

Transcript of **TELEPHONIC JUDGE'S CONFERENCE**

Date: May 20, 2014

Case: MICROSOFT CORPORATION v. SURFCAST, INC.

Planet Depos

Phone: 888-433-3767

Fax: 888-503-3767

Email: <u>transcripts@planetdepos.com</u>
Internet: <u>www.planetdepos.com</u>

Court Reporting | Videography | Videoconferencing | Interpretation | Transcription

		2
1	Telephonic Judge's Conference with the Patent	
2	Trial and Appeal Board:	
3		
4		
5		
6		
7	Phone: 866-702-0697	
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14	Pursuant to Agreement, before DENICE LOMBARD,	
15	CSR.	
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		

		3
1	APPEARANCES	
2	ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER MICROSOFT CORPORATION:	
3	JEFFREY P. KUSHAN, ESQUIRE	
4	JOSEPH A. MICALLEF, ESQUIRE	
5	SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP	
6	1501 K Street, NW	
7	Washington, DC 20005	
8	(202) 736-8000	
9		
10	ON BEHALF OF PATENT OWNER SURFCAST, INC.:	
11	JAMES M. HEINTZ, ESQUIRE	
12	DLA PIPER LLP	
13	One Fountain Square	
14	11911 Freedom Drive	
15	Suite 300	
16	Reston, Virginia 20190	
17	(703) 773-4000	
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		

		4
1	APPEARANCES CONTINUED	
2	ON BEHALF OF PATENT OWNER SURFCAST, INC.:	
3	RICHARD BONE, ESQUIRE	
4	VLP LAW GROUP, LLP	
5	2225 E. Bayshore Road	
6	Suite 200	
7	Palo Alto, California 94303	
8	(650) 419-2010	
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		

		5
1	PROCEEDINGS	
2	JUDGE TIERNEY: We're starting the call. This	
3	is Judge Tierney joining with Judge Clements, and we're	
4	going to have identification of counsel for the	
5	parties. I'm going to begin with Patent Owner. If you	
6	could please identify who is on the line for you today.	
7	MR. BONE: Yes, this is Richard Bone, lead	
8	counsel for Patent Owner SurfCast.	
9	JUDGE TIERNEY: Thank you. Anyone else with	
10	you today?	
11	MR. HEINTZ: Your Honor, this is James Heintz,	
12	also for Patent Owner.	
13	JUDGE TIERNEY: And just out of curiosity, who	
14	requested the court reporter today?	
15	MR. BONE: Patent Owner.	
16	JUDGE TIERNEY: Okay. You will be responsible	
17	for submitting a copy of the transcript as an exhibit?	
18	Is there any question about that?	
19	MR. BONE: No question, no.	
20	JUDGE TIERNEY: Thank you. Anyone else for	
21	Patent Owner today before I move on?	
22	MR. BONE: No.	

	6
1	JUDGE TIERNEY: Moving over to Petitioner, do
2	I have representative of Petitioner on the line?
3	MR. KUSHAN: Yes, Your Honor. This is Jeff
4	Kushan, and with me is Joe Micallef.
5	JUDGE TIERNEY: Anyone else for the
6	Petitioner?
7	MR. KUSHAN: No.
8	JUDGE TIERNEY: My understanding is the Patent
9	Owner requested the call today. Is that correct,
10	Patent Owner?
11	MR. BