5	9982 relate to different matters.
6	"BY MR. SUH:
7	"So what were the different tasks?
8	"MS. PASCAL: Objection.
9	"MS. BOYD: Objection.
10	"MS. PASCAL: Form.
11	"THE WITNESS: Are you asking
12	me about these numbers or any
13	number?
14	"BY MR. SUH:
15	"Q. The four numbers that you
16	mention in your declaration.
17	"A. Okay. So 9982-00 0009-999
18	referred to a utility patent
19	application. 9982-0009-888
20	referred to a provisional patent
21	application. 9982-0005-999 related
22	I think to an opinion matter.
23	9982-0002-999 related to a general
24	billable matter, and sometimes
25	sometimes called general

Merrill - Washington D.C.

800-292-4789

www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

1	corporate.")
2	BY MR. SUH:
3	Q. So you referred to 9982-0005-999 as an
4	opinion matter.
5	A. That's correct. And if you look at my
6	declaration, Exhibit 2008, it's paragraph
7	paragraph 18 on page 9, you can see that the entries
8	designated as 9982-0005-999 I'm reading from this
9	paragraph now pertain to a separate matter number
10	established for a patentability assessment and prior
11	art search carried out for the invention described
12	in the SurfCast patent application.
13	I used the term "opinion" loosely in the
14	sense that it's a matter that calls for a attorney
15	analysis.
16	Q. So you put that number down indicating
17	that you were working on a patentability assessment
18	just after doing a Web search for prior art, and are
19	you telling me that you are not really doing a
20	patentability assessment?
21	MS. PASCAL: Objection.
22	MS. BOYD: Mischaracterizes the witness'
23	testimony.
24	THE WITNESS: I believe that I have
25	addressed almost this exact question at least once

800-292-4789

IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

1	now during this deposition.
2	So firstly, in this period of time, this
3	is within my first week at Pennie and Edmonds, it's
4	entirely possible that I was grouping, for example,
5	writing and Web searching under one matter number,
6	maybe not knowing at that time what the patent
7	application matter number was.
8	My recollection of my activities at the
9	firm were that I did not do any writing in
10	connection with patentability assessment. My
11	writing was on the patent application itself.
12	So where it says "Writing and Web
13	searching," I believe I was beginning to write
14	perhaps initial portions of the patent application.
15	Web searching is in connection with the types of
16	research you do in that process. You need to know
17	something about references, material that come
18	before in time.
19	BY MR. SUH:
20	Q. So can you show me anywhere in this
21	document, 2030, Exhibit No. 2035 where it suggests
22	that these entries do not relate the patentability
23	assessment?
24	MS. PASCAL: Objection, form.
25	THE WITNESS: I have told you this is I

800-292-4789

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 125

Page 125

1	wrote the entries in this document, and so I know
2	what they describe. And I have told you that they
3	describe some writing, and my only writing for
4	SurfCast was for the patent application.
5	BY MR. SUH:
б	Q. Isn't it common for inventors to have a
7	patentability assessment performed before they spend
8	money on drafting a patent application?
9	MS. BOYD: Objection, form.
10	MS. PASCAL: Objection, form. Relevance.
11	THE WITNESS: I can't say the answer to
12	that is yes. I think different people behave in
13	different ways. Sometimes the patentability
14	assessment is done concurrently or in conjunction
15	with drafting a patent application.
16	BY MR. SUH:
17	Q. Did you have any experience in drafting,
18	doing a patentability analysis before drafting a
19	patent application?
20	MS. BOYD: Objection, form.
21	THE WITNESS: Over what period of time are
22	you addressing the question?
23	BY MR. SUH:
24	Q. Any time.
25	A. Can you restate the question?
L	

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295 Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 126

1	Q. Have you ever, has it ever happened to you
2	drafting a patentability analysis before drafting a
3	patent application?
4	MS. BOYD: Objection, form. Objection,
5	relevance.
б	THE WITNESS: I believe during my career I
7	have almost certainly carried out a patentability
8	assessment before drafting an application. That's
9	correct.
10	Whether I have actually reduced the
11	patentability assessment to writing, I don't think I
12	very often do that. In fact, hardly ever.
13	BY MR. SUH:
14	Q. So you never take notes?
15	MS. BOYD: Objection.
16	MS. PASCAL: Objection.
17	THE WITNESS: That's not what I said.
18	That's that's a large step from what I said.
19	BY MR. SUH:
20	Q. "Writing" is a broad term. Don't you
21	agree?
22	A. Well, I say "Reducing the patentability,"
23	et cetera, "to writing." That's totally different
24	from taking notes.
25	Q. Well, I am looking at this entry, it says

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 127

1	"Writing."
2	A. Yes.
3	Q. That's all it says.
4	A. And I have already told you that I believe
5	it means writing in the patent application.
6	Q. So you say you believe. Do you know as a
7	matter of fact?
8	A. I am confident.
9	Q. It is documented there is no mention of
10	tiles or refresh rates on this date.
11	Is that correct?
12	A. So could you please restate the question?
13	Q. The entry on this date, June 22nd, it's at
14	page 8 of Exhibit 2035?
15	A. Yes.
16	Q. Is there any mention of tiles or refresh
17	rates?
18	A. There is no mention of tiles and refresh
19	rates. And I also I am also prepared to say that
20	in this logbook I don't think you will find those
21	terms mentioned.
22	Q. Thank you.
23	A. Right.
24	Q. Let's go to page 24. It's your entry on
25	July 9th. Says "Miscellaneous activity for SurfCast

```
Page 128
```

in SurfCast's patent download." 1 2 Do you specifically remember what you did on this date? 3 4 Α. I don't specifically remember, no. So other than this notebook, you don't 5 Ο. have any evidence of what you did on this date, do 6 7 you? Well, if you would permit me to look at 8 Α. the un-redacted form of this notebook, the entries 9 that you see in front of you is redacted may give me 10 11 some indication of other things I did on that day. 12 But beyond that, I can't say that I know 13 now specifically what I did on July 9th, 1999. Okay. So as documented, you did not work 14 Ο. 15 on drafting the SurfCast patent application on this 16 date. 17 Correct? I don't believe that's a fair 18 Α. 19 extrapolation. Where does it say you worked on drafting 20 0. the SurfCast patent application on this date? 21 It doesn't say that. But it said I 22 Α. carried out some work for SurfCast, and at that time 23 24 my work for SurfCast was working on the patent 25 application.

800-292-4789

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295 Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 129

1	I don't believe that I don't believe
2	that working on the patent application is limited to
3	drafting portions of it. Working on it can include
4	research.
5	Q. So if I understand correctly, as
б	documented, there is no mention of drafting a patent
7	application for SurfCast on this date.
8	Is that correct?
9	A. Based on what's in this logbook it does
10	not say "drafting the patent application for
11	SurfCast," that's correct.
12	Q. So let's move on to page 30.
13	A. I also before we do that, I also want to
14	draw your attention to a paragraph in my
15	declaration, if you let me find that for a minute.
16	(Pause)
17	A. You will see, I am in Exhibit 2008 on page
18	8, footnote 3, in that footnote I describe my work
19	habit for writing entries in my logbook, and it
20	states that over the period of time you were just
21	looking at including July 9th, my narratives were
22	quite brief and not necessarily fully descriptive,
23	and I developed a more consistent habit later on
24	during this period.
25	Q. Okay. So if you can turn to page 30?

Merrill - Washington D.C.

800-292-4789

www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 130

1	A. Yes.
2	Q. This is for July 15th, and there is one
3	hour of SurfCast patent download and one hour of
4	SurfCast reading.
5	A. Yes.
6	Q. Do you specifically remember what you did
7	on this date?
8	A. I do not specifically remember beyond what
9	is what is described here.
10	And I'll repeat my answer to your prior
11	question, there is a portion of time here that's
12	redacted. It's possible that if I see the
13	un-redacted version I may be reminded of other
14	things I did on that day.
15	Q. Okay. And you don't have any evidence of
16	what you specifically did on this date other than
17	what's written here on Exhibit 2035?
18	A. I don't believe I do, that's correct.
19	Q. You were looking at what existed before,
20	not SurfCast alleged investigation on this day.
21	Correct?
22	A. I don't believe that's correct.
23	Q. Why is that?
24	A. There is an entry one hour SurfCast
25	reading.

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295 Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 131

1	Q. And do you specifically remember what you
2	were reading on this day?
3	A. I don't specifically remember, but I know
4	that as part of preparing the patent application I
5	was reading about aspects of the technology that I
6	was going to write about, not just what might have
7	been in the prior art.
8	Q. You downloaded patents. Do you know what
9	you downloaded?
10	A. I don't remember specifically which
11	patents I downloaded.
12	Q. Does it say that you did not read these
13	downloaded patents on this date?
14	MS. PASCAL: Objection, form.
15	THE WITNESS: It does not say that I did
16	not read those patents.
17	BY MR. SUH:
18	Q. So that is a possibility. Correct?
19	A. It is a possibility. But as I said to you
20	earlier, those patent well, as I said to you
21	earlier, part of my reading to have included reading
22	material, reading about material that I described in
23	the application, and that may have been included in
24	some of the patents I downloaded.
25	Q. But you don't remember as a fact whether

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law

800-292-4789

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 132

you did read the draft patent application rather 1 2 than something else, do you? 3 MS. PASCAL: Objection, form. 4 THE WITNESS: That's correct, I do not remember. 5 BY MR. SUH: 6 7 And as documented, you did not work on Ο. drafting the SurfCast patent application on this 8 9 date. Is that correct? 10 11 MS. BOYD: Objection, form. THE WITNESS: So I'll answer as I have 12 13 answered the previous questions. There is not a written narrative on this page that says I drafted 14 15 the patent application. But I consider my work for SurfCast in 16 17 this period to be unified in the sense that it 18 was -- it was directed towards the patent 19 application preparation process. 20 BY MR. SUH: So let's turn to page 31. It's an entry 21 Ο. for July 16th, .5 hours of get book from Stacy's for 22 SurfCast, and expense form for SurfCast, and this is 23 for one hour. 24 25 Who is Stacy?

> Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295 Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 133

1	A. Stacy's is the name of a bookstore that
2	existed at that time on University Avenue in Palo
3	Alto. It specialized in scientific and computer
4	based books.
5	Q. Do you remember what books you got from
6	Stacy's?
7	A. I don't remember them by title, although
8	I I think I remember just generally what they
9	were about.
10	Q. What was that about?
11	A. There was it was either about I'm
12	just trying to remember. Either about computer
13	networks or something called Web channels, I think.
14	Q. So you are you finished?
15	A. Iam.
16	Q. So you were looking at what existed
17	before, not SurfCast alleged invention.
18	Is that correct?
19	MS. PASCAL: Objection. Form.
20	THE WITNESS: I don't know if that's
21	correct.
22	BY MR. SUH:
23	Q. Why is that?
24	A. I don't know. You can deduce that from
25	this entry. I went to get a book.

Merrill - Washington D.C.

www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

1	Q. In fact, there is no indication as to
2	whether you even read the book, is that correct, on
3	this day?
4	A. On this day, that's correct, it does not
5	say that I read the book.
6	Q. So as documented, you did not work on
7	drafting the SurfCast patent application on this
8	day.
9	Is that correct?
10	MS. PASCAL: Objection.
11	MS. BOYD: Objection.
12	MS. PASCAL: Form. Mischaracterizes
13	testimony.
14	THE WITNESS: As I have said to you
15	previously, I consider at that time there were a lot
16	of things that I did that went towards the
17	preparation of the patent application, including
18	getting materials.
19	BY MR. SUH:
20	Q. That was not my question. My question
21	was, did you work on drafting the patent application
22	on this date?
23	MS. PASCAL: Objection, form. And asked
24	and answered.
25	MS. BOYD: Argumentative.

800-292-4789

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

1	THE WITNESS: I believe I have already
2	answered this question, but I'll state again,
3	according to these entries on this page I did not
4	draft portions of the patent application on this
5	day.
б	BY MR. SUH:
7	Q. Okay. Let's go to page 36. This is an
8	entry for July 21st.
9	A. Okay.
10	Q. There is an entry for one-and-a-half-hour
11	meeting with AG AJG in August and Klaus Lagermann
12	and .25 hour for talking with AJG, and half an hour
13	organizing trip to New York.
14	Do you remember what you did on this day?
15	A. Okay. Consistent with my previous answer,
16	what is written here describes what I did. I don't
17	have specific recollection, recollection of these
18	events beyond what is written.
19	Q. So you don't remember what you talked
20	about on this date.
21	Is that
22	A. Correct.
23	Q. And as documented, you did not work on
24	drafting the SurfCast patent application.
25	Correct?

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295 Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 136

1		MS. BOYD: Objection.
2		MS. PASCAL: Object to form.
3		BY MR. SUH:
4	Q.	On this date, just to clarify.
5	Α.	Again, I will reiterate, the narratives do
6	not state	that I drafted the application. But as I
7	have said	before, I considered meetings,
8	discussio	ns, and other activities were all connected
9	with the p	process of preparing the patent
10	applicati	on.
11	Q.	So if we can go to page 36?
12	Α.	We are on
13		MS. BOYD: We are on
14		BY MR. SUH:
15	Q.	Oh, I'm sorry, page 37. And this is an
16	entry for	July 22nd?
17	Α.	Yes.
18	Q.	I see .25 hours of travel arrangements and
19	1.5 hours	of SurfCast patent downloading. And do
20	you remem	ber what you were downloading?
21	Α.	I do not specifically remember.
22	Q.	You would agree you were downloading what
23	existed b	efore, not SurfCast alleged invention.
24		Correct?
25		MS. PASCAL: Objection, object to form.

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 137

1	THE WITNESS: I believe I use this term
2	"patent downloading" to mean retrieving patents from
3	Websites such as the PTO Website or maybe a third
4	party vendor called MicroPatent.
5	Sometimes I was downloading patents that I
6	considered to be exemplary in the software space.
7	Sometimes I was downloading patents that I thought
8	were relevant to the SurfCast invention.
9	BY MR. SUH:
10	Q. So you were looking at what existed
11	before, not the invention.
12	Correct?
13	MS. BOYD: Objection.
14	MS. PASCAL: Objection.
15	MS. BOYD: Form.
16	MS. PASCAL: Form.
17	THE WITNESS: It's correct to say I was
18	looking at things that existed before, but that's an
19	essential part of the process of preparing a patent
20	application.
21	BY MR. SUH:
22	Q. And as documented, you did not work on
23	drafting the SurfCast patent on this date.
24	Correct?
25	MS. BOYD: Objection.

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295 Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 138

Page 138

1	MS. PASCAL: Objection.
2	MS. BOYD: Form.
3	THE WITNESS: Again, as I have answered
4	before, there is no narrative that says on this
5	document drafting application, but I consider my
6	work for SurfCast during that time to be part of an
7	overall process of preparing the application.
8	BY MR. SUH:
9	Q. Go to page 38. And here there is an entry
10	of 0.25 hours downloading sample patent for SurfCast
11	and e-mailing Klaus.
12	Do you remember what this was about?
13	A. Not specifically beyond what is written.
14	Q. And as documented, you did not work on
15	drafting the SurfCast patent application on this
16	date.
17	Correct?
18	MS. PASCAL: Objection, form.
19	THE WITNESS: Again, the narrative does not
20	include the term "drafting patent application," but
21	I consider that the time spent was in connection
22	with preparing the patent application for SurfCast.
23	BY MR. SUH:
24	Q. And do you have evidence showing that this
25	was in connection with drafting the SurfCast patent

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law

800-292-4789

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 139

1	application?
2	A. It says in the narrative that what I did
3	was for SurfCast. I also sent an e-mail to Klaus,
4	that is, Mr. Lagermann.
5	Q. Okay. Let me rephrase it.
6	Do you have evidence showing that you
7	drafted the SurfCast patent application on this
8	date?
9	MS. PASCAL: Objection, form.
10	THE WITNESS: The entries in this logbook
11	are the best evidence I have for this day.
12	BY MR. SUH:
13	Q. And we can go to page 40. This is an
14	entry for July 27th, 0.75 hours for reviewing
15	materials for SurfCast to take to New York.
16	Do you specifically remember what you did
17	on this date?
18	A. I do not specifically remember.
19	Q. And as documented, you did not draft the
20	SurfCast patent application on this day.
21	Is that correct?
22	MS. PASCAL: Objection, form.
23	THE WITNESS: Again, the narrative does not
24	say that I drafted the patent application.
25	However, I was reviewing materials in

Merrill - Washington D.C.

www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

1	connection with that process and in connection with
2	a forthcoming meeting in New York City that we have
3	previously talked about today with other Pennie and
4	Edmonds attorneys and SurfCast personnel.
5	BY MR. SUH:
6	Q. Let's go to page 41. There is two
7	entries, two hours of preparing for meeting on
8	SurfCast, this is for July 28th, and three hours of
9	meeting on SurfCast with Ovid, Klaus, Tom, AG AGG
10	and P. DeStefano.
11	Do you see that?
12	A. Yes.
13	Q. Do you specifically remember what you did
14	on this date?
15	A. In part.
16	Q. What was it?
17	MS. BOYD: Caution the witness not to
18	disclose attorney-client privileged communications.
19	THE WITNESS: I remember we had a meeting,
20	the persons listed in the second narrative in a
21	conference room of Pennie and Edmonds in New York
22	City.
23	BY MR. SUH:
24	Q. Is that it? Are you done?
25	A. I remember some of what is talked about,

800-292-4789

IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

1	but I believe it's covered by attorney-client
2	privilege.
3	Q. You can answer.
4	MS. BOYD:
5	MS. PASCAL: Excuse me?
б	MS. BOYD: What?
7	THE WITNESS: I just answered.
8	MR. SUH: There was no objection by
9	counsel.
10	MS. PASCAL: Fine. Attorney-client
11	privilege. We have already agreed that
12	MS. BOYD: And I already instructed him not
13	to answer if it was attorney-client privileged. You
14	know, this is this is getting just a tad abusive,
15	and I'm I'd appreciate if you could keep that
16	under control. I really would. Thank you.
17	MR. SUH: I just want the record to be
18	clear. Did you not
19	MS. PASCAL: She made an objection to
20	MS. BOYD: We don't have to object to
21	everything that comes out of your mouth. There is
22	an ongoing it was an ongoing line of questioning,
23	the objection stands, if you could move on I would
24	appreciate it.
25	MR. SUH: I would like an objection for

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 142

800-292-4789

each question if you want to object to the question. 1 2 MS. BOYD: I will object when I want to object, and my witness will follow my instructions 3 4 as I give them. 5 MR. SUH: And I did not hear any instructions from you on this question. He asserted 6 7 his own objection. THE WITNESS: No, I believe she told me 8 that I need not answer. I heard that. 9 MR. SUH: Okay. Maybe I did not hear that. 10 11 MS. BOYD: You need to take a lesson in how to take a deposition, sir. 12 13 MR. MICALLEF: I think we should take a break and maybe get the Board on the phone now, 14 15 Counsel. 16 MR. SUH: Okay. 17 MR. MICALLEF: You are making narrative 18 objections and you are making arguments to counsel, 19 and I really think we ought to have the Board's view 20 on that because that's not your -- your -- your right there. 21 22 MS. BOYD: Okay. 23 MR. MICALLEF: So let's call them up. THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This is the end of 24 volume one, videotape number two in the deposition 25

> Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law

800-292-4789

of Dr. Richard Bone. We are going off the record, 1 2 the time is 1:07. 3 (Whereupon, a recess was taken 4 commencing at 1:07 P.M. and concluding at 1:10 P.M.) 5 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the 6 7 This is the beginning of volume one, record. videotape number three in the deposition of 8 Dr. Richard Bone. The time is 1:10. 9 BY MR. SUH: 10 11 Q. Okay. If you can turn to page 42? Of Exhibit 2035? 12 Α. 13 That's right. And there are entries for Ο. July 29th? 14 15 Α. Yes. And there is an hour of breakfast with 16 Ο. 17 Ovid, Tom, Paul, et cetera. 18 Α. Yes. Do you specifically remember what you did 19 Ο. 20 on this day? Yes, I have some recollection. 21 Α. Okay. Can you tell me about that? 22 Q. MS. PASCAL: I'm going to caution you 23 against revealing attorney-client privilege in your 24 25 answer. But you can answer to the extent that that

Merrill - Washington D.C.

IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

www.merrillcorp.com/law

does not reveal privileged information. 1 2 THE WITNESS: Noted. Thank you. 3 I also want to refresh my recollection of 4 the following page of this exhibit. MR. SUH: Sure. 5 THE WITNESS: Okay. There was a breakfast 6 7 meeting with the persons listed here and probably also Mr. Lagermann and Mr. Gray. As I recall, I 8 think it occurred in a location in Midtown, 9 Manhattan. 10 11 Then there was a long meeting at one of the conference rooms in the Pennie and Edmonds 12 13 offices that at least Mr. Lagermann and myself were there and Mr. Gray, and I think also Mr. Santoro. 14 15 BY MR. SUH: 16 Ο. Okay. Do you remember what you talked 17 about on this date? I have a partial recollection. 18 Α. MS. PASCAL: Same caution to not reveal 19 20 attorney-client privileged information. BY MR. SUH: 21 22 Q. Are you going to answer? 23 Α. You haven't asked me a question. I asked if you specifically remember what 24 0. you talked about this day. 25

Merrill - Washington D.C.

www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 145

1	A. And I answered in part.
2	Q. And what was it about?
3	MS. PASCAL: And I'm going to caution you
4	in your answer not to reveal any attorney-client
5	privilege.
6	MS. BOYD: And I will reiterate that
7	caution and instruction not to not to testify
8	regarding any attorney-client privileged
9	communication.
10	Is this really what you want your record
11	to look like, though? Really?
12	THE WITNESS: I believe that's correct.
13	What I talked about on that day is covered by
14	attorney-client privilege.
15	BY MR. SUH:
16	
TO	Q. So you are not answering. Correct?
17	Q. So you are not answering. Correct? A. I just answered.
17	A. I just answered.
17 18	A. I just answered. Q. Okay. And as documented, you did not work
17 18 19	<ul><li>A. I just answered.</li><li>Q. Okay. And as documented, you did not work</li><li>on drafting the SurfCast patent application on this</li></ul>
17 18 19 20	<ul><li>A. I just answered.</li><li>Q. Okay. And as documented, you did not work</li><li>on drafting the SurfCast patent application on this day.</li></ul>
17 18 19 20 21	A. I just answered. Q. Okay. And as documented, you did not work on drafting the SurfCast patent application on this day. Correct?
17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. I just answered.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And as documented, you did not work</li> <li>on drafting the SurfCast patent application on this</li> <li>day.</li> <li>Correct?</li> <li>MS. BOYD: Objection mischaracterize</li> </ul>
17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. I just answered. Q. Okay. And as documented, you did not work on drafting the SurfCast patent application on this day. Correct? MS. BOYD: Objection mischaracterize witness' testimony.

Merrill - Washington D.C.

www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 146

1	response to previous questions of this nature, the
2	narrative does not say that I drafted the patent
3	application on this day.
4	However, my work over this time period was
5	dedicated to preparing a patent application for
6	SurfCast, and this meeting was intimately connected
7	with that process.
8	I can't say more than that.
9	BY MR. SUH:
10	Q. Okay. Let's go to page 43. There is 0.5
11	hours of tidying notes from SurfCast meeting. Do
12	you specifically remember what you did on this date?
13	A. Not beyond what is written there. And as
14	you'll note, there are portions that are redacted,
15	and if I had access to the un-redacted portions I
16	may have a better ability to refresh my memory of
17	that day.
18	Q. And as documented, you did not work on
19	drafting the SurfCast patent application on this
20	date.
21	Correct?
22	MS. BOYD: Objection.
23	MS. PASCAL: Objection to form,
24	mischaracterization.
25	THE WITNESS: Again, there is no language

800-292-4789

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 147

1	that says that. But again, I will reiterate that
2	whatever narrative I have related to SurfCast is
3	connected with a process of preparing a patent
4	application.
5	BY MR. SUH:
6	Q. Let's turn to page 46. This is an entry
7	for August 2nd, 0.5 hours talk with Brett about
8	SurfCast.
9	Do you specifically remember what you
10	talked about on this date?
11	MS. PASCAL: I'm going to caution the
12	witness to the extent that it reveals
13	attorney-client privilege that, not to answer that
14	aspect of the question.
15	But you may answer so long as it does not
16	reveal privilege.
17	THE WITNESS: Right. Or attorney work
18	product.
19	MS. PASCAL: Yes. Thank you.
20	THE WITNESS: Yes. I don't have a specific
21	recollection of what I talked about on that day.
22	BY MR. SUH:
23	Q. And as documented, you did not work on
24	drafting the patent application for SurfCast.
25	Correct?

Merrill - Washington D.C.

www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295 Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 148

MS. PASCAL: Objection, form. 1 2 MS. BOYD: Object. 3 MS. PASCAL: And mischaracterizes 4 testimony. 5 THE WITNESS: Again, at the risk of being repetitive, my answer is that although the narrative 6 7 does not explicitly say I drafted the patent application, my activities over this period were 8 focused on preparing a patent application for 9 SurfCast. 10 11 BY MR. SUH: 12 Q. So go to page 48. 13 MS. BOYD: Are you skipping page 47? 14 MR. SUH: Yes. 15 MS. BOYD: Okay. BY MR. SUH: 16 17 Ο. So 48 is for August 4th. Says "Figures, facts to Klaus, listen to tapes." 18 Do you know how long this was for? There 19 20 is no time entry. There is no direction. 21 I understand. So it says "rest of day," Α. and it may be possible to correlate activities on 22 this day with what is in one of the invoices, the 23 Pennie and Edmonds, if it covers that period of 24 25 time.

Merrill - Washington D.C.

800-292-4789

www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 149

1	In the absence of making that connection,
2	I am only best that I would speculate that I have
3	spent some hours on SurfCast. It's a Wednesday. I
4	only have two hours noted for other matters. If I
5	put something like "rest of day," it's most likely
6	that I spent several hours.
7	I can also add that the narrative says
8	"figures" and includes "listen to tapes." Both of
9	those would have required some time.
10	Q. Okay. And as documented, you did not work
11	on drafting the SurfCast patent application on this
12	date.
13	Correct?
14	MS. BOYD: Objection.
15	MS. PASCAL: Form.
16	MS. BOYD: Mischaracterizes the testimony.
17	MS. PASCAL: Same objection for both of us.
18	THE WITNESS: I disagree, and to the extent
19	that I do reference figures, which I think means
20	that I quite probably worked on preparing some
21	figures, which I would I would say is part of
22	drafting a patent application.
23	BY MR. SUH:
24	Q. Let's go to page 63. And this is an entry
25	for August 19th.

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295 Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 150

1	Α.	Yes.
2	Q.	And "0.25 hours of SurfCast (Klaus e-mail
3	plus print	z)."
4		Do you specifically remember what you did
5	on this da	ay?
6	Α.	I do not specifically remember.
7	Q.	And as accounted, you did not work on
8	drafting t	the SurfCast patent application on this
9	date.	
10		Correct?
11		MS. BOYD: Objection.
12		MS. PASCAL: Objection to form,
13	mischaract	terizes testimony.
14		THE WITNESS: Again, as I have stated
15	before, th	ne narrative does not state that I drafted
16	a patent a	application.
17		However, I am involved in at least some
18	communicat	tion with SurfCast, and that I consider to
19	be connect	ed with preparing a patent application.
20		BY MR. SUH:
21	Q.	Well, you don't specifically remember what
22	you did or	n this day.
23		Is that correct?
24	Α.	I don't specifically remember.
25	Q.	Let's go to page 68. This is an entry for

Merrill - Washington D.C.

800-292-4789

www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 151

1	August 24th, there is a 0.25 hour entry which says
2	"Talked with Andrew Gray regarding timing of
3	SurfCast application."
4	Do you remember what you talked about on
5	this day?
6	MS. PASCAL: I'm going to caution the
7	witness not to reveal any attorney-client or
8	attorney work product communications.
9	MS. BOYD: Same caution and instruction.
10	THE WITNESS: While I have no specific
11	recollection, the narrative says "Talked with Andrew
12	Gray re timing of SurfCast application."
13	BY MR. SUH:
14	Q. So other than talking about the timing of
15	the SurfCast application, you don't recall anything
16	else you talked about.
17	Is that correct?
18	MS. PASCAL: Same caution.
19	THE WITNESS: That's correct, if you are
20	talking about with Mr. Gray. But as I have said
21	before, there are other entries on this day that are
22	redacted, and if I could see what they were, I may
23	be I may be able to remember other things I did
24	on that day.
25	BY MR. SUH:

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295 Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 152

800-292-4789

1	Q. And as documented in this exhibit, you did
2	not recall drafting the SurfCast patent application
3	on this day.
4	Correct?
5	MS. BOYD: Objection, mischaracterizes the
6	witness' testimony.
7	MS. PASCAL: Same objection.
8	THE WITNESS: So the narrative does not say
9	that I drafted the patent application on that day,
10	that's correct. But clearly I was I was
11	addressing aspects of preparing the patent
12	application due to a discussion with Mr. Gray on
13	that subject.
14	BY MR. SUH:
15	Q. And what is your basis for saying that?
16	A. The narrative references SurfCast and the
17	timing of the application.
18	Q. It only mentions the timing. Does it
19	mention anything else?
20	A. It does not.
21	Q. Are you done?
22	A. I am.
23	Q. Let's go to page 75. And this is a time
24	entry for August 31st. And there is 1.5 hours of
25	background materials for SurfCast patent.

Merrill - Washington D.C.

www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

1	Do you specifically remember what you were
2	looking at?
3	A. I don't specifically remember, no.
4	Q. So you don't have any evidence of what you
5	specifically did on this date, do you?
6	A. I have this logbook which is in front of
7	both of us which narrates what I did on that day
8	whilst at Pennie and Evans.
9	Q. So other than this logbook, you don't have
10	any evidence of what you did on this date.
11	Correct?
12	A. Not me personally, I do not, that's
13	correct.
14	Q. And as documented, you did not work on
15	drafting the SurfCast patent application on this
16	date.
17	Correct?
18	MS. PASCAL: Objection to form,
19	mischaracterizes testimony.
20	THE WITNESS: Again, I'll give you the same
21	answer I have been giving. Whilst the narrative
22	does not say that I drafted the patent application,
23	it is part of an overall process of preparing an
24	application.
25	And you'll notice also that it says one

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 154

Page 154

1	and a half hours background materials. That's a
2	significant amount of time. And it is it is in
3	my view clearly connected with preparing the patent
4	application.
5	BY MR. SUH:
6	Q. Well, you were looking at what existed
7	before, not SurfCast invention.
8	Correct?
9	MS. PASCAL: Objection.
10	THE WITNESS: Possibly. But this may also
11	have been part of drafting the background section of
12	the patent application.
13	BY MR. SUH:
14	Q. Is there any portion indicating that?
15	A. There is not. But there is not also a
16	portion that indicates I was I was only looking
17	at prior materials.
18	Q. Okay. Let's go to page 87. This is for
19	September 12th, and 1.5 hours of "SurfCast, read
20	about XML."
21	Do you specifically remember what you did
22	on this day?
23	A. I did not specifically remember beyond
24	what is referenced in this narrative.
25	Q. And what is XML?

Merrill - Washington D.C.

800-292-4789

www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295 Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 155

1 It's a markup language that was I think Α. 2 relatively new at that time. 3 Did it exist before the SurfCast alleged Ο. 4 invention? MS. PASCAL: Objection, form. 5 THE WITNESS: I don't know the answer to б 7 that. 8 BY MR. SUH: As documented, you did not work on 9 0. drafting the SurfCast patent application on this 10 11 date. 12 Correct? 13 MS. BOYD: Objection. 14 THE WITNESS: Again, and I'll repeat my 15 answer, although the narrative does not state drafting patent application, I was working for 16 17 SurfCast on this day, a Sunday, and I was reading 18 about something that I considered to be relevant to 19 preparing the patent application, and therefore this 20 entry is part of the overall process of preparing the patent application. 21 22 BY MR. SUH: 23 Okay. Let's go to page 88. There is an Q. entry of 0.25 hours, "Talked with Mr. Gray about 24 SurfCast," and one hour for "Read further about 25

Merrill - Washington D.C.

800-292-4789

www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 156

1	XML."
2	Do you specifically remember what you
3	talked about on this day?
4	MS. PASCAL: I'm going to caution the
5	witness to the extent the answer calls for
6	revelation of attorney-client or attorney work
7	product, you may answer except for that.
8	THE WITNESS: Yeah, I don't specifically
9	remember what I talked about on that day.
10	BY MR. SUH:
11	Q. And as documented, you don't, you did not
12	work on drafting the SurfCast patent application on
13	this day.
14	Correct?
15	MS. PASCAL: Objection, form, and
16	mischaracterizes prior testimony.
17	MS. BOYD: Same objections.
18	THE WITNESS: I'll repeat. There are two
19	entries on this day, September 13, for SurfCast, the
20	one you just read to me and then a second one read
21	further about MS XML. I consider that both of
22	those are consistent with the fact that I was
23	preparing the patent application for SurfCast over
24	that time.
25	BY MR. SUH:

800-292-4789

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295 Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 157

1	Q. Let's go to page 89, September 14th.
2	There is 0.5 hours of read more XML, and 0.25 of
3	talk to Mr. Gray about U.S. 5,918,237, and one hour
4	of "Retrieved plus read about U.S. 5,918,237."
5	Do you specifically remember what you did
6	on this date?
7	A. No, I do not.
8	Q. Do you specifically remember what you
9	talked about on this date?
10	MS. PASCAL: And I'm going to caution the
11	witness not reveal any attorney work product or
12	attorney-client privileged information. But
13	otherwise you may answer.
14	THE WITNESS: I do not remember what I
15	talked about on this day.
16	BY MR. SUH:
17	Q. You are looking at what existed before,
18	not SurfCast's alleged invention.
19	Correct?
20	MS. PASCAL: Objection, form.
21	THE WITNESS: Can you be more specific?
22	There are several narrative entries on this day.
23	BY MR. SUH:
24	Q. You talked you read about XML, talked
25	about a U.S. patent that existed before this date.

Merrill - Washington D.C.

www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

So isn't it correct that you were looking at what 1 2 existed before, not SurfCast's invention. 3 Correct? 4 MS. PASCAL: Objection, form. THE WITNESS: The U.S. patent 5,918,237 5 clearly already existed at the time I was reading 6 7 I don't know temporally whether it's before it. SurfCast or not. 8 The first entry that says "Read more XML," 9 again, I don't know exactly what the date the XML 10 11 came into existence was. BY MR. SUH: 12 13 And as documented, you did not work on 0. drafting the SurfCast patent application on this 14 15 date. 16 Correct? 17 MS. PASCAL: Objection, form, mischaracterizes testimony. 18 THE WITNESS: Again, I'll repeat the answer 19 20 you have now heard several times. There is no narrative on this day that describes drafting the 21 patent application. But everything I was doing for 22 SurfCast in this period of time was connected with 23 24 the process of preparing the patent application. 25 BY MR. SUH:

> Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

> > Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 159

800-292-4789

1	Q. Let's turn to page 92. There is 0.25
2	hours of "Arrange for transfer documents to be
3	prepared."
4	Do you specifically remember what you did
5	on this day?
6	A. No.
7	Q. And as documented, you did not work on
8	drafting the SurfCast patent application on this
9	date.
10	Correct?
11	MS. PASCAL: Object to the form,
12	mischaracterizes testimony.
13	THE WITNESS: I believe that's correct, I
14	do not see a narrative that refers to drafting a
15	patent application on this day.
16	BY MR. SUH:
17	Q. Let's turn to page 104. There is 0.1 hour
18	of "Talk to Andrew Gray about patent process."
19	There is a .1 hour of "Talked to Gray Williams about
20	current status."
21	Do you specifically remember what you
22	talked about on this day?
23	MS. PASCAL: I'm going to caution the
24	witness not to reveal any attorney-client or
25	attorney work product communications.

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295 Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 160

800-292-4789

1	MS. BOYD: Same caution, same instruction.
2	THE WITNESS: I don't remember what I
3	talked about on this day.
4	BY MR. SUH:
5	Q. As documented, you did not work on
6	drafting the SurfCast patent application on this
7	day.
8	Correct?
9	MS. PASCAL: Objection to form.
10	MS. BOYD: Objection.
11	MS. PASCAL: Mischaracterizes testimony.
12	THE WITNESS: That's correct, there is not
13	a narrative that talks about drafting the patent
14	application on this day.
15	BY MR. SUH:
16	Q. So if you can go to page 109, that is an
17	entry, this is for October 4th, and there is an
18	entry of 0.1 hours, "Talked to Andrew Gray about
19	SurfCast."
20	Do you specifically remember what you
21	talked about on this day?
22	MS. PASCAL: I'm going to caution the
23	witness not to reveal any attorney work product or
24	attorney-client communications in your answer.
25	MS. BOYD: Same caution.

Merrill - Washington D.C.

800-292-4789

www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

THE WITNESS: I don't recall what I talked 1 2 about on this day. 3 BY MR. SUH: 4 Ο. As documented --5 MS. PASCAL: Excuse me. Would it be possible to take a short bio break? 6 7 MR. SUH: Sure. I'll just finish this one 8 and I can. 9 MS. PASCAL: Okay. BY MR. SUH: 10 11 Q. And as documented, you did not work on drafting the SurfCast patent application on this 12 13 date. 14 Correct? 15 MS. PASCAL: Objection, form, 16 mischaracterizes testimony. 17 THE WITNESS: It's correct. There is not a narrative that describes drafting the patent 18 application. 19 20 But I consider this entry and the previous two or three that we just discussed to be connected 21 with the process of preparing the application and 22 working towards that goal. 23 24 MR. SUH: We can take a break. 25 MS. PASCAL: Thank you.

> Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295 Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 162

800-292-4789

#### Page 162

1 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Okay. Going off the 2 record, the time is 1:31. 3 (Whereupon, a recess was taken 4 commencing at 1:31 P.M. and concluding at 1:43 P.M.) 5 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Okay. We are back on 6 the record. The time is 1:43. 7 8 BY MR. SUH: 9 Ο. Let's go to page 110 of 2035. 10 Α. Okay. 11 Q. And this entry is for October 5th. Yes. 12 Α. 13 And there is 0.5 hours of "Discussed draft 0. of patent with Andrew Gray and Brett Lovejoy." 14 Do 15 you specifically remember what you talked about on this day? 16 17 MS. PASCAL: I'll caution you not to reveal any attorney work product or attorney-client 18 privilege. 19 20 MS. BOYD: Objection. 21 THE WITNESS: I don't specifically 22 remember, no. 23 BY MR. SUH: 24 And as documented, you did not talk about Ο. the SurfCast patent application. 25

Merrill - Washington D.C.

800-292-4789

www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295 Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 163

1	Correct?
2	MS. BOYD: Objection.
3	MS. PASCAL: Objection, form,
4	mischaracterizes testimony.
5	MS. BOYD: Mischaracterizes the document.
6	THE WITNESS: The narrative does not say
7	drafted patent application, but clearly from the
8	narrative I am involved in the process of preparing
9	the patent application because I'm discussing the
10	draft with two other persons at Pennie and Edmonds.
11	BY MR. SUH:
12	Q. Let's go to page 111. There is a 0.4
13	hour, this is for October 6th, 0.4 hour of "Talked
14	to Brett Lovejoy about status of patent," and
15	"Meeting with Ovid Santoro, Gabriel, Brett Lovejoy
16	(Klaus Lagermann via speakerphone). Print out copy
17	of patent, followup conversation with Brett Lovejoy
18	about timeline. Drew up timeline, arranged for
19	e-mail of encrypted document to Ovid, Klaus, and
20	telephone call with Andrew Gray, e-mail timeline to
21	Andrew Gray, Ovid, and Klaus."
22	Do you specifically remember what you
23	talked about on this day?
24	MS. PASCAL: I'm going to offer the same
25	caution to the witness regarding attorney-client,

Merrill - Washington D.C.

800-292-4789

www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 164

attorney work product privileges. 1 2 MS. BOYD: Same caution. 3 THE WITNESS: I don't remember 4 specifically. 5 BY MR. SUH: As documented, you did not work on 6 Q. 7 drafting the SurfCast patent application on this 8 date. 9 Correct? I disagree. 10 Α. 11 MS. PASCAL: Objection. THE WITNESS: The last narrative that you 12 13 did not read just now says "1.5 hours, revisions to draft of patent." I conclude that that is working 14 15 on drafting the patent application. BY MR. SUH: 16 17 Other than that, you did not work on Q. drafting the SurfCast patent application on this 18 date. 19 20 Correct? 21 MS. PASCAL: Objection, form, misstates testimony and document. 22 23 THE WITNESS: I mean, I hope you don't mind me saying I think that's actually fatuous. There is 24 25 1.5 hours entry on this day in which I am basically

Merrill - Washington D.C.

800-292-4789

IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

www.merrillcorp.com/law

Page 165

1	carrying out revisions to the patent draft
2	application. There is 1.9 hours in which I am
3	talking with the client, talking with other people
4	at Pennie and Edmonds about the patent application.
5	That looks to me like half of the day I'm
б	working on SurfCast and working on matters in
7	connection with preparing the patent application,
8	including revising a draft.
9	BY MR. SUH:
10	Q. Let's go to page 113. This is for October
11	8th. And there is an entry of 0.25 hours, "Updated
12	Andrew Gray about current timetable."
13	Do you specifically remember what you
14	talked about on this date?
15	MS. PASCAL: Same caution regarding
16	privilege information.
17	MS. BOYD: Same caution.
18	THE WITNESS: I don't specifically remember
19	what I talked about, no.
20	BY MR. SUH:
21	Q. And as documented, you did not work on
22	drafting the SurfCast patent application on this
23	day.
24	Correct?
25	MS. BOYD: Object.

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295 Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 166

800-292-4789

Page	16	56
- 0 ) 0		~ ~

1	MS. PASCAL: Objection.
2	MS. BOYD: Mischaracterizes witness'
3	testimony and the document.
4	THE WITNESS: That is correct. The
5	narrative does not say that I worked on drafting a
6	patent application.
7	But I can say that on that day you can
8	tell from the time entry below it five and
9	three-quarter hours on a matter that by the billing
10	number I know is a training matter, and I know that
11	throughout the period that we have been talking
12	about in this deposition I actually attended a lot
13	of training related matters at Pennie and Edmonds.
14	So it looks as if on this particular day most of my
15	day was in a training matter.
16	So you know, I still managed to find some
17	time to discuss the patent application with
18	Mr. Gray.
19	BY MR. SUH:
20	Q. What aspects of the patent application did
21	you discuss?
22	MS. BOYD: Objection.
23	MS. PASCAL: Objection.
24	MS. BOYD: Caution the witness not to
25	disclose attorney or work product information.

800-292-4789

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 167

1	THE WITNESS: I don't recall what I
2	specifically discussed beyond what is written in the
3	narrative on this page.
4	BY MR. SUH:
5	Q. Let's go to page 117. This is for October
6	12th?
7	A. Okay.
8	Q. And there is an entry of 0.33 hours which
9	says "Teleconference with Ovid Santoro, Klaus
10	Lagermann, Paul DeStefano and Brett Lovejoy." Do
11	you specifically remember about what you talked
12	about on this day?
13	MS. PASCAL: Caution to the witness
14	regarding the revealing attorney-client and attorney
15	work product classifications.
16	MS. BOYD: Same caution.
17	THE WITNESS: Again, I do not specifically
18	remember what was discussed on this teleconference.
19	BY MR. SUH:
20	Q. As documented, you did not work on
21	drafting the SurfCast patent application on this
22	day.
23	Correct?
24	MS. BOYD: Objection, form.
25	MS. PASCAL: Objection.

800-292-4789

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295 Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 168

1	MS. BOYD: Mischaracterizes the testimony
2	and the document.
3	THE WITNESS: According to the narrative I
4	did not draft the patent application on this day.
5	But as previously stated, activities I carried out
б	for SurfCast were connected with and part of a
7	process of preparing the patent application.
8	BY MR. SUH:
9	Q. Let's go to page 118. This is a time
10	entry for October 13th. There is 1.25 hours of
11	teleconference with Brett Lovejoy, Ovid Santoro,
12	Klaus Lagermann about patent and followup discussion
13	with Brett Lovejoy and Andrew Gray.
14	Do you specifically remember what you
15	talked about on this day?
16	MS. PASCAL: Caution to the witness with
17	regard to revealing privileged conversation.
18	MS. BOYD: Same caution.
19	THE WITNESS: I do not specifically
20	remember what I talked about on this day.
21	But it should be clear, as with my answer
22	to previous questions, this is a
23	one-and-a-quarter-hour entry, it's a teleconference
24	with both the inventors as well as other personnel
25	at Pennie and Edmonds, and it's part of the process

Merrill - Washington D.C.

800-292-4789

www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 169

1	of preparing the patent application.
2	BY MR. SUH:
3	Q. And as let's go to page 123. This is
4	an entry for October 18th.
5	A. Yes.
6	Q. And there is 0.25 hours of talk to Brett
7	Lovejoy about TCP/IP. Do you remember what you
8	talked about on this day?
9	MS. PASCAL: Same cautions regarding
10	privilege.
11	THE WITNESS: Beyond what is discussed, I
12	mean, beyond what is recited in this narrative I do
13	not remember specifically what I discussed.
14	BY MR. SUH:
15	Q. And you were looking at what existed
16	before, not the SurfCast invention.
17	Correct?
18	MS. PASCAL: Objection, form.
19	MS. BOYD: Objection.
20	THE WITNESS: I don't know that I can say
21	that what I'm talking about there is before
22	SurfCast's invention. I do know that I am talking
23	about TCP/IP.
24	BY MR. SUH:
0.5	
25	Q. As documented, you did not work on

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295 Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 170

800-292-4789

1	drafting the SurfCast patent application on this
2	day.
3	Correct?
4	MS. BOYD: Objection.
5	MS. PASCAL: Objection. Form,
6	mischaracterization.
7	THE WITNESS: I did not so excuse me.
8	The narratives do not describe drafting the patent
9	application on this day, but this discussion is in
10	connection with preparing the patent application.
11	BY MR. SUH:
12	Q. Can we go to page 124, please? There is a
13	time entry for October 19th.
14	A. Uh-huh.
15	Q. And there is an entry of 0.7 hours
16	attending meeting with Mr. Carberry, talking with
17	Brett Lovejoy about TCP/IP, and 0.5 hours of prep
18	for meeting with Mr. Carberry and one hour of
19	
	meeting with Mr. Carberry, Andrew Gray, and Brett
20	meeting with Mr. Carberry, Andrew Gray, and Brett Lovejoy.
20 21	
	Lovejoy.
21	Lovejoy. Do you remember what you talked about on
21 22	Lovejoy. Do you remember what you talked about on this day?
21 22 23	Lovejoy. Do you remember what you talked about on this day? MS. PASCAL: Same caution revealing

Merrill - Washington D.C.

800-292-4789

www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 171

1	THE WITNESS: I don't specifically remember
2	what I talked about with Mr. Lovejoy and Mr
3	well, with Mr. Lovejoy.
4	I have some recollection of what was
5	discussed with Mr. Carberry, but I believe that's
6	covered by attorney-client privilege.
7	BY MR. SUH:
8	Q. As documented, you did not work on
9	drafting the SurfCast patent application.
10	Correct?
11	MS. PASCAL: Objection, form,
12	mischaracterization.
13	THE WITNESS: Again, the narratives do not
14	describe drafting a patent application. But the
15	meetings and the discussions are all connected with
16	the process of preparing the patent application.
17	BY MR. SUH:
18	Q. Turn to page 133. This is for October
19	28th. There is one hour of "Reviewed prior art and
20	attention to docket."
21	Do you specifically remember what you did
22	on this day?
23	A. I do not specifically remember, no.
24	Q. And as documented, you did not work on
25	drafting the SurfCast patent application on this

800-292-4789

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 172

Paq	ie	1	7	2
LUY				~

1	date.
2	Correct?
3	MS. BOYD: Objection.
4	MS. PASCAL: Objection, form,
5	mischaracterization.
6	THE WITNESS: According to the narrative
7	there is no description of me drafting the patent
8	application on this day, that's correct.
9	BY MR. SUH:
10	Q. In fact, you were looking at what exists,
11	not SurfCast's alleged invention.
12	Correct?
13	MS. PASCAL: Objection, form.
14	THE WITNESS: The narrative "Reviewed prior
15	art" would appear to suggest that I am looking at
16	things that came before, that is correct.
17	MR. SUH: Microsoft objects to the
18	privilege and work product objections asserted in
19	this deposition, and Microsoft also objects to all
20	of Dr. Bone's testimony that was based on
21	speculation and any other basis beyond his own
22	memory as irrelevant, lacking foundation, and based
23	on hearsay.
24	And I think I'm done, but I'll have to
25	confer with Joe. So can we go on a five-minute

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 173

1	break?
2	MS. PASCAL: Yeah. Just to make clear that
3	we may need to go back on the record ourselves. So
4	this deposition is still open.
5	MR. SUH: All right.
6	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off the record,
7	the time is 1:55.
8	(Whereupon, a recess was taken
9	commencing at 1:55 P.M. and
10	concluding at 1:55 P.M.)
11	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Back on the record. The
12	time is 1:55.
13	MS. PASCAL: Just before we broke, I
14	believe Mr. Wu raised some objections. I would like
15	him to state the basis for each of the objections
16	that he raised.
17	MR. MICALLEF: Erica, if I may, if we are
18	going to do that, I would like to have the witness
19	leave to room, please.
20	MS. PASCAL: On what basis?
21	MS. BOYD: Yeah.
22	MR. MICALLEF: He is not entitled to hear
23	the narrative.
24	MS. PASCAL: Why?
25	MR. MICALLEF: Because it may affect his

800-292-4789

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 174

1 testimony. 2 MS. PASCAL: I'm not following. Can you cite a rule or a law which would prevent Dr. Bone 3 4 from being in the room? Since Mr. Wu raised these objections? 5 MR. MICALLEF: Go ahead. If you are going б 7 to take the position that he may hear this, then we may have to do something about it. Because while --8 9 MS. PASCAL: I'm just --MR. HEINTZ: This is Tim Heintz here. 10 11 Joe, I have got to say I object to this. 12 Mr. Suh is taking this deposition, not you. You and 13 I are listening on the phone. We should not be on the record. 14 15 So I object to this continued 16 participation on your behalf. 17 MR. MICALLEF: Understood. MR. HEINTZ: That's all I'm going to say 18 on the record. 19 20 MR. MICALLEF: I am backup lead counsel and I am entitled to do this. And this narrative in 21 front of the witness is literally improper. 22 23 MS. PASCAL: I believe Mr. Suh raised this 24 himself with the witness in the room, and --25 MR. MICALLEF: The ongoing narrative is

> Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law

800-292-4789

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 175

1 improper. 2 MS. PASCAL: Whose? Mrs. Suh's or mine? 3 MR. MICALLEF: What's going on right now 4 between you and me. I can't make -- obviously I can't make anybody do it. I'm going to ask you 5 again to have the witness leave the room, then we б can have the discussion. 7 8 MS. PASCAL: Okay. For now we'll -- we'll 9 ask Dr. Bone to leave the room. We may revisit this after we have heard the basis for Mr. Wu's 10 11 objections. 12 Dr. Bone, would you just step out for a 13 few minutes and we will call you back in? THE WITNESS: Certainly. 14 15 MS. PASCAL: Thank you. I apologize. THE WITNESS: Okay. Exit stage left. 16 17 MS. PASCAL: Okay. Mr. Suh, you are on the record with some objections, so I'd like you to now 18 19 go through the basis of each of your -- go through 20 each objection and the basis for each objection. 21 MR. SUH: The basis for the objecting to 22 the privileged and work product is because Dr. Bone 23 relied on the billing records. 24 MS. PASCAL: Which billing records? MR. SUH: That is Exhibit 2035. 25

Merrill - Washington D.C.

800-292-4789

www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 176

MS. PASCAL: That you are calling his time 1 2 entry log a billing record? 3 MR. SUH: That's right. And Exhibit 2010, 4 Exhibit 2049, and Exhibit 2050. 5 MS. PASCAL: Okay. Just for clarification, again for clarity of record, are б 7 you -- you said Mr. -- your basis for the privilege 8 objection was Mr. or Dr. Bone's -- I believe you 9 addressed him as Mr. Bone's -- reliance. And now I want to be clear on which exhibits that you are 10 actually speaking to. 11 12 MR. SUH: Exhibit 2035. 13 MS. PASCAL: Okay. So stop right there. 14 Are you calling Exhibit 2035 a billing record? 15 MR. SUH: Time entry record, same as 16 billing records. 17 MS. PASCAL: Okay. And what is the basis of your objection as it refers to --18 19 MR. SUH: Basically you can't have it both 20 ways. 21 MS. PASCAL: Could you let me finish my 22 question before you --23 MR. SUH: I thought you were finished. 24 Sorry. 25 MS. PASCAL: What is your basis with regard

> Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 177

to specifically Exhibit 2035 and the objection you 1 2 have raised? 3 MR. SUH: You have raised a lot of 4 objections based on privilege and instructed the witness not to answer based on privilege. And this 5 was offered as evidence by Mr. Bone himself. б So our 7 position is that Mr. Bone, SurfCast waived the 8 privilege. 9 MS. PASCAL: First of all, two things. You might recall we don't believe we have with regard to 10 11 the entries that are in here, we -- we have -- in other words, what we have redacted, what is 12 13 un-redacted you are entitled to have. In fact, we offered you even a more un-redacted logbook which 14 15 you objected to and did not want to use today. But set that aside, I believe in answer to 16 17 each of your questions -- and you are free to review 18 the record, Ms. -- Dr. Bone said he did not recall, 19 which did give you your answer, regardless of 20 privilege. 21 So I'm not really sure what you are expecting to get even without that if his answer is 22 23 "I don't recall." 24 But if you know, please let me know so we 25 can clear it up.

800-292-4789

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295 Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 178

1	MR. SUH: My recollection okay, if you
2	are finished? My recollection is that you made a
3	series of objections and instructed the witness not
4	to answer, so that that is the basis.
5	MS. PASCAL: Right.
6	MS. BOYD: So
7	MR. MICALLEF: So we are going to stand by
8	our objection. You know, the record is what it is.
9	So I don't know what you want. We are not going to
10	back off of that objection.
11	MS. BOYD: Yeah. And I'll just if if
12	you have an argument which you are required actually
13	to make on the record under you are required to
14	explain your objection on the record, what is your
15	explanation for how the logbook is a waiver of
16	privilege? Can you point me to privileged
17	information that's in the logbook as it's been
18	entered as an exhibit?
19	MR. SUH: For example, I pointed to the
20	log, portions in the logbook where it says "Talked
21	with Andrew Gray," and I questioned about it.
22	MS. BOYD: Right. So "Talked with Andrew
23	Gray," that's foundational information for a
24	privilege. That is not privileged information.
25	MR. MICALLEF: Well, I don't I'm not so

800-292-4789

Page 179

1	sure that's right.
2	But we are entitled to explore all of
3	these documents, and when he put them into the
4	record, then and cited to them in his direct
5	testimony, in his declaration, in our view that
6	opened it up. And your assertions of privilege are
7	improper.
8	Now, you can tell the Board otherwise and
9	we'll tell the Board our, our story. You know what
10	our objection is now with respect to the privilege.
11	So I don't know what you are trying to do.

12 MS. BOYD: Okay. So -- so no, I'm going to 13 echo Jim's objection, which is you are not taking this deposition. All right. So this isn't your --14 15 this isn't currently your argument to make. So I will echo that. 16

17 Mr. Suh, if there is particular information in the logbook that you believe is 18 itself a waiver of privilege, I would like you to 19 20 point it out right now because we would --

MR. MICALLEF: No, we are not -- we are 21 22 not going to do that.

23 MR. SUH: We are not going to do that. 24 MS. PASCAL: Excuse me, Mr. Micallef, I 25 think we are going to caution you again about who is

Merrill - Washington D.C.

800-292-4789

IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

www.merrillcorp.com/law

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 180

1 taking the deposition. 2 But we will say here we are all convened 3 here with the witness who is presently standing 4 outside the room. You have the opportunity and the time as it is only now 2:00 o'clock Pacific time and 5 you have I believe up to a certain number of hours б 7 on the record to take this deposition. 8 If there is something that we can rectify here, then we should do it because I think it's 9 going to be hard to explain to the Board why you 10 11 forego several hours of deposition with witness and 12 attorney time here because you don't want to tell us 13 what it is we can address. 14 MR. MICALLEF: We told you, and you are 15 welcome to address it on redirect. 16 MS. PASCAL: No. 17 MR. MICALLEF: Give you something to clear 18 up. 19 MS. PASCAL: Just --20 MR. MICALLEF: And I am -- I am not going to be made to be quiet. I'm not asking questions of 21 22 the witness, he is out of room, I am backup lead, lead counsel and lead counsel is here, I am entitled 23 24 to do this. 25 MS. PASCAL: Okay. I disagree with you.

> Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law

800-292-4789

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 181

1	Regardless of this, I'm going to ask
2	whoever it is going to answer, whether it's Mr. Suh,
3	and I apologize if I am misspeaking on your name,
4	I'm not is it Suh or Suh.
5	MR. SUH: Suh.
6	MS. PASCAL: Mr. Suh, I'm very sorry about
7	that. Mr. Suh.
8	It's your intention to say that you have
9	an objection about the witness' testimony. You have
10	a certain number of hours left to you allocated on
11	the record on which we could object we could
12	address this objection. That is the whole point of
13	objections, so that they can be addressed,
14	particularly ones that can be addressed while the
15	witness is still present and has time to do it as
16	well as the attorneys.
17	So as was asked of you, will you please,
18	if there are particular entries that you believe are
19	a waiver of privilege, and for example, just so we
20	can help this process along, have information that
21	would not appear on a privilege log, for example, if
22	I write you a letter as a client, my privilege log
23	is going to say talk to or wrote letter, whatever it
24	is, oral, verbal, our names and the date and some
25	general description of the subject matter without

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law

800-292-4789

```
Page 182
```

1	revealing the actual ins and outs content, if there
2	is something in here that you think goes beyond a
3	privilege log entry I would
4	MS. BOYD: Please point it out to us.
5	MS. PASCAL: Yeah, point it out.
6	MS. BOYD: So we can take that under
7	consideration.
8	And if we if you persuade us that we
9	have indeed waived privilege with regard to an
10	entry, then right now we have the witness, we have
11	the videographer, we have the court reporter, we
12	have the attorneys. If you can if you can show
13	us something where we have actually waived privilege
14	then we can address it now.
15	MR. MICALLEF: No, wait a second. We asked
16	the questions, you asserted the privilege. So it's
17	now incumbent on you if you think there is something
18	to clear up. We don't have a burden to go back and
19	start this deposition all over again and ask the
20	same questions over again because you improperly
21	asserted a privilege, and we are not going do it.
22	You have four and a half hours of redirect.
23	MS. PASCAL: Okay. I just want to clear a
24	statement that you are unwilling to do this, and if
25	that's the record you want to make, then I'm fine

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 183

1	with it. I just want a clear statement that it's
2	2:04 P.M. Pacific time and it's my understanding
3	from Mr. Micallef's representation here as I guess
4	he is backup lead counsel if I mistook that, my
5	apologies, but it's the backup lead counsel's
б	representation that they do not want to address and
7	try to rectify this situation here, in which case
8	we if that is is that correct, we will go off
9	the record for a short break and then we will let
10	you know if there will be redirect testimony.
11	MR. MICALLEF: That is not my position. My
12	position is we did it once, and it's not incumbent
13	on us to go back and take the deposition all over
14	again, it's incumbent on to you clear up the record.
15	I don't have to do it twice.
16	MS. PASCAL: I'm just going to be clear
17	here on the record. We don't believe we have waived
18	privilege, we believe that the entries in the
19	logbook as Mr. Suh addressed them in the deposition
20	are no different than what would appear on a
21	privileged log in terms of the people involved, the
22	date and a very general description of the subject
23	matter.
24	If there are entries you believe that do
25	not conform to that, I am simply asking for you to

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law

800-292-4789

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 184

put at least an example, if not more than one 1 2 example on the record to see if we can then address 3 those specific entries in Dr. Bone's deposition 4 today. If you don't want to do that, then so be 5 it, but I need to know what your position is on 6 7 that. 8 MR. SUH: One comment --9 MR. MICALLEF: No -- go ahead, Wonjoo. MR. SUH: One comment I would like to make 10 11 is this is not just a privilege log. Dr. Bone is 12 relying on these entries to establish a diligence, 13 and he even put a chart, Exhibit 2051 and 2052, on 14 it. 15 MS. PASCAL: Uh-huh. MR. SUH: And it includes these narratives, 16 17 attend meeting with attorneys about TCP/IP, about 18 time entries. And these, by presenting these evidence and relying on these evidence, SurfCast 19 20 waived the attorney-client privilege. And that's our position. 21 22 MS. BOYD: Okay. So --MR. MICALLEF: So and so now we have the 23 positions on the table, and no one's going to decide 24 25 them today.

Merrill - Washington D.C.

800-292-4789

www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295 Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 185

1	So what do you want to do?
2	MS. PASCAL: What do you mean, no one's
3	going to decide them today? I'm not following.
4	MR. MICALLEF: No one's going to resolve
5	this dispute today. It will get resolved, I'm sure,
б	or it won't matter. But no one's going to resolve
7	it today.
8	MS. PASCAL: I think if I follow, or I
9	think I understand what you are saying, I guess at
10	this point we can go off the record and take a
11	break.
12	MR. MICALLEF: Okay.
13	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Okay. Off the record,
14	the time is 2:07.
15	(Whereupon, a recess was taken
16	commencing at 2:07 P.M. and
17	concluding at 2:18 P.M.)
18	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the
19	record. The time is 2:18.
20	BY MR. SUH:
21	Q. Mr. Bone, did you talk to your counsel
22	during the break?
23	A. Briefly, yes.
24	Q. What about?
25	A. They mentioned the fact that I'm going

## RICHARD GEORGE ANDREW BONE - 2/19/2014

Page 186

```
come in here, I'm going to listen to some more
 1
 2
      questions from you, and then I understand that the
 3
      deposition will be closed.
 4
                MR. SUH: Okay. I would like to pass the
 5
      witness.
 б
                MS. PASCAL: I have no questions at this
 7
      time.
                THE WITNESS: Sorry, you would like to do
 8
 9
      what?
                MS. PASCAL: Pass the witness. He means he
10
11
      is asking me if I am going to do redirect.
12
                THE WITNESS: Okay.
13
                MS. PASCAL: And no, at this time we have
14
      no redirect.
15
                MR. SUH: All right.
                MS. PASCAL: So I believe the deposition is
16
17
      closed.
18
                THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Okay. This is the end
      of volume one, videotape number three in the
19
20
      deposition of Dr. Richard Bone. We are going off
21
      the record. The time is 2:19.
22
                (Whereupon, the deposition was
23
                 adjourned at 2:19 P.M.)
24
                             --000--
25
```

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295 Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 187

## RICHARD GEORGE ANDREW BONE - 2/19/2014

Page 187

1	I declare under penalty of perjury the
2	is true and correct. Subscribed at
3	, California, this day
4	2014.
5	
6	Richard George Andrew Bone
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
2	I, COREY W. ANDERSON, a Certified
3	Shorthand Reporter, hereby certify that the witness
4	in the foregoing deposition was by me duly sworn to
5	tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the
6	truth in the within-entitled cause;
7	That said deposition was taken down in
8	shorthand by me, a disinterested person, at the time
9	and place therein stated, and that the testimony of
10	the said witness was thereafter reduced to
11	typewriting, by computer, under my direction and
12	supervision;
13	That before completion of the deposition,
14	review of the transcript was not requested. If
15	requested, any changes made by the deponent (and
16	provided to the reporter) during the period allowed
17	are appended hereto.
18	I further certify that I am not of counsel
19	or attorney for either or any of the parties to the
20	said deposition, nor in any way interested in the
21	event of this cause, and that I am not related to
22	any of the parties thereto.
23	DATED:
24	
25	COREY W. ANDERSON, CSR 4096

800-292-4789

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295 Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 189

A	addition	ahead	132:12 135:15 141:3
ability	47:2	174:6 184:9	141:13 142:9 143:25
8:22 146:16	additionally	AJG	143:25 144:22 145:4
able	83:4	135:11,12	147:13,15 148:6
15:25 151:23	address	al	153:21 155:6,15
absence	7:25 180:13,15 181:12	1:13 6:13	156:5,7 157:13
149:1	182:14 183:6 184:2	alleged	158:19 160:24
absolute	addressed	118:12 130:20 133:17	168:21 177:5,16,19
76:15	123:25 176:9 181:13	136:23 155:3 157:18	177:22 178:4 181:2
absolutely	181:14 183:19	172:11	answered
38:21	addressing	allocated	32:10 52:6 74:18 82:3
abusive	104:10 125:22 152:11	181:10	98:3 99:18 101:12
141:14	adjourned	allowed	103:25 104:3 108:17
accelerated	186:23	188:16	112:3,22 132:13
11:19	advice	Alto	134:24 135:2 138:3
accepted	19:21 20:4	5:5 6:1,21 8:2 14:14	141:7 145:1,17,25
90:6	affect	83:11 133:3	answering
access	173:25	amount	9:12 19:25 36:16
146:15	AFTERNOON	38:7 115:22 154:2	145:16
accommodate	117:1	amounts	answers
116:13	AG	19:4	9:7
accompanied	135:11 140:9	analysis	Antimicrobials
16:1	agent	123:15 125:18 126:2	68:4,6 72:1 76:4 79:2
accounted	16:11	Anderson	98:25 99:17 100:3
150:7	agents	1:25 5:6 7:12 188:2,25	101:2 108:25
accounting	28:7 29:10 87:17	Andrew	Antonio
40:13 43:19	AGG	1:21 5:8 7:16 8:1	8:2
accurate	140:9	24:20 25:7,25 26:9	anybody
37:24 51:18	ago	27:7 105:21,25	30:6 31:14 69:11,15
action	32:7 96:15	106:22 119:11 151:2	69:24 70:4 175:5
44:2 77:9 103:3	agree	151:11 159:18	apologies
activities	37:19,25 41:16 47:1	160:18 162:14	183:5
52:3 56:16 59:24 61:1	47:14,25 48:9,22	163:20,21 165:12	apologize
61:8 124:8 136:8	51:8 52:24 58:25	168:13 170:19	175:15 181:3
148:8,22 168:5	59:23 61:11 71:23	178:21,22 187:6	Appeal
activity	74:11 76:21 80:3	answer	1:2 6:11
59:6 61:8,11,15	89:14 94:10 98:6	9:8,17 10:1 12:8 20:5	appear
127:25	108:13 112:12	27:25 33:22 34:22	92:8 172:15 181:21
actual	126:21 136:22	35:21 36:9 38:15	183:20
16:14 17:9 36:2	agreed	43:1 50:9 53:12	appeared
102:19 182:1	141:11	62:11 63:5 68:12	5:7 40:9
add	agreement	81:18,20 83:19 96:2	appears
18:3 24:6 40:19 41:7	17:13 20:6 21:10,11	96:20,21 97:12 98:9	52:2 59:6 66:1 119:24
63:4 92:23 149:7	24:2 65:5,20	106:6,15 112:9	appended
added	Ah	119:19 120:5 121:19	188:17
38:9	93:8	125:11 130:10	application
	I	l	

Merrill - Washington D.C.

800-292-4789

www.merrillcorp.com/law

IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

14:25 17:16,20 18:6 155:21 156:12,23 118:18 123:11,18 85:13,15,22 89:22 18:9 27:9,18 28:18 158:14,22,24 159:8 131:7 171:19 172:15 assignment 28:23 29:5,7,12,15 ascribed 73:15 159:15 160:6,14 77:11 30:16,17 37:21 45:19 161:12,19,22 162:25 assisting 45:20 47:3,10,15,22 163:7,9 164:7,15,18 aside 83:4 48:3 52:16 53:14 165:2,4,7,22 166:6 177:16 associate 54:10,17 56:7,14 166:17,20 167:21 14:10,15,18 17:10 asked 58:9,12 59:1,25 168:4,7 169:1 170:1 21:9,10 34:18 45:4 25:18 60:11,22 61:2,12 170:9,10 171:9,14,16 50:9 74:17 82:1 associated 62:1,4,18 63:9,12,15 171:25 172:8 84:15,19 92:16 97:11 120:9 63:24 64:4 68:21,25 applications 97:20.25 98:3 99:17 assume 49:9 67:5 68:7,13 69:7 70:9 71:24 72:2 99:18 108:17 112:3 9:16 38:19 43:25 73:16,22 74:4,8,10 91:20 95:14 103:2 112:23 113:1 119:18 attend 74:11 76:3,5 79:11 122:1 134:23 144:23 116:3 184:17 apportion 79:12,13 80:4,17 52:13 144:24 181:17 attended 81:25 83:5,9,9,13 appreciate 182:15 108:24 166:12 84:11,14,16,25 85:2 141:15,24 asking attending 86:2,13 87:7 88:7,8,8 appropriate 21:5 22:18 28:21 170:16 89:1,11 90:5,7,15,16 44:1 32:11 36:22 45:13 attention 91:1,11 92:10,21 appropriately 56:1 63:22 91:13 77:4 91:10 98:25 93:2,10,15,19 94:11 63:10 107:21 122:11 102:1,3,24 103:17,20 94:23 95:2 96:17,23 approximately 180:21 183:25 103:22 104:4,6,14 97:3,10,22,24 98:1 78:25 86:9 186:11 129:14 171:20 98:15 99:6,11,13,16 April aspect attorney 101:7 105:3,11,22,23 1:11 14:20 147:14 10:5 15:8,10 16:17 106:20 107:6,11 architecture aspects 18:7 23:16 25:8,11 108:1,14 109:4 13:10 33:6 97:5 131:5 25:14 26:23 35:4 111:14,25 114:7,13 argument 152:11 166:20 53:10 54:22 55:2 115:18,21 117:22 178:12 179:15 assert 72:23 79:23 82:5 120:19 121:12 argumentative 19:23 55:3,11 83:12 85:7 107:22 122:19,21 123:12 41:4 52:4 60:4 61:5 asserted 123:14 147:17 151:8 124:7,11,14 125:4,8 62:20 99:19 100:15 21:1 55:9 142:6 156:6 157:11 159:25 125:15,19 126:3,8 103:24 134:25 172:18 182:16.21 160:23 162:18 164:1 127:5 128:15,21,25 arguments assertions 166:25 167:14 129:2,7,10 131:4,23 142:18 179:6 180:12 188:19 132:1,8,15,19 134:7 Arrange assessment attorneys 134:17,21 135:4,24 114:2 159:2 57:10 58:7 120:1.13 14:13 29:2 86:24 136:6,10 137:20 arranged 120:18 123:10,17,20 87:16 89:7 94:6 138:5,7,15,20,22 124:10,23 125:7,14 163:18 110:9 140:4 181:16 139:1,7,20,24 145:19 126:8,11 182:12 184:17 arrangement 146:3,5,19 147:4,24 21:3,14,22 64:21 assign attorney-client 148:8,9 149:11,22 65:18 116:8 33:7 34:17 35:2 53:10 150:8,16,19 151:3,12 54:22,25 55:3 62:9 arrangements assigned 151:15 152:2,9,12,17 19:17 136:18 73:21,25 74:3,3 75:25 62:13 63:19 66:7 153:15,22,24 154:4 77:17 78:3 79:15,21 67:21 102:6 104:12 art 154:12 155:10,16,19 54:9,16 57:10 58:8 80:1.3,7 82:14,22 104:19,23 109:10,25

Merrill - Washington D.C.

800-292-4789

www.merrillcorp.com/law

IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

141:10,13 143:24	111:19,21 117:2	116:4 124:13 143:7	56:15 64:2 78:6
144:20 145:4,8,14	121:7,9,21 143:6	begins	79:19 80:23 81:14
147:13 151:7 156:6	162:6 173:3,11	6:6 38:10	87:9 98:21 99:7
157:12 159:24	175:13 178:10	<b>begun</b>	104:10 119:20
160:24 162:18	182:18 183:13	10:4	139:11 149:2
163:25 167:14 171:6	185:18	behalf	better
184:20	background	7:5 174:16	146:16
	10:19 26:10,12,17,21		
August 2:15 69:7 79:10 83:10	26:23 27:2 80:16	<b>behave</b> 125:12	<b>beyond</b> 117:25 128:12 130:8
		believe	
83:15,19,21 84:10	152:25 154:1,11		135:18 138:13
86:9 90:7,17,25 91:2	backlog	8:20 17:14 19:4,9	146:13 154:23 167:2
91:8,12,15,21 92:13	70:7,13 71:7,11,13,17	23:23 25:17 26:4	169:11,12 172:21
93:3 97:6,9,14,18,21	<b>backup</b>	27:3,17 28:25 29:3	182:2 <b>bill</b>
98:16 99:2,5,8,9,10	174:20 180:22 183:4,5	30:24 31:3,9,16,25	DIII 17:4 40:9 49:23 62:15
99:12 100:20 105:4,8 105:13,20 116:5	backwards	32:24 33:6,15 34:16 37:6 39:10 40:5,14	17:4 40:9 49:23 62:15 65:6
135:11 147:7 148:17	96:5,24	-	billable
135:11 147:7 148:17 149:25 151:1 152:24	balance 13:5	42:14,15 43:2 46:24 49:24 50:9 51:11	17:4,9 45:22 65:15
Austin	bar	52:21 53:13,21 54:3	17:4,9 45:22 65:15
3:4,11 6:25 7:7	14:9 15:13,15 83:10	54:21 56:10,22 61:22	billed
author	93:14 107:7,10	61:24 62:3 64:24	38:5 39:23 42:8,22
36:13	<b>base</b>	67:23 70:12 75:25	58.5 59.25 42.8,22 51:9 65:12
available	103:8	78:24 79:21 84:12	
101:23	based		<b>billing</b> 38:18 40:1 41:22 42:1
Avenue	13:3 20:1,7 34:10	85:2 88:2 89:4,21 91:12 94:1,2 97:11	49:14 52:2 62:16
5:5 6:21 133:2	38:19 52:25 54:24	97:12,21 98:6 99:14	119:23,24,25 166:9
award	62:23 64:2 65:9	99:20 101:8,12	175:23,24 176:2,14
65:9	78:20 94:3,8 102:21	103:25 104:7,8	175.25,24 176.2,14
aware	103:5,12,15 104:6,7	106:12 108:18 109:6	bills
37:11 52:14 116:10	111:5,10,11 112:22	116:15 119:18	42:5,8,16,19 43:4,6,12
<b>A.M</b>	120:3 129:9 133:4	120:16 123:24	42.3,8,10,19 43.4,0,12 <b>bio</b>
<b>A.W</b> 5:4 6:3 20:20,21 22:8	172:20,22 177:4,5	120:10 125:24 124:13 126:6 127:4,6	
22:9 64:12,13	basically	124.13 120.0 127.4,0	biotechnology
22.7 04.12,13	11:10 14:8,16 57:6	130:18,22 135:1	29:6
B	164:25 176:19	137:1 141:1 142:8	29.0 bit
B	basis	145:12 159:13 171:5	52:19
3:20 15:23	40:21 60:6 102:23	173:14 174:23 176:8	blank
Bachelor's	152:15 172:21	177:10,16 179:18	41:5,20,21
10:20,22,22	173:15,20 175:10,19	180:6 181:18 183:17	<b>Board</b>
back	175:20,21 176:7,17	183:18,24 186:16	1:2 6:11 22:15,20 55:1
13:24 14:2 15:5 20:22	176:25 178:4	believed	142:14 179:8,9
20:25 22:10 29:11	began	94:9	180:10
32:25 33:20 44:7	12:13 83:4	benefit	Board's
47:6 50:3 64:14,19	beginning	107:10	142:19
65:24 74:22,25 96:16	10:19 12:12 13:1,16	best	Bockius
100:5,14 102:1	14:10,19 34:18 64:15	9:17 28:5 29:17 32:15	14:14
	1 110,17 5 1110 0 1115	,, <u>2010</u> <u>2</u> ,, <u>0</u> 2.10	1

Merrill - Washington D.C.

800-292-4789

www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

Bone	111:9,19 112:2	173:13	111:6,10 113:21
1:21 2:10 5:8 6:8 7:16	114:15 116:21 122:2	build	117:17 125:11
8:1 55:20,21 64:17	122:9 123:22 125:9	86:20	128:12 146:8 175:4,5
143:1,9 174:3 175:9	125:20 126:4,15	burden	176:19
175:12,22 177:6,7,18	132:11 134:11,25	182:18	capability
184:11 185:21	136:1,13 137:13,15	business	27:13,16
186:20 187:6	137:25 138:2 140:17	43:24 114:20	Carberry
Bone's	141:4,6,12,20 142:2	43.24 114.20 busy	34:4,5,8,16 170:16,18
172:20 176:8,9 184:3	142:11,22 145:6,22	28:6	170:19 171:5
Bone/Pennie	146:22 148:2,13,15	20.0	card
2:13	149:14,16 150:11	<u> </u>	16:6
bonus	151:9 152:5 155:13	C	career
65:11	156:17 160:1,10,25	3:1 4:1 6:5 11:23 13:6	94:5 95:18 96:12
book	162:20 163:2,5 164:2	CA	126:6
77:20 78:21 132:22	165:17,25 166:2,22	3:21 4:15	carried
133:25 134:2,5	166:24 167:16,24	Calendar	58:8 69:20 123:11
books	168:1,18 169:19	2:24	126:7 128:23 168:5
133:4,5	170:4,25 172:3	California	carrying
bookstore	173:21 178:6,11,22	5:5 6:1,18,22 8:2	53:15 165:1
133:1	179:12 182:4,6	187:3	case
bottom	184:22	call	8:15 10:11 23:5 29:1
39:3 114:1	boyd@turnerboyd	22:20 62:1 142:23	38:21 44:2 68:13
Bovd	4:18	163:20 175:13	85:12 96:13 117:12
4:13,16 7:2,2,3 21:24	break	called	183:7
22:4,22 25:23 28:9	9:21,25 63:2,5 64:8	5:10 10:21 11:3 13:18	cases
30:22 32:10 34:23,25	116:17,19 117:6,12	13:18 15:21 18:4	23:6 82:13,22 84:19
35:20 36:21 37:4	142:14 161:6,24	45:23 122:25 133:13	85:22,25 96:4,7
39:16 40:24 41:2	173:1 183:9 185:11	137:4	98:11
42:3 43:14,16 44:22	185:22	calling	categorized
45:5,11 46:17 47:19	breakfast	176:1,14	59:24 61:1,12
48:13 51:21 52:4	143:16 144:6	calls	cause
53:4,9,20 54:20 55:1	breaks	58:4 60:4 62:9 72:22	52:21 188:6,21
55:12 56:4,9,21 58:2	9:20	92:1 106:3 109:24	caution
59:11 60:2,4,12 61:3	Brett	123:14 156:5	53:9 66:6 67:20 72:23
61:5,14,21 62:7,9,20	24:22 26:16 119:11,11	Cambridge	85:6 102:5 109:9,25
63:1 64:1 65:1 66:6	147:7 162:14 163:14	10:21,23 11:10,24	140:17 143:23
67:16,18,20 70:2	163:15,17 167:10	12:17	144:19 145:3,7
71:14 72:5,22 73:9	168:11,13 169:6	campus	147:11 151:6,9,18
74:15 75:10,22 76:8	170:17,19	116:3	156:4 157:10 159:23
78:4,13 79:17 81:15	brief	Canada	160:1,22,25 162:17
82:25 85:6,9,20 87:2	129:22	11:4	163:25 164:2 165:15
87:13 88:3,10,12	Briefly	can't	165:17 166:24
89:2,17 95:23,25	185:23	24:1 41:6 49:15 51:17	167:13,16 168:16,18
98:3 102:5 105:15	broad	52:24 76:15 78:23	170:23,25 179:25
106:2 107:20 109:9	126:20	103:16 104:5,11	cautions
109:24 110:6,19	broke	110:7,22,22 111:3,6	169:9

Merrill - Washington D.C.

800-292-4789

www.merrillcorp.com/law

IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

	•		
certain	cite	109:22 110:3,10,14	76:19 105:10 106:19
92:23 180:6 181:10	83:14 174:3	111:1,7 112:18 165:3	completion
certainly	cited	181:22	188:13
33:15 55:3 86:22	179:4	clients	complex
87:22 90:4 96:4	City	49:3 55:23 81:6	42:12 83:6 93:23,24
126:7 175:14	4:15 32:22 140:2,22	closed	94:11
certificate	claiming	186:3,17	complicated
16:2 188:1	107:10	closely	94:9
Certified	claims	18:6 56:13	compound
5:6 188:2	60:20	collecting	21:17
certify	clarification	65:9	computational
188:3,18	9:15 84:1 101:3 176:6	come	13:20 14:1
cetera	clarified	37:3 75:8,15,16,20	computer
126:23 143:17	52:17	124:17 186:1	11:16,17,17,20 12:15
CFR	clarify	comes	12:20,24 27:4 83:6
15:22	55:2 76:13 79:11 87:6	141:21	94:8 133:3,12 188:11
chance	112:15,16 136:4	coming	concerned
91:14	clarity	28:2	43:19
changes	51:15 176:6	commencing	conclude
188:15	class	5:3 20:20 22:8 64:12	164:14
channels	11:18,19,20,22,23	143:4 162:4 173:9	concluding
133:13	classes	185:16	20:21 22:9 64:13
characterization	11:16 116:3	comment	143:5 162:5 173:10
94:16 101:18,21	classifications	22:22 184:8,10	185:17
characterize	167:15	commitment	conclusion
90:19	clear	69:21	60:5
characterized	21:8 55:8,16,17,20	common	concurrent
56:12,12 120:8	63:7 91:18 114:19	13:4 43:2 83:22 84:2,2	31:16
chart	141:18 168:21 173:2	125:6	concurrently
111:16 184:13	176:10 177:25	communication	125:14
check	180:17 182:18,23	62:10,13 109:25 110:1	conduct
73:18	183:1,14,16	145:9 150:18	10:6
chemist	clearly	communications	confer
13:20	60:21 152:10 154:3	53:10 54:5 66:8 92:2	172:25
chemistry	158:6 163:7	102:6 104:13,19,23	conference
10:24,25 11:14,15	clerical	109:10 140:18 151:8	93:16 140:21 144:12
12:14 14:1 26:19	49:16 50:10 51:12	159:25 160:24	confident
children	clerk	company	79:3 127:8
117:9	14:3,7 15:6 17:1 25:9	4:23 13:8,18,23,25	conform
chose	25:18 95:7	18:4	183:25
75:2	clerks	complete	confused
chronological	83:11 87:17 94:6	38:20 74:10 83:13	57:18
72:3 73:7,13 74:13,24	client	84:12 92:19,20	conjunction
75:2,7 76:6	23:23 40:3 43:22 44:3	completed	125:14
chronologically	44:19 49:20 66:11	115:9	connected
71:21 72:19	67:6 68:8 109:17,18	completing	60:22 63:11 136:8
, 1.21 , 2.17		B	00. <b>22</b> 00.11 100.0
	•		-

Merrill - Washington D.C.

800-292-4789

www.merrillcorp.com/law

IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

146:6 147:3 150:19	141:16	89:16 90:8 92:14	23:15,21,25 24:4,7
154:3 158:23 161:21	Cont'd	94:12 95:3,6 97:23	34:19 35:8 50:6
168:6 171:15	4:1	98:17.22 99:15	54:24 55:10,23,24
connection	convened	100:18 103:18	92:3 106:11 117:5,11
8:13 31:15 35:25	180:2	104:20 107:25 108:8	141:9 142:15,18
36:12 37:8 65:18,22	convenient	104.20 107.25 108.8	174:20 180:23,23
120:18 124:10,15	63:1	114:8,14 115:2,16	183:4 185:21 188:18
138:21,25 140:1,1	conversation	117:13,14 118:13,20	counsels
149:1 165:7 170:10	117:7 163:17 168:17	119:7,8 120:2,4	29:25
consecutive	conversations	123:5 126:9 127:11	counsel's
73:2	119:25	128:17 129:8,11	183:5
rs.2 consider	copies	130:18,21,22 131:18	couple
			34:3
17:10 132:16 134:15	30:11 31:4,11,14	132:4,10 133:18,21 134:2,4,9 135:22,25	
138:5,21 150:18	<b>copy</b>		course
156:21 161:20	23:7 32:3 91:3,19	136:24 137:12,17,24 138:17 139:21	16:16
consideration	103:9,11 110:24		<b>court</b>
182:7	163:16	145:12,16,21 146:21	7:12,13,14 8:15 9:7
considered	Corey	147:25 149:13	21:19 182:11
56:16 63:11 92:18	1:25 5:6 7:12 188:2,25	150:10,23 151:17,19	covered
136:7 137:6 155:18	corporate	152:4,10 153:11,13	33:7 34:16 54:21 98:7
consistent	26:23,24 45:23,25	153:17 154:8 155:12	104:23 110:11 111:2
72:25 91:18 129:23	46:2 123:1	156:14 157:19 158:1	141:1 145:13 171:6
135:15 156:22	Corporation	158:3,16 159:10,13	covers
consultant	1:4 6:8,18 7:1	160:8,12 161:14,17	148:24
18:16	correct	163:1 164:9,20	created
contact	10:12 11:22 15:7,8,9	165:24 166:4 167:23	36:14
109:22 110:2,10,14	15:11,14 16:12,13,15	169:17 170:3 171:10	credulity
111:7 112:19	16:18,19,24,25 17:17	172:2,8,12,16 183:8	43:5
contacted	17:18,21,22 20:2	187:2	crystallography
109:18	23:11,19,20 25:15	correcting	26:19
contain	26:25 28:19 30:21,25	40:14	CSR
31:4	35:8,9 37:13,14 39:8	correctly	1:25 188:25
contains	39:15 41:18 42:9,23	20:6 57:9 71:5 82:11	culminating
114:20	43:3,13 44:21 45:25	129:5	93:2,3
content	46:3 47:4,5,16 48:4,7	correlate	current
63:18,23 182:1	48:12 49:14 51:19	148:22	14:21 59:19 61:20
contents	53:2 54:19 57:12,13	correspond	159:20 165:12
36:6	57:15 59:2,4 60:1,14	60:16	currently
contingency	60:18 61:13 62:12	corresponds	179:15
19:16 20:7 21:2,14,21	65:3 71:8 72:4 73:8	99:2	curriculum
21:23 64:21 65:17	73:17,19 74:14 75:9	couldn't	11:11
continue	76:19,24 79:16 80:5	15:20 16:10,16	cycle
32:17	80:21 81:13,24 82:15	counsel	38:18
continued	82:18,23 83:1,17	6:23 9:22 10:10,15	D
67:12 91:15 174:15	84:8,13 86:10,21	18:7,13,16 19:20	<u> </u>
control	87:1,12,19 88:9	20:4,16 22:15 23:10	D
	I	l	1

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law

800-292-4789

IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

2:1 6:5 deduce 129:22 135:5,14 139:11,20 dash 143:20 144:25 133:24 design 47:9 145:13,20 146:3,17 defending 13:13 68:21 72:2 76:5 date 147:21 148:21,23 55:11 79:11,13 83:8 84:16 6:14 53:19 69:12 149:5 150:5,22 151:5 defense 84:25 85:2 86:2,13 78:18 79:4,7 83:10 151:21,24 152:3,9 22:15 87:7 90:6 91:10 93:2 153:7 154:22 155:17 define 93:9 94:22 95:1 97:3 85:1 89:10,12,23 156:3,9,13,19 157:15 18:14 21:23 71:10 98:1 93:13,15,17,22 104:25 106:23 107:7 157:22 158:21 159:5 designated definitely 109:7,13,20 117:24 159:15,22 160:3,7,14 104:22 57:22 123:8 160:21 161:2 162:16 definition 118:2,8 119:1,13 desire 127:10,13 128:3,6,16 163:23 164:25 165:5 85:21 90:4 128:21 129:7 130:7 165:23 166:7,14,15 degree DeStefano 167:12,22 168:4,15 10:20 24:24 25:11,19 26:5 130:16 131:13 132:9 134:22 135:20 136:4 168:20 169:8 170:2,9 department 140:10 167:10 **DeStefano's** 137:23 138:16 139:8 170:22 171:22 172:8 40:13 139:17 140:14 187:3 40:12 deponent davs 144:17 146:12,20 188:15 detail 17:6 31:20,22 32:6 119:2 147:10 149:12 150:9 deposed 153:5,10,16 155:11 51:14 69:21 73:2 8:69:3 determine 157:6,9,25 158:10,15 77:9,11 98:21 100:6 54:17 deposition 159:9 161:13 164:8 100:9,10,11 101:4 developed 1:20 6:7,19 10:4,6 164:19 165:14 172:1 114:20,21,22 115:5 22:14,21 23:1 34:18 129:23 181:24 183:22 115:14,16 120:7 64:16 124:1 142:12 didn't DATED DC 142:25 143:8 166:12 43:6 52:12 86:12 188:23 3:6,13 172:19 173:4 174:12 88:25 90:13 98:14 deadline dates 179:14 180:1,7,11 100:10 101:9,17 52:10,25 53:8 54:6 69:19 182:19 183:13,19 105:2 107:14 108:13 70:23 72:12,12 73:3 Dechaene 184:3 186:3,16,20,22 111:13,23 114:12 75:6 78:24 79:14 59:19 61:19,23 63:8 188:4,7,13,20 115:20 117:11 82:13,21,21 84:23 decide describe Diego 89:15 100:5 103:2,20 184:24 185:3 90:23 125:2,3 129:18 3:21 104:9 115:3 decided difference 170:8 171:14 day 62:23 82:5 described 50:25 17:6 30:4.7 31:19 declaration different 13:22 58:9 119:3 2:9 23:4 36:1,12 45:17 45:3,7,9 51:6,9,10 33:17,18 34:9 52:11 123:11 130:9 131:22 53:22,25 60:19,23 57:5 58:6 69:6 70:14 describes 52:2,13 69:9,23 69:21,25 70:25 77:21 74:23 76:10 77:2,14 135:16 158:21 161:18 70:23 71:3 73:3 77:9 79:22 80:8 81:10 78:9 86:16 90:19 description 77:11 84:20 96:3 83:20 86:7 88:21 102:14 103:5,9 105:5 2:8 46:9 50:17,22 112:7 113:2,3 121:25 90:11 91:1 92:10 106:17 122:16 123:6 122:5,7 125:12,13 56:23 61:9 119:20 129:15 179:5 96:7,10,14 105:12 126:23 183:20 120:10,11 172:7 115:23 118:5,11 declare differently 181:25 183:22 119:6,10,16,21 187:1 51:4.6 descriptions 128:11 130:14,20 dedicated 52:25 80:17 difficult 131:2 134:3,4,8 146:5 descriptive 96:23

Merrill - Washington D.C.

800-292-4789

www.merrillcorp.com/law

IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation - Ex. 1102, p. 196

Page 7

digits	District	12:20 96:13 123:18,19	29:25
44:24,25	8:14 21:19	125:18 158:22	doubt
diligence	diverted	don't	55:4
2:24 184:12	91:10	8:20 9:14 18:23,23	download
diligently	DLA	26:11,20,22 27:3,11	128:1 130:3
70:8	3:19 4:3 5:4 6:20 7:4,9	28:13,21,25 30:24	downloaded
direct	23:13,15,15,18,25	31:11 32:10 33:15	131:8,9,11,13,24
179:4	24:3	38:10,20 42:7,16,20	downloading
directed	doc	43:10,10 46:7,19	136:19,20,22 137:2,5
132:18	12:18,19	48:22 51:3 52:20	137:7 138:10
direction	docket	54:2,7,13 55:7,10	Dr
148:20 188:11	71:3 85:18,18,23 86:3	61:8 62:2,21,24	25:9,18 55:21 59:19
disagree	86:18,20 101:14,16	63:17 69:14 70:12	61:19 64:17 143:1,9
51:20 53:3,5 149:18	171:20	71:16 73:25 74:19	172:20 174:3 175:9
164:10 180:25	docketed	75:14 76:22 77:12,12	175:12,22 176:8
disclose	103:2	80:9 82:4,12,20 83:1	177:18 184:3,11
66:7 72:24 85:7 102:6	docketing	84:12 87:24 89:12	186:20
140:18 166:25	82:20	90:3 92:5,7,12,15,22	draft
discuss	doctoral	94:13,15,20 95:11	17:20 18:9 27:8 29:4
55:14 59:19 61:20	11:2 13:17	96:1,19 97:12 98:20	29:12,15 63:15,23
63:9 105:9 166:17,21	document	99:14 101:8,20 102:7	70:8 81:25 84:14
discussed	24:17 30:2 32:3 35:21	102:18 104:16,18,24	91:4 92:21 95:7,12
33:2,10,12 34:13,15	35:22,25 36:2,3	105:17 106:12,21	95:13,22 97:24 99:16
63:18,23 79:23 82:8	39:19,20 41:13 49:8	107:19,21 108:7	105:10 106:19
106:19 161:21	80:23 114:16 124:21	109:5,5,12,14 116:15	108:23 132:1 135:4
162:13 167:2,18	125:1 138:5 163:5,19	118:1,7 119:5,9,15	139:19 162:13
169:11,13 171:5	164:22 166:3 168:2	120:16 121:6 126:11	163:10 164:14 165:1
discussing	documented	126:20 127:20 128:4	165:8 168:4
61:25 80:6 106:22	89:4 127:9 128:14	128:5,18 129:1,1	drafted
163:9	129:6 132:7 134:6	130:15,18,22 131:3	17:15 27:18 28:17,22
discussion	135:23 137:22	131:10,25 133:7,20	29:7 92:18 95:15
22:17 58:17 62:24	138:14 139:19	133:24 135:16,19	132:14 136:6 139:7
73:23 152:12 168:12	145:18 146:18	141:20 147:20	139:24 146:2 148:7
170:9 175:7	147:23 149:10 152:1	150:21,24 151:15	150:15 152:9 153:22
discussions	153:14 155:9 156:11	153:3,4,9 155:6	163:7
33:13 136:8 171:15	158:13 159:7 160:5	156:8,11 158:7,10	drafting
disinterested	161:4,11 162:24	160:2 161:1 162:21	64:4 74:7 83:5 88:7
188:8	164:6 165:21 167:20	164:3,23 165:18	89:6 90:15 95:1
DISPLAY	169:25 171:8,24	167:1 169:20 171:1	98:14 101:7 105:3,23
1:14	documents	177:10,23 178:9,25	108:14 111:14,24
dispute	22:25 35:19 36:10	179:11 180:12	114:6,12 115:17
185:5	43:8 114:4 159:2	182:18 183:15,17	125:8,15,17,18 126:2
dissolved	179:3	184:5	126:2,8 128:15,20
14:12	doesn't	door	129:3,6,10 132:8
distinct	105:22 128:22	92:3.6	134:7,21 135:24
62:3	doing	double-sided	137:23 138:5,15,20
			10,120 100,0,10,20

Merrill - Washington D.C.

800-292-4789

www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

138:25 145:19	Edmonds	engage	152:24 155:20,24
146:19 147:24	2:13 14:3,8,11,12,14	16:5	158:9 160:17,18
149:11,22 150:8	14:23 15:6 16:3 25:8	engaged	161:20 162:11
152:2 153:15 154:11	25:10,12 31:5 32:23	47:1	164:25 165:11 166:8
155:10,16 156:12	40:13 42:5 43:19	engineering	167:8 168:10,23
158:14,21 159:8,14	57:21 67:6 68:8 71:1	27:4	169:4 170:13,15
160:6,13 161:12,18	82:5 93:21 94:7	enter	176:2,15 182:3,10
164:7,15,18 165:22	124:3 140:4,21	49:13	equally
166:5 167:21 170:1,8	144:12 148:24	entered	96:6
171:9,14,25 172:7	163:10 165:4 166:13	40:6,8 82:8 178:18	equations
drafts	168:25	entire	94:3
30:11,14,16 31:4,7,12	educational	28:10,12 95:18	Erica
80:16 91:20	10:18 11:11	entirely	3:22 7:4 173:17
draw	effectively	27:5 124:4	erica.pascal@dlapi
129:14	17:5	entitled	3:24
129:14 Drew	efficient	92:4 173:22 174:21	5:24 error
163:18	96:12		50:10
<b>Drive</b>	eight	177:13 179:2 180:23 entries	
4:5	88:21		errors 49:16 51:12
4.5 due	either	30:4,6 34:3 39:20 40:7	
69:18 70:23 72:12,12	21:16 27:17 31:9 37:7	41:8,9 49:19,25	<b>ESQ</b> 3:7,14,22 4:8,16
	44:23,25 51:11,11	51:17,18 52:20 56:11	5.7,14,22 4.8,10 essential
73:3 75:6 89:10,14		58:14 89:5 92:25	
89:23 93:12,15,16	79:22 93:15 109:17	97:18 98:20 105:17	137:19
103:20 104:9 107:9	133:11,12 188:19	108:7 110:23 115:3	essentially
109:7,12 152:12	elaborate	115:22 123:7 124:22	16:3 56:16 71:2
<b>duly</b> 5:11 188:4	121:16	125:1 128:9 129:19	101:13
	electrical	135:3 139:10 140:7	establish
duration	27:4	143:13 151:21	184:12
65:12	eligible	156:19 157:22	established
D'Alessandro	65:10	177:11 181:18	57:21,23 58:7 123:10
2:19	employed	183:18,24 184:3,12	et
<b>E</b>	6:17 16:4	184:18	1:13 6:13 126:23
E	employee	entry	143:17
2:1 3:1,1 4:1,1 6:5,5	18:15	23:6 37:16,25 50:4,14	European
earlier	employment	50:21 59:18 60:16,20	69:1 83:7
76:19 79:4 81:18	13:14 16:3 17:13	61:18 62:15 77:2,20	Evans
131:20,21	empty	78:9 82:7 99:24	153:8
earliest	101:14	100:4,25 106:17	evenings
100:4	encompasses	107:1 113:9,17,21	17:8
East	49:1	114:18 115:15	event
6:21	encrypted	117:16,19 126:25	188:21
echo	163:19	127:13,24 130:24	events
	ended	132:21 133:25 135:8	135:18
55:15,24 179:13,16	39:22	135:10 136:16 138:9	everybody
edit	ends	139:14 147:6 148:20	22:14 28:6
42:5	47:20	149:24 150:25 151:1	evidence
		I	

Merrill - Washington D.C.

800-292-4789

www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

8			
30:19 32:12,16 39:25	47:7 50:4,14,21 57:5	72:9	97:4
53:18,22,25 78:6	58:22 59:7,8,15,16	explains	far
79:19 80:23 81:14	59:23 60:17,19,25	70:24	22:15 115:19
111:5,5 118:1,4,8	61:18 65:24 66:19	explanation	fatuous
119:16 128:6 130:15	80:10,15 83:3,14	178:15	164:24
138:24 139:6,11	90:23 93:4 98:23	explicitly	fax
153:4,10 177:6	99:1,21 100:23 102:1	22:13 148:7	40:11 91:3
184:19,19	102:16 103:9.15	explore	faxed
exact	104:6 105:8,14 107:2	179:2	91:19
104:25 121:19,19	104:0 105:0,14 107:2	extensive	faxes
123:25	123:6 124:21 127:14	13:12	31:9
	129:17 130:17	extent	
<b>exactly</b> 62:24 90:3 110:23	143:12 144:4 152:1		<b>February</b>
		58:4 77:10 92:1 98:4	1:22 5:3 6:2,14
113:7 158:10	175:25 176:3,4,4,12	101:22 143:25	fee
exam	176:14 177:1 178:18	147:12 149:18 156:5	19:16 20:6 21:2,9,11
14:9 15:16	184:13	extrapolation	21:13,14,21 24:2
EXAMINATION	exhibits	128:19	64:21 65:5,17,20
2:3,5 7:22	2:6 176:10	extremely	feedback
EXAMINATIONS	exist	22:16 28:6	89:7 91:6,9
2:2	31:10 37:12 155:3	e-mail	feel
examined	existed	139:3 150:2 163:19,20	79:3
5:11	118:12 130:19 133:2	e-mailing	feels
example	133:16 136:23	138:11	55:22
29:1,5 32:2 80:8 124:4		e-mails	fellowship
178:19 181:19,21	157:17,25 158:2,6	31:4,7,9	11:3,3 13:17
184:1,2	169:15		felt
Exchange	existence	F	87:8 88:6 115:10
67:1 71:25 76:4 79:2	31:3 158:11	facsimile	fewer
81:12,19 82:2 97:5	exists	36:5	32:4
98:2 107:5,15 108:2	172:10	fact	field
exclusively	Exit	10:13 18:5 35:7 42:8	14:1
12:24 29:2,6	175:16	42:22 57:4 76:22	fifth
excuse	expecting	84:6 90:24 98:14	52:11 113:25
6:20,21 38:14 55:6,21	177:22	126:12 127:7 131:25	figures
56:25 57:3 78:11	expense	134:1 156:22 172:10	60:20 80:16,17 91:4,7
101:1 141:5 161:5	132:23	177:13 185:25	91:14,20 92:8,8,12
170:7 179:24	experience	factor	92:15,17 94:21
exemplary	26:14 125:17	65:14 96:11	148:17 149:8,19,21
137:6	expertise	facts	figuring
exhibit	87:22	148:18	78:13
2:9,12,15,17,22,24	explain	fair	file
23:7 24:10,13 29:19	16:13 41:24 56:19	9:18 10:2 101:18,20	93:9,19 107:6
29:20 35:10,12,14,16		128:18	filed
35:24 36:1,8,8 37:16	70:21,22 178:14	familiar	1:12 37:21 69:7 90:5
38:3 41:16 42:20	180:10	9:2 94:5,7	92:9 93:20,21 103:16
43:12 44:7,18 46:8	explained	familiarized	104:6
,	-		

Merrill - Washington D.C.

800-292-4789

www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

film	21.10 22.22 66.1	45.5 10 47.17 49.5	4:4
filing	21:19 38:22 66:1	45:5,12 47:17 48:5	4.4 four
63:11 93:3	73:15,23 77:9,20	48:14,21 49:6 51:2	
filings	78:18 79:22 81:10	54:12 56:9 60:4,12	12:18 44:23 45:16
59:20 61:20	82:7 83:20 86:7	61:4 63:16 66:17	69:9,9 116:4 122:15
fill	90:11 95:22 98:10	69:13 70:2,10 71:9	182:22
71:3 86:17 101:16	100:9,11,13 105:10	72:7,22 73:10 74:15	fourth
final	106:19 108:23 120:7	74:16 76:8,25 77:18	44:12 113:25
11:14	124:3 158:9 177:9	78:4 82:25 83:24	Francisco
finalized	firstly	84:17 85:14 87:2	6:18
66:22	124:2	89:3 90:9 91:1 95:25	free
financially	Fish	96:18 100:16 101:19	177:17
19:6	14:17,20 15:2	102:4 103:23 104:21	Freedom
financing	five	108:3 111:9 115:24	4:5
46:6,10,15	17:6 44:24 76:2 82:21	118:14 119:17	Friday
find	166:8	120:23 121:17 122:2	114:21
36:24 42:11 113:22	five-minute	122:10 124:24 125:9	front
121:8 127:20 129:15	172:25	125:10,20 126:4	22:19 34:11 41:14
166:16	focus	128:9 131:14 132:3	89:18 103:10,13
fine	110:13	132:11,23 133:19	110:24 111:11
141:10 182:25	focused	134:12,23 136:2,25	128:10 153:6 174:22
finish	148:9	137:15,16 138:2,18	full
9:12 10:1 38:14 55:18	follow	139:9,22 145:24	7:24 15:20 17:1,5,11
57:3 66:16 67:9	20:4 106:11 142:3	146:23 148:1 149:15	17:12
68:11,14 69:5 84:10	185:8	150:12 153:18 155:5	fully
88:25 95:1,22 97:9	following	156:15 157:20 158:4	52:12 129:22
99:5,12 109:3 115:17	45:2,6 121:24 122:4	158:17 159:11 160:9	fundamentally
161:7 176:21	144:4 174:2 185:3	161:15 163:3 164:21	52:22
finished	follows	167:24 169:18 170:5	further
13:17 33:18 36:16	5:12 7:18 43:7 111:22	171:11 172:4,13	113:14 114:22 155:25
74:7 77:10,10 90:16	121:10,22	formal	156:21 188:18
97:13,22 101:6	followup	11:22 12:4,6,9 13:11	
133:14 176:23 178:2	163:17 168:12	forthcoming	G
firm	footnote	93:15 140:2	G
7:7 14:21 16:4 17:24	129:18,18	Fortran	2:10 6:5
24:7 28:11,12 29:2	forego	13:2,6	Gabriel
42:13,15 43:23,25	180:11	forwards	163:15
44:3 49:2 51:14	foregoing	96:5	gained
52:11 80:9 83:12	187:2 188:4	foundation	19:6
85:3,3,5 87:9 101:13	foreign	30:23 39:9 41:3 46:18	Galliani
124:9	68:13	47:18 48:6 54:11	25:3,12,14,19 26:7
firms	forgotten	70:11 72:6 73:11	27:8 37:16 60:21
117:10	112:14	74:17 85:19,20 88:12	Galliani's
firm's	form	98:5 107:16 172:22	27:1
44:19	25:6,23 27:10 28:9,20	foundational	general
first	30:13 35:20 36:6,21	178:23	12:11 45:22,23,25
5:11 11:12,18 17:3	37:4 42:10,24 43:17	Fountain	46:2 53:13 62:16
		<b></b>	

800-292-4789

IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

76:17 86:17 109:16	goes	14:13,21 24:8	4:8 7:9,9 174:10,10,18
122:23,25 181:25	22:18 182:2	grouping	held
183:22	going	124:4	13:19 29:3
generally	22:19 32:15 59:7 80:9	Guerrero	Helen
66:4,10 67:3 68:4,23	106:11,15 116:13,22	4:24 6:17	2:18
133:8	131:6 143:1,23	guess	help
generated	144:22 145:3 147:11	29:17 183:3 185:9	107:14,22 116:8,11,12
38:18	151:6 156:4 157:10	guessing	181:20
George	159:23 160:22 162:1	28:4	hereto
1:21 5:8 7:16 8:1	163:24 173:6,18	20.4	188:17
1.21 5.8 7.10 8.1	174:6,18 175:3,5	н	
		habit	<b>high</b> 10:19
getting	178:7,9 179:12,22,23	49:15 51:24 129:19,23	
43:25 89:22 134:18	179:25 180:10,20	half	highlighted
141:14	181:1,2,23 182:21	12:14 13:24 75:4	46:14
give	183:16 184:24 185:3	135:12 154:1 165:5	highly
15:20,21 41:7 56:24	185:4,6,25 186:1,11	182:22	30:9
70:14 78:9 128:10	186:20		history
142:4 153:20 177:19	good	hand	13:15
180:17	116:16	59:7 89:18	hold
given	graduate	handed	16:10,16
16:7 69:12,25 72:16	12:15	59:14	holding
73:2 77:21 78:1,3	graduated	handing	16:9
82:4 102:8	14:8	24:10 29:18	hope
gives	granted	hang	164:23
11:10	18:21	21:25 22:1	hour
giving	graphical	happened	9:20 17:9 65:15
106:7 153:21	12:4	39:11 41:6 42:15	113:10,15 130:3,3,24
go	Gray	103:1 104:8 126:1	132:24 135:12,12
9:4 20:15,25 22:2 46:8	24:20 25:7,17,25 27:7	hard	143:16 151:1 155:25
47:6 50:3,4 55:13	105:7,21 106:1,22	89:18 180:10	157:3 159:17,19
64:19 74:22 81:2	144:8,14 151:2,12,20	haven't	163:13,13 170:18
96:23 116:2,9 118:24	152:12 155:24 157:3	38:9 88:13 90:16	171:19
127:24 135:7 136:11	159:18,19 160:18	144:23	hourly
138:9 139:13 140:6	162:14 163:20,21	head	65:7
146:10 148:12	165:12 166:18	18:24 56:17	hours
149:24 150:25	168:13 170:19	heads	17:4 38:5,10 39:4,7,14
152:23 154:18	178:21,23	9:9	39:14 40:18,18,18,18
155:23 157:1 160:16	Gray's	hear	40:19,22,23 41:10
162:9 163:12 165:10	26:9	89:19 100:10 142:5,10	65:11 88:21 113:16
167:5 168:9 169:3	greater	173:22 174:7	114:9 115:22 117:16
170:12 172:25 173:3	119:2	heard	132:22 136:18,19
170.12 172.23 173.3		9:16 22:16,22 142:9	132.22 130.18,19
	<b>green</b> 16:6	158:20 175:10	
182:18 183:8,13 184:9 185:10		hearsay	140:8 146:11 147:7
	ground	172:23	149:3,4,6 150:2
goal	98:7	Heintz	152:24 154:1,19
161:23	group		155:24 157:2 159:2
	I	I	

800-292-4789

IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

F	1 0
Page	13

160:18 162:13	46:4 61:7 129:3	15:9 86:1	133:17 136:23 137:8
164:13,25 165:2,11	138:20	ins	137:11 154:7 155:4
166:9 167:8 168:10	included	182:1	157:18 158:2 169:16
169:6 170:15,17	31:7 45:24 54:18	instance	169:22 172:11
180:6,11 181:10	101:10 131:21,23	58:16	inventions
182:22	includes	Instruct	26:15
hundred	59:23 60:25 149:8	62:10	inventor
29:17 94:2,24	184:16	instructed	18:5
Hydrogen	including	141:12 177:4 178:3	inventors
67:1 71:25 76:4 79:2	129:21 134:17 165:8	instructing	1:13 91:3 93:16 96:6
81:11,19 82:2 97:5	incomplete	106:5	125:6 168:24
98:2 107:5,15 108:2	41:17	instruction	investigation
hyphen	incompleteness	35:1 56:4 110:6 145:7	130:20
45:7 51:1 122:4	41:13	151:9 160:1	invoice
	inconsistent	instructions	2:15,22 38:21 40:15
I	77:13	106:11 142:3,6	invoices
identical	incumbent	intent	36:18 37:1,2,11 38:17
52:3	182:17 183:12,14	51:5	43:25 56:23 148:23
identification	INDEX	intention	involved
24:14 29:21 35:13,15	2:2,6	181:8	37:7 102:9 150:17
35:17 59:9	indicates	inter	163:8 183:21
identify	119:25 154:16	1:16 6:12 37:8	involvement
6:23	indicating	interchangeably	72:13
immediate	123:16 154:14	44:25	in-house
75:6 98:25 101:25	indication	interest	18:16
102:3,24 103:16,21	128:11 134:1	18:18 19:10,13	IPR
104:4,5,13	industry	interested	19:11,14 20:8 21:10
immediately	11:6,25 12:22 13:6	21:6,7 188:20	65:19
13:8	influx	interfaces	IPR2013-00292
imminent	71:22 72:20 75:5,18	12:5	1:16 6:13
69:18	76:7	Internet	IPR2013-00293
impact	information	53:16	1:17
8:22	1:15 106:4 144:1,20	intimately	IPR2013-00294
important	157:12 165:16	146:6	1:17
55:8	166:25 170:24	introductory	IPR2013-00295
improper	178:17,23,24 179:18	17:23	1:18
174:22 175:1 179:7	181:20	invalidity	irrelevant
improperly	informed	66:2,11 71:24 73:20	47:19 110:20 172:22
182:20	92:19	74:6,12 76:3 79:1	isn't
inaccuracy	infringement	81:11 82:1 91:11	22:18 68:14 81:24
120:8	65:10	97:4 98:1 108:24	84:13 97:23 99:15
inaccurate	initial	109:7 112:10,18	100:18 105:2 107:25
50:1,10 52:22	39:21 71:22 72:20	120:21	111:13,23 115:2
inaccurately	75:5,18 76:7 80:16	invention	120:14 125:6 158:1
51:25	91:4,19 98:24 124:14	58:8 83:6 94:8 118:12	179:14,15
include	initially	118:19 123:11	Issued
		110,17 120,11	100 <b>40</b> 4

800-292-4789

IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

1:11	100:22,22 103:4,12	79:9 81:5,19 90:24	158:10 166:10,10,16
item	100.22,22 103.4,12	90:24 127:25 128:13	169:20,22 177:24,24
113:13	136:15 141:15	129:21 130:2 132:22	178:8,9 179:9,11
it's	143:23 145:3 147:11	135:8 136:16 139:14	183:10 184:6
		140:8 143:14	
10:21 11:3 21:24 27:4	151:6 156:4 157:10		knowing
36:5 40:5,14 43:3	159:23 160:22 163:9	June	80:8 124:6
46:14 50:4 52:11	163:24 165:5 169:21	2:24 12:3 14:5,17,24	knowledge
55:8,10,16,20 56:22	172:24 174:2,9,18	36:19 50:5 51:8,9	42:7,14,21 43:8,11,22
56:25 58:6 61:17	175:5 177:21 178:25	52:18 70:6 71:1,5	L
65:1,2,2,22 67:5,10	179:12 180:21 181:1	78:25,25 80:4,7,18	laboratory
67:10,10 68:12 72:25	181:4,6 182:25	80:20 81:5,10,21	69:2 83:8
79:11,12 80:14 85:12	183:16 185:3,5,25	100:5,14,19,19,22,25	
86:1 89:4 91:4 92:17	186:1	101:6 118:24 127:13	lacked
94:20 95:6 96:23	J	K	51:15
104:25 105:13 111:2			lacking
112:6 113:14,25	J	K	172:22
114:1 117:22 123:6	2:19 3:22	3:5,12	lacks
123:14 124:3 127:13	JAMES	Karen	30:23 39:9 41:3 46:18
127:24 130:12	4:8	4:16 7:2	47:17 48:5 54:11
132:21 137:17 141:1	Jim	keep	70:10 72:6 74:16
149:3,5 155:1 158:7	7:9	141:15	85:19,20 98:5 107:16
161:17 168:23,25	Jim's	Kingdom	lady
178:17 180:9 181:2,8	179:13	10:21	95:11
182:16 183:1,2,5,12	jim.heintz@dlapipe	Klaus	Lagermann
183:14	4:10	135:11 138:11 139:3	91:3,21 92:10,13
I'd	jmicallef@sidley.com	140:9 148:18 150:2	135:11 139:4 144:8
9:3 102:14 141:15	3:16	163:16,19,21 167:9	144:13 163:16
175:18	job	168:12	167:10 168:12
I'll	1:24 12:23 17:11,12	know	language
21:17 43:1 44:9 52:6	Joe	18:23,23,25 26:11,12	146:25 155:1
66:6 67:20 75:12	7:6 22:13,22 55:6	26:22 27:3,11,24	languages
84:1 97:15 98:9,18	172:25 174:11	28:3,21 31:14 33:2	12:21,25 13:3,3,6,7
110:19 130:10	join	34:12,13 36:9 38:10	large
132:12 135:2 153:20	80:9	38:20 43:7,24 46:7	42:12 63:9 68:18
155:14 156:18	joined	46:19 52:10,14,21	126:18
158:19 161:7 162:17	14:3,21 17:24 57:21	55:20 57:25 61:8,25	law
172:24 178:11	joining	67:14 73:20,23 74:1	5:4 6:20 14:3,7,9,21
I'm	17:16,20 85:4	76:22 77:16 78:17	15:6 17:1,7,8 23:5
21:6,7 24:10 29:18	JOSEPH	79:25 80:7,9 82:4	24:8 25:9,18 42:13
32:15 33:21 40:7	3:14	83:1 86:6 87:24 92:5	83:10 87:17 94:6
42:19 43:24 50:6	Jot	94:13,15 95:10,11	95:7 174:3
52:11,19 55:19 56:1	78:13	96:1,19 101:22	lawyers
57:4,17 59:6 64:7	judgment	110:24 124:16 125:1	28:7 29:10
72:17,17 73:1 77:5	19:7 62:1	127:6 128:12 131:3,8	lead
77:13 79:20,21 80:12	July	133:20,24 141:14	10:10 35:8 174:20
82:17 87:6 89:8	8:9 32:18 33:20 79:1,8	148:19 155:6 158:7	180:22,23,23 183:4,5
02.17 07.0 07.0			
	•		•

Merrill - Washington D.C.

800-292-4789

www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

	I	l	
leading	listen	51:17 52:20 54:8,16	31:20 49:17 62:24
44:24	148:18 149:8 186:1	66:19 72:17 77:20	making
leave	listening	107:4 118:11,18	10:14 44:24 142:17,18
173:19 175:6,9	174:13	126:25 129:21	149:1
left	literally	130:19 133:16	managed
11:24 12:17 13:23	30:8 52:17 100:6,9,10	137:10,18 153:2	166:16
14:16,20 175:16	100:11 174:22	154:6,16 157:17	managing
181:10	litigation	158:1 169:15 172:10	71:22 72:20 75:4 76:6
legal	18:19 20:10 21:11,20	172:15	Manhattan
4:22 38:23 60:5	29:3 31:16 37:7	looks	144:10
legitimate	64:22 65:8	51:14 66:22 90:10	March
10:7	little	105:7 165:5 166:14	16:8
lesson	52:19	loosely	marked
142:11	LLP	123:13	24:13 29:20 35:12,14
letter	3:4,11,19 4:3	lost	35:16 59:8
181:22,23	location	61:15	markup
let's	144:9	lot	155:1
27:16 35:10 38:2 46:8	log	28:2 44:8 55:10 68:13	Marshall
74:22 117:15 118:24	106:17 176:2 178:20	71:3 96:22 134:15	4:14
127:24 129:12	181:21,22 182:3	166:12 177:3	material
132:21 135:7 140:6	183:21 184:11	lots	124:17 131:22,22
142:23 146:10 147:6	logbook	42:13	materials
149:24 150:25	23:6 53:21,24 73:18	Lovejoy	54:3 134:18 139:15,25
152:23 154:18	83:16 97:15 98:10,18	24:22 25:9,18 26:3	152:25 154:1,17
155:23 157:1 159:1	102:12 104:24 108:4	27:8 59:19 61:19	mathematics
159:17 162:9 163:12	110:11,15 111:2,17	162:14 163:14,15,17	11:14
165:10 167:5 168:9	119:3 127:20 129:9	167:10 168:11,13	matter
169:3	129:19 139:10 153:6	169:7 170:17,20	6:8 21:15 27:13,14
level	153:9 177:14 178:15	171:2,3	39:22 40:3,8 44:16
69:21 96:24	178:17,20 179:18	Lovejoy's	45:21,22 46:20,22
Lewis	183:19	26:16	47:14,20,25 48:2,9
14:14,16	logs	lunch	48:18 49:2 51:10,15
license	82:7	116:19,24	52:16 54:18 56:14,19
16:9	long		57:7,17,20,22 58:1,6
licensed	16:1 55:16,24 94:18	M	58:15 62:2,16,16
16:22 25:21,25	94:23 95:10,21	Macromolecular	66:4 67:3 68:5,23
limited	144:11 147:15	68:21 72:2 76:5 79:10	69:25 76:22 77:21
15:21 16:10 129:2	148:19	83:8 84:15,25 85:2	78:1 91:16 98:12
line	look	86:2,13 87:7 90:6	100:5 101:11 104:8
47:12 113:25,25	24:11 39:18 57:5	91:10 93:2,9 94:22	104:19 107:23
141:22	60:18 78:8 91:14	95:1 97:3 98:1	109:16,23 110:9
list	105:5 108:4,22	main	115:2,13 120:3,9
65:25	110:15 111:16	64:22	121:14 122:22,24
listed	113:11 123:5 128:8	Maine	123:4,9,14 124:5,7
17:12 18:5 56:22	145:11	8:15 21:20 37:8 65:9	127:7 166:9,10,15
60:17 140:20 144:7	looking	majority	181:25 183:23 185:6
30127 2 10120 2 1117			

800-292-4789

IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

Page	16
1030	- U

matters	meeting	183:3	183:4
15:3 16:5 26:14 40:6	32:21,23,25 33:3,14	MicroPatent	mixture
43:20 45:7,25 46:4	34:4,5,7,14 58:16	137:4	13:6
47:2 56:8 58:12	61:23 62:6 63:14,19	Microsoft	modify
65:25 67:11,14,15,23	63:24 105:7,9 106:18	1:4 6:8 7:1,8 8:13,14	50:8
67:25 68:2,14,16,19	135:11 140:2,7,9,19	15:3 19:8 22:13	molecular
69:10,24 72:11 76:3	144:7,11 146:6,11	172:17,19	94:3
77:17 78:3 79:25	163:15 170:16,18,19	middle	moment
88:22 98:24 101:15	184:17	9:25 33:21 40:2	8:15
102:9 106:22 108:25	meetings	9.25 55.21 40.2	Monday
102.9 100.22 108.23	98:11 136:7 171:15	Midtown	114:22,22
122.3 149.4 103.0	<b>member</b>	144:9	
	15:12	mind	<b>money</b> 19:7 43:23 125:8
may		164:23	
12:25 19:18 32:7	<b>memory</b>		monitor
42:13 50:8 51:11,13	61:22 66:18 70:15	mine	6:15
51:15 52:14,16 56:12	78:17 146:16 172:22	175:2	month
58:14,15,17 73:3,25	mention	minor	38:20 65:7,7 94:25
100:4 120:7 128:10	44:8 45:16 122:16	50:10 51:12	monthly
130:13 131:23	127:9,16,18 129:6	minute	38:18
146:16 147:15	152:19	21:25 41:7 70:14	months
148:22 151:22,23	mentioned	97:16 129:15	14:15 71:2 77:5 85:4
154:10 156:7 157:13	24:19 58:21 67:1 68:3	minutes	96:5
173:3,17,25 174:7,8	68:20 71:19 75:18	99:25 175:13	Morgan
175:9	90:14 93:12 101:25	Miscellaneous	14:14,16
mean	105:18 114:20,25	127:25	MOTHOD
18:15 27:12,12 28:10	120:21 121:4 127:21	mischaracterization	1:14
29:1 30:8 36:5,9	185:25	60:13 146:24 170:6	mouth
38:22 42:15 43:1	mentions	171:12 172:5	89:18 141:21
49:15 63:7 71:10	152:18	mischaracterize	move
73:12,15 74:23 75:1	Merrill	145:22	108:21 129:12 141:23
75:15,24 85:15 88:20	4:22 6:17 7:13	mischaracterizes	moved
89:25 115:7 137:2	Message	73:11 74:17 80:22	14:13
164:23 169:12 185:2	2:18	84:18 123:22 134:12	multiple
meaning	met	148:3 149:16 150:13	67:11,14
51:6 75:3	59:18 61:19 93:18	152:5 153:19 156:16	multiplying
means	Micallef	158:18 159:12	65:14
9:8 39:13 75:7,20,25	3:14 7:6,7 22:12,13,23	160:11 161:16 163:4	
127:5 149:19 186:10	55:6,7,13 56:1	163:5 166:2 168:1	<u> </u>
meant	142:13,17,23 173:17	missed	Ν
15:24	173:22,25 174:6,17	36:25 81:20	2:1 3:1 4:1 6:5
mechanics	174:20,25 175:3	misspeaking	name
94:3	178:7,25 179:21,24	181:3	7:24 11:9 39:4 133:1
medications	180:14,17,20 182:15	misstates	181:3
8:21	183:11 184:9,23	79:17 81:15 95:4	names
meet	185:4,12	114:15,16 164:21	181:24
61:9 93:22	Micallef's	mistook	narrates

Merrill - Washington D.C.

800-292-4789

www.merrillcorp.com/law

IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

153:7	95:8 101:9,13 135:13	124:5,7 142:25 143:8	64:23 66:17 67:16,17
narrative	139:15 140:2,21	166:10 180:6 181:10	67:19 69:13 70:1,2
91:17 100:25 105:10	155:2	186:19	70:10 71:9,14 72:5,6
121:19 132:14 138:4	nights	numbers	72:22 73:9,10 74:15
138:19 139:2,23	116:4	6:12 38:10 44:8,9,14	74:16 75:10,11,22
140:20 142:17 146:2	nodding	44:16 45:2,3,6,14,16	76:8,25 77:18 78:4,6
147:2 148:6 149:7	9:9	47:14,25 48:2,2,9,18	79:17,19 80:22 81:14
150:15 151:11 152:8	non-assertion	49:7 51:10 52:2	81:15 82:16,24,25
152:16 153:21	65:2	120:3 121:23,24	83:24 84:17 85:14,19
154:24 155:15	non-patent	122:4,12,15	85:20 86:14 87:2,13
157:22 158:21	56:7 58:12	NW	87:20 88:3,10,11
159:14 160:13	non-privileged	3:5,12	89:2,3 90:9 91:25,25
161:18 163:6,8	33:13		94:14 95:4,23,24
164:12 166:5 167:3	non-weekend	0	96:18 98:3,4 99:18
168:3 169:12 172:6	91:1	0	100:15 101:19 102:4
172:14 173:23	normally	6:5	103:7,23 104:15,21
174:21,25	95:21	oath	106:2,3 107:16,20
narratives	Nos	8:3,19 31:18	108:3,17 109:24
34:10,11 77:2 129:21	1:16 42:20 43:12	object	110:6 111:9 112:3
136:5 170:8 171:13	notary	12:7 21:17 32:15	114:15 115:6,24
184:16	6:17	110:19 136:2,25	118:3,14,21 119:17
NATO	note	141:20 142:1,2,3	120:15,23 121:17
11:3	92:24 102:14 146:14	148:2 159:11 165:25	122:2,8,9 123:21
natural	notebook	174:11,15 181:11	124:24 125:9,10,20
10:22 11:7,9	49:25 128:5,9	objected	126:4,4,15,16 131:14
nature	noted	32:8 54:24 177:15	132:3,11 133:19
109:16 146:1	82:8 109:11 144:2	objecting	134:10,11,23 136:1
necessarily	149:4	22:16 106:7 175:21	136:25 137:13,14,25
71:20 72:18 76:11	notes	objection	138:1,18 139:9,22
78:23 129:22	126:14,24 146:11	19:12 20:12,12 21:1	141:8,19,23,25 142:7
necessary	notice	25:6,23 27:10 28:9	145:22,24 146:22,23
69:18	5:2 153:25	28:20 30:13,22,23	148:1 149:14,17
need	November	31:24 33:5,23 35:1,3	150:11,12 152:5,7
9:21 86:17 124:16	2:17,22 15:16 16:21	35:20 36:21 37:4,5	153:18 154:9 155:5
142:9,11 173:3 184:6	16:22	37:23 38:8 39:9,16	155:13 156:15
needed	number	39:17 40:24 41:2,3	157:20 158:4,17
86:22 115:10,11	6:7 13:2 15:20 16:8	41:23 42:3,10,24,25	160:9,10 161:15
needs	18:24 39:4 40:1	43:14,15 44:22 45:5	162:20 163:2,3
55:22	44:10,11,12,19 45:14	45:10,11 46:17,23	164:11,21 166:1,22
networks	49:14 52:15 58:7,25	47:17 48:5,13,14,21	166:23 167:24,25
133:13	59:1 60:10 62:17	49:6 51:2,21 52:4	169:18,19 170:4,5
never	64:16 65:11,25 72:11	53:4,20 54:1,11,20	171:11 172:3,4,13
17:15,19 37:2 126:14	72:12 80:13 85:22	56:3,4,9,21 57:19	175:20,20 176:8,18
new	94:3 108:24 119:23	58:2,3,3 59:3 60:2,3	177:1 178:8,10,14
28:2 32:21,22 80:19	119:24,25 120:9	60:12 61:3,4 62:7,8 62:10 20 63:16 64:1	179:10,13 181:9,12
83:11,12 84:7 93:20	122:13 123:9,16	62:19,20 63:16 64:1	objections
	1		

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law

800-292-4789

IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

l de la companya de la			
10:14 34:19 142:18	113:23 136:15	0 <b>O</b> 0	outside
156:17 172:18	okay	1:3 5:1,13 116:25	18:7,13 180:4
173:14,15 174:5	9:6,13,19,23 12:9	186:24	outstanding
175:11,18 177:4	13:16 15:5 21:19	open	108:25
178:3 181:13	24:5,9,12 29:18,24	173:4	overall
objects	32:3,9,14,18 34:2,20	opened	36:6 138:7 153:23
172:17,19	34:21 35:10 38:13	57:20,23 92:3,6 179:6	155:20
observation	40:20 41:9,11,22	operating	overbroad
35:4	44:6 45:2,18 46:14	43:24	120:15
obtained	49:12 50:11 52:8	opinion	overnight
19:7	55:12 56:3 58:11	45:21 52:16 56:14,19	52:17
obviously	59:17 61:17 64:6,8,9	57:9,14,16,17 66:2	oversimplification
175:4	64:24 65:4 74:22	66:11,22 71:24 73:20	72:9
occasional	76:2 78:20 81:4,17	74:6,12 76:4 79:1	overwhelming
49:16	85:8,9,10 93:23	81:11 82:2 91:11	49:17
occurred	112:11 116:22	97:4 98:2 108:24	Ovid
144:9	121:23 122:17	109:8,20 112:10,18	1:13 140:9 143:17
occurs	128:14 129:25	120:21 121:4,14	163:15,19,21 167:9
77:9	130:15 135:7,9,15	120:21 121:4,14	168:11
October	139:5 142:10,16,22	opportunity	owned
1:12 2:25 15:16 34:1	143:11,22 144:6,16	180:4	67:6 68:7,25
36:20 37:17,21 59:18	145:18 146:10	opposed	ovner
61:18 66:22 70:6	148:15 149:10	83:21	1:8 3:18 4:2 6:9 7:5
71:6 160:17 162:11	154:18 155:23 161:9	options	23:16 109:18
163:13 165:10 167:5	162:1,6,10 167:7	18:21	o'clock
168:10 169:4 170:13	175:8,16,17 176:5,13	oral	180:5
171:18	176:17 178:1 179:12	181:24	<b>000</b>
October-November	180:25 182:23	order	6:4
15:17	184:22 185:12,13	23:1 71:3 72:3 73:7,13	0.4
OED	186:4,12,18	74:13 75:7,7 76:6,23	Р
15:19	once	77:16 78:2 91:5,6	P
offer	17:7 123:25 183:12	93:21 107:6	3:1,1 4:1,1 6:5 140:10
163:24	ones	ordering	Pacific
offered	29:25 49:8,9 117:21	76:16	180:5 183:2
177:6,14	181:14	organization	page
office	one's	42:12	2:3,8 9:5 24:19 37:15
1:1 6:10 16:23 25:22	184:24 185:2,4,6	organizing	38:2,22,22 39:3 40:2
26:1 28:1 32:22	one-and-a-half-hour	135:13	40:17 41:5,6,8,9,19
61:24 63:8 83:12	135:10	original	41:20,21 44:8,18,18
84:7 93:20 95:8	one-and-a-quarter	103:9,10	46:8,12,13 47:6,7,7
111:1	168:23	ought	47:13 50:3,4,6,7,14
offices	ongoing	142:19	50:20 55:20,25 57:6
5:4 6:20 83:11,23	68:14,15 77:3 89:6	outcome	58:22 59:10,15 61:17
144:13	141:22,22 174:25	18:18 19:10,14 20:7	66:1,21,25 68:3,21
Oh	onwards	outs	69:7 70:18 71:19,24
18:3 46:14 79:7	71:1	182:1	71:25 72:1,2 74:22
		l	

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law

800-292-4789

IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

80:10,12,14,14 83:3	partes	104:15,21 106:3,7,10	26:1 27:6,6,9 28:7,17
83:14 90:22 93:1	1:16 6:12 37:8	107:16 108:3,17	28:22 29:4,10,12,15
97:2 98:23 99:22	partial	112:3 115:6,24	30:16,17 45:19,20
100:23 102:1 105:14	144:18	116:18 118:3,14,21	47:2,10,15,22 48:3
107:2 108:21 113:14	participation	119:17 120:15,23	49:9 52:15 53:14
113:15 114:1 116:2	174:16	121:17 122:8,10	56:14 58:9,18 59:1
117:15 118:24 123:7	particular	123:21 124:24	59:20,25 60:11,22
127:14,24 129:12,17	104:8 166:14 179:17	125:10 126:16	61:2,12,20 62:1,4,17
129:25 132:14,21	181:18	131:14 132:3 133:19	63:9,12,15,24 64:4
135:3,7 136:11,15	particularly	134:10,12,23 136:2	65:9 66:12 67:5,11
138:9 139:13 140:6	120:6 181:14	136:25 137:14,16	67:23 68:7,12,25
143:11 144:4 146:10	parties	138:1,18 139:9,22	70:9 73:16,21 74:4
147:6 148:12,13	188:19,22	141:5,10,19 143:23	79:12 81:25 83:5
149:24 150:25	partner	144:19 145:3,24	84:11,14 86:24 87:16
152:23 154:18	25:19,20 49:22,22	146:23 147:11,19	87:17 89:1,11 90:5
155:23 157:1 159:1	party	148:1,3 149:15,17	90:14,15 91:20 92:9
159:17 160:16 162:9	66:11 137:4	150:12 151:6,18	92:9,21 94:18 95:14
163:12 165:10 167:3	Pascal	152:7 153:18 154:9	96:16,23 97:10,24
167:5 168:9 169:3	3:22 7:4,4 12:7 19:12	155:5 156:4,15	98:15 99:6,11,13,16
170:12 171:18	19:19,22 20:3,12	157:10,20 158:4,17	101:7 103:1 105:3,23
pages	21:5,8,15,17 22:1	159:11,23 160:9,11	108:14 109:4,18
70:17 94:2,21 99:1	25:6 27:10 28:20	160:22 161:5,9,15,25	111:14,24 114:6,12
102:16	30:13,23 31:24 32:15	162:17 163:3,24	115:18,21 117:17,22
paid	33:5,21,24 34:24	164:11,21 165:15	120:19 121:12
43:11,25	37:5,23 38:8,14 39:9	166:1,23 167:13,25	122:18,20 123:12
Palo	39:17 41:3,23 42:10	168:16 169:9,18	124:6,11,14 125:4,8
5:5 6:1,21 8:2 14:14	42:24 43:15,17 45:10	170:5,23 171:11	125:15,19 126:3
83:11 133:2	45:12 46:18,23 47:17	172:4,13 173:2,13,20	127:5 128:1,15,21,24
papers	48:5,14,21 49:6 50:6	173:24 174:2,9,23	129:2,6,10 130:3
15:25	51:2 54:1,11 55:15	175:2,8,15,17,24	131:4,20 132:1,8,15
par	55:18 56:3 57:3,19	176:1,5,13,17,21,25	132:18 134:7,17,21
16:21	58:3 59:3 60:3 61:4	177:9 178:5 179:24	135:4,24 136:9,19
paragraph	61:6 62:8,19 63:16	180:16,19,25 181:6	137:2,19,23 138:10
57:6 66:21 69:6 70:21	64:23 65:3 66:17	182:5,23 183:16	138:15,20,22,25
70:24 71:19 76:10	67:17,19 69:13 70:1	184:15 185:2,8 186:6	139:7,20,24 145:19
81:2 90:22,23 91:23	70:10 71:9 72:6	186:10,13,16	146:2,5,19 147:3,24
93:6 105:8 123:6,7,9	73:10 74:16 75:11	pass	148:7,9 149:11,22
129:14	76:25 77:18 78:6	186:4,10	150:8,16,19 152:2,9
paragraphs	79:19 80:22 81:14	passed	152:11,25 153:15,22
70:17,19 86:16	82:16,24 83:24 84:17	15:15 16:20,20	154:3,12 155:10,16
part	85:14,19 86:14 87:20	patent	155:19,21 156:12,23
39:21 63:9 131:4,21	88:11 89:3 90:9	1:1,2,8,10 3:18 4:2 6:9	157:25 158:5,14,22
137:19 138:6 140:15	91:25 92:5 94:14	6:10,10 7:5 14:24	158:24 159:8,15,18
145:1 149:21 153:23	95:4,24 96:18 98:4	15:13,15 16:5,11,17	160:6,13 161:12,18
154:11 155:20 168:6	99:18 100:15 101:19	16:21,23 17:15,20	162:14,25 163:7,9,14
168:25	102:4 103:7,23	18:5,7,9 23:16 25:22	163:17 164:7,14,15
	Í		, ,

Merrill - Washington D.C.

800-292-4789

www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

164:18 165:1,4,7,22	40:13 42:5 43:18	permit	6:23 7:14,20,24,25 9:8
166:6,17,20 167:21	44:19 45:4 47:1	128:8	9:15 38:15 48:16
168:4,7,12 169:1	57:21 67:6 68:8	permitted	59:15 61:14 74:20
170:1,8,10 171:9,14	70:25 73:16 82:5	10:5 22:21	80:25 102:10 110:17
171:16,25 172:7	83:12 84:7 86:25	person	111:20 118:16
patentability	87:17 93:21 94:7	38:19 49:22 87:9	121:18 127:12
57:10 58:7 120:1.13	116:8 120:7 122:1	188:8	170:12 173:19
120:18 123:10,17,20	124:3 140:3,21	personal	177:24 181:17 182:4
120:18 123:10,17,20	144:12 148:24 153:8	42:7,14,21 43:7,11,21	plus
124.10,22 125.7,15	163:10 165:4 166:13	43:22	50:18 51:1 150:3
patentable	168:25		157:4
54:18	Pennie's	<b>personally</b> 5:7 31:13 36:3,22	
	45:24		<b>point</b> 19:22 32:2 68:15
patents	45:24 PENY4	37:14 42:4,16 43:3	
48:10,19 54:9 117:18		44:17 54:2 57:16	80:24 86:23 88:4
131:8,11,13,16,24	2:23	84:24 93:19 95:16	91:17 92:18,20,24
137:2,5,7	people	118:10 120:17	99:1 178:16 179:20
Patricia	11:12 16:14 84:6,20	153:12	181:12 182:4,5
4:24 6:16	85:3 125:12 165:3	personnel	185:10
Paul	183:21	140:4 168:24	pointed
24:24 26:5 143:17	percent	persons	40:17 178:19
167:10	12:20 19:4,5 40:23	31:5 37:7 140:20	points
Paul's	percentage	144:7 163:10	83:15
26:21	19:1,2	persuade	portfolio
Pause	performed	182:8	67:1,5,11,15,24 68:4,6
24:15 66:20 70:16	125:7	pertain	68:7,12,18 71:25
75:13 78:12,15 90:21	period	49:9 123:9	72:1 76:4,5 81:12,19
97:17 98:19 102:17	30:20 36:19 38:23	pertains	82:2 97:5 98:2 99:1
105:6,16 106:24	70:25 89:8 90:20	49:3	99:17 100:3 101:2
108:6 110:18,21	98:15 104:9,23 105:4	Petitioner	102:21 103:2 107:6
111:18 113:6,12,24	105:18 107:9 108:8	1:5 3:3 5:10	107:15 108:2,25
129:16	108:10,15 110:10	phone	portfolios
pay	111:1,3,7,15 112:1	55:2 142:14 174:13	72:10,11
24:3	112:19,24 113:3	phrase	portion
paying	114:19 120:6 124:2	90:4	121:8 130:11 154:14
23:21,23	125:21 129:20,24	Ph.D	154:16
peculiar	132:17 146:4 148:8	10:24 12:12 13:1	portions
42:11	148:24 158:23	26:18	53:14 92:23 124:14
penalty	166:11 188:16	Piper	129:3 135:4 146:14
187:1	periods	3:19 4:3 5:4 6:20 7:4,9	146:15 178:20
pending	69:17 77:6	23:13,15,15,18,25	position
8:15	perjury	24:3	13:19 174:7 177:7
Pennie	187:1	place	183:11,12 184:6,21
14:3,7,11,12,13,23	permanent	6:19 32:21 188:9	positions
15:6 16:3 17:3,16,20	15:18 16:7	platforms	184:24
25:8,10,11 28:8	permission	13:4	possession
29:11 31:5 32:22	64:25	please	36:19 37:1,2
	I	l	

Merrill - Washington D.C.

800-292-4789

www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

	_	_	
possibility	170:10 171:16	63:20 64:25 65:1,2	160:23 162:18 164:1
131:18,19	present	67:21 106:8 110:8	166:25 167:15
possible	4:21 181:15	141:2,11 143:24	172:18 175:22
40:5 52:11 71:20	presentation	145:5,14 147:13,16	programming
72:18 76:11 86:1	93:16	162:19 165:16	11:18,23 12:4,11 13:7
90:2 111:2 124:4	presenting	169:10 171:6 172:18	programs
130:12 148:22 161:6	184:18	176:7 177:4,5,8,20	12:16,21,24 13:12
possibly	presently	178:16,24 179:6,10	progress
68:18 94:2 154:10	180:3	179:19 181:19,21,22	61:25
post	pretty	182:3,9,13,16,21	project
11:2 12:18,19 13:16	91:18	183:18 184:11,20	66:16 67:9,10 68:11
postponed	prevent	privileged	68:17 69:5,15,16,18
107:9,18,25	174:3	19:18 21:24 22:18	72:13,16 73:24 74:9
practice	prevented	35:5 62:8,10,13 66:7	76:16,18,19 79:22
15:25 16:22 25:22,25	70:8	92:1 102:6 106:4	82:6,9 86:13,25 87:3
27:5,6 29:6 37:20	previous	109:10,25 140:18	87:11 89:21 96:24
49:13 83:22	20:25 50:8 64:19	141:13 144:1,20	101:10 109:14,15
precise	83:19 96:21 112:9,17	145:8 157:12 168:17	110:3
18:23,24	120:5 132:13 135:15	170:24 175:22	projects
precision	146:1 161:20 168:22	178:16,24 183:21	28:2 52:13 69:20
78:24	previously	privileges	70:22 71:3 73:2 77:3
prediction	13:22 51:12 101:12	164:1	78:18 79:15 80:19
83:6	134:15 140:3 168:5	probably	81:6 87:18 109:16
prep	principal	29:3,6 36:2 39:10	prompted
170:17	14:18	56:12 87:22 95:20	109:16
preparation	principally	144:7 149:20	promulgates
47:9,15,21 48:3 59:1	13:2 81:6 97:2	problem	15:19
59:24 60:11 61:1,12	print	55:7	proprietary
62:17 63:12 132:19	150:3 163:16	process	13:7
134:17	prior	18:8 43:4 89:6 101:14	prosecuted
prepare	16:21 54:9,16 57:10	124:16 132:19 136:9	14:24
23:1 57:16	58:8 72:13 85:4	137:19 138:7 140:1	protect
prepared	93:17 94:5 115:10	146:7 147:3 153:23	55:22
36:3 43:8 57:14 90:5	118:18 123:10,18	155:20 158:24	protected
114:4 127:19 159:3	130:10 131:7 154:17	159:18 161:22 163:8	63:19
preparing	156:16 171:19	168:7,25 171:16	protein
35:25 36:12 47:2	172:14	181:20	26:18,19 83:7
48:19 60:22 108:23	priority	produce	provide
131:4 136:9 137:19	107:11	36:18	33:17 91:5
138:7,22 140:7 146:5	priveledged	produced	provided
147:3 148:9 149:20	20:11	31:15 37:6	75:3 188:16
150:19 152:11	privilege	product	providing
153:23 154:3 155:19	10:7 19:23 20:1 21:1	30:19 53:11 54:22	102:25
155:20 156:23	33:7 34:17 35:2	72:23,24 85:7 109:19	Provin
158:24 161:22 163:8	54:22,25 55:3,9,11	147:18 151:8 156:7	13:18
165:7 168:7 169:1	55:22 56:3,5,21 58:4	157:11 159:25	provisional
			-

Merrill - Washington D.C.

800-292-4789

www.merrillcorp.com/law

IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

37:20 45:20 47:22	52:6 60:7,24,25	94:1	recess
107:11 121:12	63:22,25 64:20 74:20	range	20:19 22:7 64:11
122:20	75:1 78:16 82:3	112:7,8	116:24 143:3 162:3
PTO	83:19 84:2,22,22	rate	173:8 185:15
16:1 67:25 137:3	88:14 92:4 93:25	65:7,15	recited
public	96:20,21 97:12	rates	169:12
6:17	102:21 104:1,4	127:10,17,19	recognition
publication	110:19 111:19	read	15:21 16:10
93:17	112:10,17 113:2	44:9 61:14 74:25	recognize
published	118:16 120:6 121:20	111:19,21 121:7,9,21	24:17 30:2 35:19 36:5
67:24	123:25 125:22,25	131:12,16 132:1	recollection
pure	127:12 130:11	134:2,5 154:19	28:5,14 46:20 51:3
11:10	134:20,20 135:2	155:25 156:20,20	54:14 56:15 62:22
purpose	142:1,1,6 144:23	157:2,4,24 158:9	63:8 64:3 67:25 70:3
57:25	147:14 176:22	164:13	79:3 91:5 93:14 99:7
purposes	questioned	reading	100:13 102:8,19
40:14	178:21	17:22,23 123:8 130:4	100:19 102:0,19
pursuant	questioning	130:25 131:2,5,21,21	124:8 135:17,17
5:2	141:22	131:22 155:17 158:6	143:21 144:3,18
push	questions	really	147:21 151:11 171:4
88:6	10:7 81:18 89:19	56:24 123:19 141:16	178:1,2
put	132:13 146:1 168:22	142:19 145:10,11	record
58:6,15 62:2 88:14	177:17 180:21	177:21	7:25 18:20 20:15,17
89:18 106:17 123:16	182:16,20 186:2,6	Realtime	20:23 22:3,5,11 55:8
149:5 179:3 184:1,13	quick	5:7	55:14,17,21 64:9,15
putting	98:8	reason	76:14 91:12 106:9
72:8	quickly	9:21 27:12 49:24 54:8	111:6,22 112:15
P.M	89:22,25 90:15	109:15	116:23 117:3 121:10
116:24 117:1 143:4,5	quiet	reasonably	121:22 141:17 143:1
162:4,5 173:9,10	180:21	96:20	143:7 145:10 162:2,7
183:2 185:16,17	quite	reasons	173:3,6,11 174:14,19
186:23	13:12 18:6 26:13	8:24 27:7	175:18 176:2,6,14,15
	68:18 94:1 129:22	recall	177:18 178:8,13,14
Q	149:20	54:7 68:16 69:14	179:4 180:7 181:11
qualification	quote	89:12 90:3 91:24	182:25 183:9,14,17
16:14	60:10,11 83:8,9	92:12,15,22 93:20	184:2 185:10,13,19
qualified		94:19,20 104:16,18	186:21
15:24	R	106:21,25 109:5,12	recorded
quarter	R	115:19,20,25 121:5	9:7
113:15 116:18	3:1 4:1 6:5	144:8 151:15 152:2	records
question	raised	161:1 167:1 177:10	74:2 82:12,20 175:23
9:11,12,14,25 10:15	173:14,16 174:4,23	177:18,23	175:24 176:16
19:25 21:1,2,9 22:17	177:2,3	receive	rectify
28:24 32:11 33:9	ramping	77:3 91:9	180:8 183:7
34:22 41:24 42:12	71:2	received	redacted
43:2 47:24 48:15	ran	17:19	34:12 41:19 78:20
	I		

Merrill - Washington D.C.

800-292-4789

www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

Page 1	23
--------	----

92:25 103:11 110:24	reg	reliance	148:6
113:14 114:1 115:22	15:20 16:7	176:9	rephrase
128:10 130:12	regard	relied	47:24 88:18 139:5
146:14 151:22	168:17 176:25 177:10	175:23	reporter
177:12	182:9	relying	1:25 5:6,7 7:12,14,17
redactions	regarding	80:25 184:12,19	9:8 20:15 111:21
32:4	105:21 145:8 151:2	remained	121:9,21 182:11
redirect	163:25 165:15	14:7 44:3	188:1,3,16
180:15 182:22 183:10	167:14 169:9 170:24	remember	<b>Reporting</b>
186:11,14	regardless		7:13
· ·	65:21 177:19 181:1	26:20 28:13 31:19,21	
reduced		31:23 32:23 33:9,11	represent
126:10 188:10	registration	33:16,17 34:1,5,5,8	6:24
Reducing	15:16	34:15 62:24 92:7	representation
126:22	regular	104:24 107:21	23:22 65:13 183:3,6
reduction	65:7	117:23 118:25 119:5	represented
37:20	reiterate	119:9,12 128:2,4	23:10,13
Redwood	136:5 145:6 147:1	130:6,8 131:1,3,10	representing
4:15	relate	131:25 132:5 133:5,7	7:1,3,7,10 23:16,18
refer	33:25 45:7 122:5	133:8,12 135:14,19	24:7
32:7,11 69:6 70:13	124:22	136:20,21 138:12	requested
90:18,18 97:15 98:18	related	139:16,18 140:13,19	188:14,15
99:21 102:11 112:19	16:5 26:14,15 27:6	140:25 143:19	require
reference	44:9 45:21,22 48:10	144:16,24 146:12	102:3
34:4 98:8 149:19	48:19 53:16 56:13	147:9 150:4,6,21,24	required
referenced	66:14 67:4,7 68:5,9	151:4,23 153:1,3	13:13 17:2,3 98:25
49:8 154:24	68:24 69:3,10 82:8	154:21,23 156:2,9	101:25 102:24 103:3
references	86:15 120:1 121:13	157:5,8,14 159:4,21	103:16,19,21 104:4,5
124:17 152:16	122:21,23 147:2	160:2,20 162:15,22	104:10 149:9 178:12
referred	166:13 188:21	163:22 164:3 165:13	178:13
45:18,20 51:13 57:7	relates	165:18 167:11,18	requirement
117:18 121:11	66:5 120:12	168:14,20 169:7,13	17:9
122:18,20 123:3	relationship	170:21 171:1,21,23	research
referring	18:12,14 24:2	REMEMBERED	69:1 83:7 124:16
58:23 100:23 113:10	relative	5:2	129:4
121:1	76:16	remembering	residence
refers	relatively	34:7	7:25
100:2 102:15 159:14	155:2	reminded	resident
176:18	release	130:13	15:18 16:7
reflect	109:19	rendered	resolve
115:15	relevance	38:23	185:4,6
reflects	42:25 43:16 46:17	repeat	resolved
114:18	61:6 62:19 64:23	48:15 58:5 61:17 79:7	185:5
refresh	67:18,19 125:10	121:18 130:10	respect
66:18 70:15 78:17	126:5	155:14 156:18	21:11 35:1 72:10
127:10,16,18 144:3	relevant	158:19	179:10
146:16	137:8 155:18	repetitive	response
		· I	<b>P</b>

Merrill - Washington D.C.

800-292-4789

www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

		-	
146:1	revisit	Sandy	search
responsible	64:20 175:9	2:18	57:11 58:8 123:11,18
41:22 42:1	Reyes	Santoro	searching
rest	2:18	1:13 144:14 163:15	50:18,22 51:1,1 53:15
148:21 149:5	Richard	167:9 168:11	117:16 120:12 121:4
restate	1:21 2:10,12 5:8 6:7	save	124:5,13,15
74:20 118:15 125:25	7:16 8:1 64:17 143:1	30:1	second
127:12	143:9 186:20 187:6	saying	11:13 22:1 44:10 46:9
Reston	Richardson	35:4 40:21 55:19	47:12,12 75:4 140:20
4:7	14:17,20 15:2	69:15 70:4 77:13	156:20 182:15
Retrieved	right	79:20,21 92:6 102:23	secretary
157:4	78:11,19 81:17 83:18	103:5 152:15 164:24	40:12
retrieving	97:21 100:24 108:16	185:9	section
137:2	112:21 113:1 120:14	says	2:11 154:11
reveal	112.21 113.1 120.14	38:22 40:1,2 44:18,19	2.11 134.11 see
53:10 110:1,7 144:1	127:23 142:21 143:13 147:17 173:5	46:15 61:19 74:25	30:6 37:16 38:5 39:3
144:19 145:4 147:16	145:13 147:17 175:3	99:24 105:20 106:17	40:17 44:12 46:11,12
151:7 157:11 159:24	178:22 179:1,14,20	114:6 119:10 124:12	40:17 44:12 40:11,12 47:11 50:23 52:9
160:23 162:17	178.22 179.1,14,20	126:25 127:3,25	
	risk	120:23 127:5,23	59:21,22 66:3 73:18 77:1 12 12 81:8
revealing	148:5		77:1,12,12 81:8
143:24 167:14 168:17		147:1 148:17,21	90:19,19,22 91:14
170:23,24 182:1	Road	149:7 151:1,11	93:8 97:7 98:20 99:4
reveals	8:2	153:25 158:9 164:13	100:3 105:17 107:12
147:12	role	167:9 178:20	109:1 110:16 116:6
revelation	35:4 43:18	schedule	123:7 128:10 129:17
156:6	room	116:14	130:12 136:18
review	30:9 64:3 140:21	school	140:11 151:22
1:16 6:12 36:11 37:9	173:19 174:4,24	10:19 14:9 17:7,8	159:14 184:2
42:4 49:19,22 89:6	175:6,9 180:4,22	116:9,13	send
92:19 177:17 188:14	rooms	Schools	42:5
reviewed	144:12	117:9	sending
22:25 23:4,5,6 31:10	roughly	science	43:4
35:24 49:21 171:19	18:25 67:15 68:16	10:22 11:7,9,10,16,20	sends
172:14	rule	27:5	42:15 44:1 49:23
reviewer	174:3	sciences	sense
36:13	rules	11:11	17:5 43:2 71:21 72:19
reviewing	9:3,4 15:19 22:15	scientific	73:1 75:4 76:6
139:14,25		133:3	109:13 123:14
revise	S	scientist	132:17
81:20 83:18	S	94:6	sent
revised	2:9 3:1 4:1 6:5 25:3	scripting	31:4 36:5 40:11 43:6
60:20	26:7	13:3	49:20,21 91:2 92:10
revising	sample	SC0058852	92:12 139:3
165:8	138:10	2:16	sentence
revisions	San	SC0058862	55:18 63:5 75:4
164:13 165:1	3:21 6:18 8:1	2:19	sentences
	l		

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law

800-292-4789

IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

	1		
80:25	shows	91:6	138:13 139:16,18
separate	66:1 98:10	Solutions	140:13 143:19
52:15 58:6 62:3 123:9	Sidley	4:22,23	144:24 146:12 147:9
separately	3:4,11 6:25 7:7	somebody	150:4,6,21,24 153:1
65:20	sign	29:4,5 30:8 40:12 80:7	153:3,5 154:21,23
September	15:25	86:4	156:2,8 157:5,8
38:6,6,11,24 107:4	signed	soon	159:4,21 160:20
108:11,15,22 109:3	16:1	90:2	162:15,21 163:22
110:13 111:15 112:1	significant	sorry	164:4 165:13,18
112:4,6,19,24 113:5	154:2	8:14 18:3 23:15 24:6	167:2,11,17 168:14
113:5,7,8,9,17 114:9	similar	30:14 33:1,21 38:16	168:19 169:13 171:1
114:11,11,25 115:18	65:17 69:23	40:7 50:6 72:17	171:21,23 177:1
154:19 156:19 157:1	simple	77:25 78:7 80:12	specification
sequence	96:2,8	82:17 87:6 93:6	94:1
89:5	simply	100:11 104:3 105:15	speculate
series	183:25	136:15 176:24 181:6	62:22 92:16 102:8,20
46:9,14,15 178:3	SIMULATANEOUS	186:8	115:8 149:2
served	1:14	SOURCES	speculating
32:6	simulated	1:15	52:19 103:12
services	83:6	space	speculation
38:23 65:6,21	single	137:6	92:17 102:25 103:6
SESSION	67:10	speak	172:21
117:1	single-sided	10:5 20:14	speed
set	29:23	speakerphone	101:15
72:13 177:16	sir	163:16	spend
seven	55:1 142:12	speaking	17:7 96:4 125:7
51:14 88:21 115:22	sitting	61:24 176:11	spent
SF-001020	41:20 58:16 64:3	specialized	11:4,6 44:4 58:20
1:25	situation	133:3	95:12 138:21 149:3,6
shaking	183:7	specific	spoke
9:9	six	46:20 54:13 62:21	60:21
shares	51:14 67:25 68:2	82:13 89:12 92:8	Square
18:22 19:3	115:2	102:7,19 109:12,14	4:4
sheet	skill	115:8 135:17 147:20	Stacy
85:18,23 86:3	96:24	151:10 157:21 184:3	132:25
short	skipping	specifically	Stacy's
9:20 63:2 161:6 183:9	148:13	26:11,20 27:3 28:14	132:22 133:1,6
shorthand	slightly	31:19,21,23 33:3,10	stage
5:6 188:3,8	69:23	33:12 34:8 46:7 53:7	175:16
shortly	small	53:19 54:7 62:17	stand
86:8	13:18	69:14 82:4 92:15	178:7
show	software	104:11,24 109:5	standing
124:20 182:12	13:9,21,25 26:14,14	117:17,23 118:2,8,25	180:3
showing	27:6 29:7 117:17,18	119:9,14 128:2,4,13	stands
39:25 74:2 82:13,21	137:6	130:6,8,16 131:1,3	141:23
138:24 139:6	solicit	131:10 136:21	start
	1	1	1

Merrill - Washington D.C.

800-292-4789

www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

start	streamlined	29:9,22 30:15 31:1	136:3,14 137:9,21
9:12 27:16 48:10,18	60:20	32:1,13,19 33:8,23	138:8,23 139:12
49:3 74:6 94:25	Street	34:2,6 35:6,18,23	140:5,23 141:8,17,25
95:13 182:19	3:5,12,20 4:14	36:15,23 37:10 38:1	142:5,10,16 143:10
started	strict	38:12,16,25 39:12,24	144:5,15,21 145:15
17:7 70:25 73:24 74:9	22:16	40:16,25 41:11,15,25	146:9 147:5,22
76:18 77:8 80:6	strictly	42:6,18 43:9 44:5	148:11,14,16 149:23
84:24,24 85:1 86:8	71:21 72:19	45:1,8,15 46:21,25	150:20 151:13,25
98:10,12 100:6,12	strike	47:23 48:8,17,24	152:14 154:5,13
starting	114:10 115:6	49:11 50:7,11,13	155:8,22 156:10,25
95:7 101:4,21	struck	51:7,22 52:8,23 53:6	157:16,23 158:12,25
state	39:21 40:22	53:12,17,23 54:4,15	159:16 160:4,15
6:24 7:24 106:16	structured	54:23 55:17 56:6,18	161:3,7,10,24 162:8
135:2 136:6 150:15	65:6	57:1,8,24 58:10 59:5	162:23 163:11 164:5
155:15 173:15	structures	59:10,13 60:8,15	164:16 165:9,20
stated	83:7	61:10,17 62:5,14,25	166:19 167:4,19
76:9 107:18 150:14	student	63:3,6,13,21 64:5,8	168:8 169:2,14,24
168:5 188:9	12:15	64:18 65:16 66:13,24	170:11 171:7,17
statement	subject	68:1 69:22 70:5	172:9,17 173:5
48:23 49:1 72:15,21	11:15 17:24 54:18	71:12,15,18 72:14	174:12,23 175:17,21
182:24 183:1	92:4 94:4 152:13	73:5,14 74:21 75:17	175:25 176:3,12,15
states	181:25 183:22	75:23 76:12,20 77:7	176:19,23 177:3
1:1 6:9 11:5 14:3	subjects	77:15,22 78:10,19,22	178:1,19 179:17,23
16:23 25:22 26:1	11:13	79:6,24 81:1,22	181:2,4,4,5,5,6,7
57:6 129:20	submitted	82:10,19 83:2 84:3,5	183:19 184:8,10,16
status	23:5,7	84:21 85:11,17,24	185:20 186:4,15
59:20 61:20,25 159:20	Subscribed	86:19 87:5,15,25	Suh's
163:14	187:2	88:5,15 89:9,17,24	175:2
statutory	subsequent	90:12 92:3,11 94:17	Suite
107:7,10	91:8	95:9 96:9 97:1 98:6	3:20 4:6,14
stayed	substance	98:13 99:23 100:1,8	suited
10:23 12:22 14:15	10:6	100:17 101:24	87:9
Stefano	substantial	102:10,13,22 103:14	summary
24:25 25:1	95:12,13	104:2,17 105:1,19	38:19
step	successful	106:5,9,14 107:17,24	Sun
15:5 126:18 175:12	65:8	108:9,20 109:21	6:25
stock	suggest	110:4,12 111:4,12	Sunday
18:21	172:15	112:6,11,13 114:24	155:17
stop	suggests	115:12 116:1,16,19	supervise
176:13	124:21	117:4 118:6,17,23	43:3
stopped	Suh	119:22 120:20 121:2	supervised
63:8	2:5 3:7 6:25 7:23 12:8	121:8,15 122:6,14	107:22
story	12:10 19:15,24 20:9	123:2 124:19 125:5	supervising
179:9	20:24 21:6,12,16,19	125:16,23 126:13,19	79:23 82:5
strain	22:24 24:16 25:13,24	131:17 132:6,20	supervision
43:5	27:15 28:12,16,24	133:22 134:19 135:6	188:12
	I I		

Merrill - Washington D.C.

800-292-4789

www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

sure	151:15 152:2,16,25	119:10,11 120:25	96:22 131:5
9:4 22:14 33:19 35:23	153:15 154:7,19	147:7 157:3 159:18	teleconference
63:6 78:10 116:21	155:3,10,17,25	162:24 169:6 181:23	167:9,18 168:11,23
144:5 161:7 177:21	156:12,19,23 158:8	185:21	Telefacsimile
179:1 185:5	158:14,23 159:8	talked	2:17
SurfCast	160:6,19 161:12	77:21 105:21 119:10	telephone
1:7 2:9 6:9 7:5,10 8:14	162:25 164:7,18	119:12 120:4 135:19	3:11 4:3 7:6 163:20
18:12,16,21 19:7,17	165:6,22 167:21	140:3,25 144:16,25	tell
20:7 23:17,23 24:2,3	168:6 169:16 170:1	145:13 147:10,21	9:22 10:18 13:14
30:16 31:6 39:23	171:9,25 177:7	151:2,4,11,16 155:24	31:18 36:2 41:6,21
40:9 42:2 43:11 44:3	184:19	156:3,9 157:9,15,24	51:18 52:24 53:7
40.9 42.2 43.11 44.3	SurfCast's	157:24 159:19,22	69:11,24 76:15 77:19
46:22 47:1 54:6,17	128:1 157:18 158:2	160:3,18,21 161:1	78:2,23 82:7 86:4
55:24 56:8 58:13,16	128.1 157.18 158.2	162:15 163:13,23	98:21 103:16,19
64:21 65:5,8,12,18		165:14,19 167:11	104:5,11 110:22,23
65:21 66:14 67:7	swear 7:14	168:15,20 169:8	104.5,11 110.22,25
68:9 69:3,10,25 70:8	sworn	170:21 171:2 178:20	143:22 166:8 179:8,9
71:23 73:16,21,24	5:11 7:17 188:4	178:22	180:12 188:5
74:4,7,10,11 76:3	system	talking	telling
78:25 80:4,17 81:7	1:14 17:4 40:7,8	42:19 57:2,4 61:15	73:1 82:12 123:19
81:25 84:11,14 85:1	1.14 17.4 40.7,8	87:3,21 100:20,22	temporally
88:7,8,25 89:7,10	T	108:11 112:9 121:3	158:7
90:15,16,25 91:13,16	t	135:12 151:14,20	ten
94:10,18 97:10,19,22	94:25	165:3,3 166:11	67:25 68:2 96:15
97:24 98:12,15,20	table	169:21,22 170:16	term
99:6,11,13,16 100:7	184:24	talks	21:6 123:13 126:20
100:12,14 101:5,7	tad	86:16 160:13	137:1 138:20
105:3,11,18,22 108:1	141:14	tapes	terms
108:8,14 109:4	take	148:18 149:8	15:25 16:4 17:2 51:4
111:14,24 112:24	9:20,25 11:11,13,15	task	53:13 76:17 87:24
113:4 114:12 115:13	11:16,23 24:10 63:2	45:24,24	127:21 183:21
115:17,21 117:22	64:8 71:20 72:18	tasked	Terrapin
118:12 120:19	82:1 84:15 95:21	81:24 84:13 97:23	13:19 18:4
121:25 123:12 125:4	96:14 97:25 99:17	99:15	testified
127:25 128:15,21,23	113:11 126:14	tasks	5:11 7:18 8:16,18 60:9
128:24 129:7,11	139:15 142:11,12,13	45:3,9 96:13 121:25	101:10 106:12
130:3,4,20,24 132:8	161:6,24 174:7 180:7	122:7	testify
132:16,23,23 133:17	182:6 183:13 185:10	TCP/IP	8:22,24 145:7
134:7 135:24 136:19	taken	169:7,23 170:17	testimony
136:23 137:8,23	20:19 22:7 39:14	184:17	73:11 74:17 79:18
138:6,10,15,22,25	64:11 72:3 73:6	technical	81:16 84:18 95:5
139:3,7,15,20 140:4	74:12 96:14 116:24	26:9,12,16,21,22 27:1	114:16 123:23
140:8,9 145:19 146:6	143:3 162:3 173:8	87:22	134:13 145:23 148:4
146:11,19 147:2,8,24	185:15 188:7	Technically	149:16 150:13 152:6
148:10 149:3,11	talk	24:7	153:19 156:16
150:2,8,18 151:3,12	75:14 105:25 117:5,11	technology	158:18 159:12
		<b>B</b> J	

Merrill - Washington D.C.

800-292-4789

www.merrillcorp.com/law

IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

	•		
160:11 161:16 163:4	theoretical	96:15 140:8 143:8	170:13 173:7,12
164:22 166:3 168:1	10:24 12:13	161:21 186:19	176:1,15 180:5,5,12
172:20 174:1 179:5	thereof	three-quarter	181:15 183:2 184:18
181:9 183:10 188:9	5:4	166:9	185:14,19 186:7,13
Thank	thereto	Thursday	186:21 188:8
7:11,20 22:23 44:6	188:22	32:18 114:21	timeframe
49:12 56:2 59:12	thicker	tidying	18:1 29:11 40:6 83:23
61:21 65:4,23 66:9	59:10,10	146:11	102:20
81:23 89:20 101:3	thing	tied	timeline
112:2 127:22 141:16	18:3 24:6 106:18	16:2 65:11	163:18,18,20
144:2 147:19 161:25	things	tiles	times
175:15	33:11 34:15 42:13	127:10,16,18	158:20
Thanks	51:25 78:14 88:14	Tim	Timesheets
101:3	128:11 130:14	174:10	2:12
that's	134:16 137:18	time	timetable
8:11,15 11:20,22 15:7	151:23 172:16 177:9	6:15 8:11 9:21 12:14	165:12
15:11 16:25 17:18,22	think	13:5,16 14:8,11,22	timing
20:11 22:20 23:9	12:2,18 14:18 15:17	15:18,22 17:1,5,7,11	105:10,21 106:19
25:15 28:24,25 30:9	15:22 16:8 17:3	17:12 20:17,23 22:5	151:2,12,14 152:17
30:24 34:19 37:14	19:22 20:11 26:19	22:11 23:6 25:7,9,12	152:18
38:20 40:19,23 44:2	27:24 29:11 30:9	25:17 26:4,13 27:14	title
54:21 56:1 57:13	31:20 32:5,10 34:25	27:23 28:1,1,3,6 36:4	1:14 133:7
58:19 59:4 60:14,18	43:5 45:21 49:17	36:4,13 37:19,24	titles
60:23,24 62:3,12	52:5,9 55:8,10 58:22	39:6 40:6,8 49:13,17	25:16
73:19 76:19 78:19	60:9 63:10 67:13	49:19 51:13 52:12,13	today
82:18 83:1 84:22	69:1 71:16 75:12	52:15 54:3 56:13	6:16 8:4,22 10:13
85:21 86:15 91:22	76:9 86:15,16 94:6	58:15,19 62:2 63:1	23:10 120:4 140:3
93:25 94:4 97:20	94:20,21,24 101:20	64:10,17 69:17 70:25	177:15 184:4,25
98:22 99:20 101:20	101:21 102:25	75:7,15,15,20,25	185:3,5,7
104:10 106:25 108:8	116:16 118:22	77:2,6,20 78:9 82:7,8	Today's
108:18 110:10,24	121:13 122:22	87:24 88:1,2,20 89:5	6:14
111:11 112:8 113:1,1	125:12 126:11	89:8 90:20 92:25	told
113:7,13,16 115:16	127:20 133:8,13	93:10,11 94:19 95:11	24:3 63:17 89:12
118:22 119:8 120:4	142:13,19 144:9,14	98:11 100:25 101:23	115:11 120:5 124:25
123:5 126:8,17,18,18	149:19 155:1 164:24	105:18 106:16 107:9	125:2 127:4 142:8
126:23 127:3 128:18	172:24 179:25 180:9	113:9 114:17 116:16	180:14
129:11 130:11,18,22	182:2,17 185:8,9	116:17,23 117:3	Tom
132:4 133:20 134:4	third	120:6 124:2,6,18	140:9 143:17
137:18 142:20	44:11 47:12 66:11	125:21,24 128:23	top
143:13 145:12	137:3	129:20 130:11 133:2	99:24
151:19 152:10	thought	134:15 138:6,21	total
153:12 154:1 159:13	104:3 113:3 137:7	143:2,9 146:4 148:20	38:6 39:19 41:10
160:12 164:24 171:5	176:23	148:25 149:9 152:23	totally
172:8 174:18 176:3	three	154:2 155:2 156:24	126:23
178:17,23 179:1	11:11 12:18 36:24	158:6,23 162:2,7	track
182:25 184:20	37:12 67:13 77:4	166:8,17 168:9	61:16
			I

Merrill - Washington D.C.

800-292-4789

www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

	I	I	
trademark	4:13 7:2	9:16 10:9 34:21 66:9	V
1:1 6:10 46:4	twice	112:17 174:17	VA
training	183:15	undertake	4:7
12:4,9 13:9,11 17:19	two	45:4 122:1	vague
166:10,13,15	11:13 13:24 48:2	unified	93:25
transcript	51:17 53:8 54:6	56:17 132:17	variety
121:7 188:14	64:16 67:13 72:10	unique	12:21 96:22
transfer	73:2 77:4 80:19 81:6	44:19	various
114:2 159:2	95:20 96:14 114:20	United	69:17 92:25 101:15
transmitted	114:21,22 115:16	1:1 6:9 10:21 11:5	vendor
36:4	140:6,7 142:25 149:4	16:23 25:22 26:1	137:4
transmitting	156:18 161:21	University	verbal
43:23	163:10 177:9	5:5 6:21 10:20 133:2	
travel	two-and-a-half	UNIX	181:24
136:18	13:20	13:2,4,6	verbally
trees	type	unreasonable	9:8
30:1	19:16 26:18 64:20	70:7,13 71:7,11	versa
trial	96:22 102:21	untimely	29:8
1:2 6:10 8:16	types	32:8	version
triggered	70:22,23 101:15 102:9	unwilling	130:13
104:13	124:15	182:24	versus
trip	typewriting	un-redacted	6:8 8:14
135:13	188:11	128:9 130:13 146:15	vice
true	typically	128.9 130.13 140.13	29:8
99:20 105:2 111:13,23	38:17 109:17	Updated	video
187:2	56.17 109.17	165:11	4:22 6:15,19
truth	U		videographer
188:5,5,6	Uh-huh	<b>urgency</b> 109:13	4:24 6:6,16 7:11,20
truthfully	9:10 67:22 170:14		20:14,17,22 22:2,5
8:25	184:15	<b>urgent</b> 69:19	22:10 64:9,14 116:22
	ultimate	USC	117:2 142:24 143:6
<b>try</b> 9:20 183:7	92:9	2:10	162:1,6 173:6,11
trying	Um		182:11 185:13,18
101:14 103:4 133:12	90:1,3	<b>use</b> 52:1 137:1 177:15	186:18
101:14 105:4 155:12 179:11	understand		videotape
	8:3 9:14 10:8,10,16,17	<b>user</b> 12:4	6:7 64:16 142:25
<b>Tuesday</b> 114:23	46:1 52:12 57:9 71:5		143:8 186:19
	74:19 77:7 82:11,11	<b>utility</b> 45:19 79:12 83:5	VIDEOTAPED
<b>turn</b> 24:19 35:10 37:15	89:19 102:15 103:4	45:19 79:12 85:5	1:20
	112:23 129:5 148:21		view
38:2 44:7,8 50:20 58:22 59:15 65:24	185:9 186:2	<b>U.K</b> 11:4 13:24	89:22 91:17 142:19
66:25 80:10 83:3	understanding	U.S	154:3 179:5
	39:19 183:2		visa
117:15 129:25	understands	15:12,18 16:6 66:12	16:5
132:21 143:11 147:6	22:14	67:24 68:13 157:3,4 157:25 158:5	visit
159:1,17 171:18 <b>Turner</b>	understood	137.23 138.3	111:1
			VLP

Merrill - Washington D.C.

800-292-4789

www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

14:21 24:8	120:8,9 188:20	31:25 32:14,18 33:6	144:6 145:12,23,25
voice	ways	33:25 34:3 35:3,7,21	146:25 147:12,17,20
6:23	44:1 125:13 176:20	35:24 36:22 37:6,24	148:5 149:18 150:14
volume	<b>Web</b>	38:9,17 39:10,18	151:7,10,19 152:6,8
6:6 64:15 142:25	50:18 51:1,1 117:16	41:5,12,24 42:4,11	153:20 154:10 155:6
143:7 186:19	120:11 121:3 123:18	43:1,18 44:23 45:6	155:14 156:5,8,18
	120.11 121.5 125.18	45:13 46:19,24 47:20	157:11,14,21 158:5
<b>vs</b> 1:6	Website	48:7,15,22 49:7 50:8	158:19 159:13,24
1:0	137:3	48.7,13,22 49.7 50.8 50:12 51:3 52:5,9	160:2,12,23 161:1,17
W	Websites	53:5,9,13,21 54:2,13	162:21 163:6.25
W	137:3	54:21 55:2 56:10,22	164:3,12,23 165:18
1:25 5:6 188:2,25	Wednesday	57:4,20 58:5 59:4,12	166:2,4,24 167:1,13
wait	1:22 5:3 6:2 149:3	60:6,14 61:7,22	167:17 168:3,16,19
9:11 182:15	1:22 5:5 6:2 149:5 week		
waiting	<b>weeк</b> 17:6 91:8 96:17	62:10,12,21 63:4,7 63:17 64:2,24 65:4	169:11,20 170:7
91:9	115:10 116:4 124:3	66:6,9,18,21 67:20	171:1,13 172:6,14 173:18 174:22,24
waive		67:22 69:14 70:3,12	-
64:25	<b>weekend</b> 114:21	71:10,16 72:8,23,25	175:6,14,16 177:5 178:3 180:3,11,22
waived	weeks	73:12 74:19 75:12,14	178.5 180.5,11,22
177:7 182:9,13 183:17	77:4 96:15	76:9 77:1,8,19 78:5,8	186:5,8,10,12 188:3
184:20	welcome	78:11,16,20,23 79:18	188:10
waiver	180:15	79:20 80:24 81:16,17	Wonjoo
65:1 178:15 179:19		82:17 83:1,25 84:4	3:7 6:25 184:9
181:19	went 13:23 14:17 133:25	84:19 85:7,8,10,15	5.7 0.25 184.9 won't
want	13:23 14:17 135:23	85:21 86:15 87:3,14	19:25 185:6
22:13 24:6 55:13,15	<b>we'll</b>	87:21 88:4,13 89:4	word
55:17,23 64:19 70:13	9:20 19:22 34:25	89:21 90:10 92:7	75:2
92:6 106:10 116:19	9.20 19.22 34.23 175:8,8 179:9	94:15 95:6 96:1,19	words
129:13 141:17 142:1	what's	98:9 99:20,24 100:2	177:12
142:2 144:3 145:10	41:21 60:6 103:12	101:20 102:5,7,11,15	work
176:10 177:15 178:9	111:11 117:25 119:4	102:18 103:8,25	15:3 30:19 39:13
180:12 182:23,25	129:9 130:17 175:3	104:16,22 105:17	44:17 53:11 54:22
183:1,6 184:5 185:1	whilst	107:21 108:4,7,18	56:7 58:11 67:12
wanted	153:8,21	109:9,11 110:1,2,7	69:11,15,18,19,24
46:1 76:13 78:17 82:6	William	110:22 111:10 112:4	70:7 71:13,21,22
86:20 98:7 112:15	25:3 26:7	110.22 111.10 112.4 112:8,12 114:16,17	70:771:13,21,22
wanting	25:3 20:7 Williams	112.8,12 114.10,17	72:10,19,20,23,24
109:19,19	159:19	119:18 120:16,24	76:7,18 82:6,9 83:22
wants	within-entitled	121:18 122:3,11	84:6,24,25 85:1,5,7
20:4	188:6	123:22,24 124:25	85:12 86:4 87:10,18
Washington	witness	125:11,21 126:6,17	88:22 90:14 91:15
3:6,13	4:12 5:10 7:3,15,19	131:15 132:4,12	98:10,14 99:10 101:5
wasn't	10:13 12:9 19:13,18	133:20 134:14 135:1	101:17,22 102:19
35:2	19:20 20:5 22:19	137:1,17 138:3,19	105:2 107:8 108:1,13
way	25:7 27:11 28:10,13	139:10,23 140:17,19	111:13,23 113:4
36:9 65:6 72:8 100:14	28:21,25 30:14,24	141:7 142:3,8 144:2	114:12 115:5,9,13,20
	20.21,23 30.14,24	1117 112.3,0 111.2	111.12113.3,7,13,20

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law

800-292-4789

IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

100.14 02 04 100.10	51.1 ( 04 52.14	22.22.22.22.22.11.12	44.00
128:14,23,24 129:18	51:1,6,24 53:14	32:22,22 83:11,12 84:7 93:20 95:8	44:20
132:7,16 134:6,21 135:23 137:22 138:6	80:15 120:11,12,19 121:3 124:5,9,11,12	135:13 139:15 140:2	1
			1
138:14 145:18 146:4	125:3,3 126:11,20,23	140:21	58:22 81:5 113:9
146:18 147:17,23	127:1,5 129:19	you'd	159:19
149:10 150:7 151:8	Writing/Web	55:7	1.25
153:14 155:9 156:6	50:22	you'll	1.25
156:12 157:11	written	20:3 100:3 146:14	
158:13 159:7,25	39:6 51:4 92:24 96:7	153:25	1.5
160:5,23 161:11	117:25 119:4,19	you're	40:19 136:19 152:24
162:18 164:1,6,17	130:17 132:14	81:17	154:19 164:13,25
165:21 166:25	135:16,18 138:13	Z	1.9
167:15,20 169:25	146:13 167:2		165:2
171:8,24 172:18	wrong	zero	1:07
175:22	39:22 40:7,8 80:12	44:24	143:2,4
worked	wrote	0	1:10
13:8,17,25 18:6 40:4	125:1 181:23		143:5,9
65:25 76:22 78:1,18	wsuh@sidley.com	0.1	1:31
79:22 80:15 81:5,11	3:9	159:17 160:18	162:2,4
83:10,20 85:3 90:11	Wu	0.25	1:43
93:1 95:8,10 97:2	173:14 174:4	40:18,18,18 138:10	162:5,7
98:24 100:13 105:23	Wu's	150:2 151:1 155:24	1:55
107:5 108:23 117:10	175:10	157:2 159:1 165:11	173:7,9,10,12
120:7 128:20 149:20		169:6	10
166:5	X	0.33	107:4
working	X	167:8	10th
11:24 17:1,5 26:13	2:1 69:15	0.4	91:9,12 97:6 98:16
30:12 43:24 46:20	XML	163:12,13	108:11,15
51:16 52:11 62:3	154:20,25 156:1,21	0.5	10.39
70:22 77:5 86:8 89:8	157:2,24 158:9,10	117:16 146:10 147:7	15:22
90:25 98:12 100:7,12		157:2 162:13 170:17	10:15
110:9 123:17 128:24	Y	0.7	64:10
129:2,3 155:16	Y	170:15	10:16
161:23 164:14 165:6	69:16	0.75	64:10,12
165:6	Yeah	40:17 139:14	10:30
wouldn't	19:19 22:4 63:3 78:2	0002	64:13,17
19:8	81:2 95:19 121:8	62:2	104
write	156:8 173:2,21	0002-999	159:17
30:4,6 44:23 96:16	178:11 182:5	58:15	109
113:9 120:17 124:13	year	0009-999	160:16
131:6 181:22	8:9 11:4,4,12,13,14,18	45:18 47:9 122:17	11
Write-off	17:4 96:14	0124-245041	37:15 66:1 71:24
41:1	years	1:24	80:14 99:22 100:23
writing	11:6 12:19 13:21,24	09555.0003999	11th
12:15,20,24 13:12,21	44:4 67:13 96:15	40:3	91:13,15 116:5
13:25 30:9 50:17,25	York	09982	11:45
13.23 30.7 30.17,23			
	•	•	•

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law

800-292-4789

IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

116.22.24	130:2	10.2 02 12.9 14.5 04	57:5 65:24 66:19
116:23,24		12:3,23 13:8 14:5,24 16:22 18:1 29:13,14	
110	15-year	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	80:15 83:3 90:23
162:9	96:12	36:20 37:17 43:12	93:4,5 98:23 102:1
111	1500	50:5 66:23 69:8 70:6	105:8 107:2 108:21
163:12	17:4,4	78:25 80:18,20 81:10	116:2 123:6 129:17
113	1501	83:10,15,23 84:10	2010
165:10	3:5,12	92:13 96:16 97:6	2:22 14:20 35:11,16
117	16	105:8,13 107:4	36:8 37:16 42:20
167:5	2:22 108:21	112:22 128:13	43:12 46:8,8 58:22
118	16th		176:3
168:9	71:1 114:11,20 132:22	2	2014
11911	17	2nd	1:22 5:3 6:2,14 187:4
4:5	66:21 113:17	83:15,19 84:10 86:9	20190-5602
12	17th	90:7,17 97:14 147:7	4:7
66:25 71:25 90:22	113:5,8,21 114:20	2:00	202
12th	115:18	180:5	4:14
154:19 167:6	17.6	2:04	202-736-8492
12:00	41:10	183:2	3:15
116:18	1700	2:07	202-736-8831
12:36	3:20	185:14,16	3:8
117:1,3	18	2:18	2030
117.1,5 123	14:15 57:6 78:25	185:17,19	124:21
169:3	14.13 37.0 78.23	2:19	2035
		186:21,23	
124	18th	20	2:12 29:19,20 50:4,14
170:12	66:23 80:4,7 100:14	1:11 105:4 114:22	80:10 83:14 99:1,21
13	100:19 114:21,25	<b>20th</b>	100:23 102:16
46:9,12,13 68:3 72:1,2	169:4	114:23	103:15 104:6 105:14
83:3 156:19	19		117:15 124:21
13th	1:22 5:3 6:2 34:1	200	127:14 130:17
168:10	19th	28:15	143:12 162:9 175:25
133	6:14 114:21,25 149:25	2000	176:12,14 177:1
171:18	170:13	1:12 5:4 6:21 15:17,17	2049
14	1900	16:21	2:15 35:10,12 36:8
2:15 69:7 70:17,19,20	6:20	20005	42:20 43:12 176:4
70:21 71:19 93:1	1988	3:6,13	2050
97:2 98:23 102:1	12:13	2002	2:17 35:10,14,24 38:3
116:2	1990	14:9	42:20 43:12 176:4
14th	29:11,13	2003	2051
38:6,11 157:1	1994	14:10,13 15:10,13	184:13
15	12:23 13:17	2004	2052
70:17,19,20,24 86:16	1995	1:11 16:8	2:24 59:7,8,15,16,23
107:2 112:5,6,19,24	12:2	2005	60:17,19,25 61:18
15th	1998	14:17	184:13
97:9 108:22 109:3	18:1	2008	21
110:13 111:15 112:1	1999	2:9 14:19 24:10,13	2:24 108:22 112:5,6
113:5,8,9 114:10	2:12,15,17,22,25,25	36:1 44:7,18 47:7	112:20,25
113.3,0,7 114.10	2.12,13,17,22,23,23	, , , , , _ , _ , _	112.20,23
	•	•	•

Merrill - Washington D.C. www.merrillcorp.com/law

800-292-4789

IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

	_		
21st	2:22	3:20	8:2
110:14 111:15 112:1		4096	619-699-2639
114:11,23 135:8	3	1:25 188:25	3:23
<b>22</b>	3	<b>41</b>	<b>63</b>
	38:22 40:2,17 129:18		
2:17		140:6	149:24
22nd	3rd	42	640
50:5 51:8 52:18	83:15,20 97:18	143:11	4:14
118:24 127:13	30	43	650-521-5930
136:16	1:12 69:7 93:7 99:3,9	146:10	4:17
23	129:12,25	45	68
81:3	30th	99:24	105:14 150:25
23rd	37:17 38:6,24 105:4	46	
51:9 52:18 79:1,8,9	300	83:14 147:6	7
81:19	4:6 95:20	47	7
24	31	83:15 148:13	2:5 70:17 71:19 74:22
2:9 127:24	99:3,8,9,10 105:8	<b>48</b>	117:15
2.9 127.24 24th	132:21		70
	31st	148:12,17	99:1
105:8,13,20 151:1	69:8 83:10 93:3	5	703-773-4148
25		5	
40:23 94:21 100:19	152:24	-	4:9
101:1 113:16 114:9	317(a)(8)	24:19 38:2 39:3 41:8,9	71
135:12 136:18	2:11	107:4 132:22	99:2
25th	34.1	5th	74
100:6 101:6	38:5,10 39:4,14 40:22	91:8 97:6,21 98:16	99:2
2550	41:12	108:11,15 162:11	75
41:16	35	5,918,237	12:19 99:2 152:23
26	2:10,15,17,22	157:3,4 158:5	771034.1
39:6,14 40:22 59:18	36	50	2:23
90:22 91:23	135:7 136:11	68:19 94:21	777
26th	37	58861	8:1
	136:15	2:16	0.1
61:18 99:2,5,9,12	38	58866	8
27			8
99:9	66:21 138:9	2:20	50:3,4,7,14 59:15
27th	<b>39</b>	<b>59</b>	61:17 118:24 127:14
99:3 139:14	19:5	2:24	129:18
28th	4	6	
80:18 140:8 171:19			8th
283818	4	6	165:11
2:15	19:4 41:5,6 80:10	70:17	80
29	4th	6th	101:1
2:12,25 32:18 78:25	79:10 83:21 90:25	163:13	8067-034
29th	91:2,21 92:13 97:19	6,724,403	99:25 101:1
33:20 36:19,20 37:21	148:17 160:17	1:10	87
70:6,6 71:6,6 80:20	40	6:00	154:18
81:5,10,21 143:14	94:20 139:13	116:4	88
	401	60	155:23
296240			···
	I	1	I

800-292-4789

IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295

	-		
888	9982-0009		
47:20	48:10,19 49:5,10		
89	<b>9982-0009-888</b>		
157:1	44:11 45:19 48:1		
137.1	121:11 122:19		
9	<b>9982-0009-999</b>		
9	44:10 48:1 50:21		
44:8,18,18 47:6,7,7	<b>9982-009-999</b>		
50:20 57:6 123:7	113:15		
9th	<b>999</b>		
90:24 127:25 128:13	50:17		
129:21	50.17		
9:00			
116:4			
<b>9:01</b>			
5:3 6:3,15			
9:17			
20:18,20			
9:23			
20:21,23			
9:24			
22:6,8			
9:25			
22:9,11			
92			
159:1			
92101-4297			
3:21			
94063			
4:15			
94303			
8:2			
992-0005			
50:15			
<b>9982</b>			
44:24 45:2,7 47:7 49:3			
121:24 122:5			
<b>9982-00</b>			
45:18 122:17			
<b>9982-0002-999</b>			
44:13 45:22 58:21			
60:10 122:23			
<b>9982-0005-999</b>			
44:12 45:21 56:11			
119:24 121:13			
122:21 123:3,8			
122.21 123.3,0			
	1	1	

Merrill - Washington D.C.

800-292-4789

www.merrillcorp.com/law IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295 Detitioner Microsoft Corporation Ex 1102 p 222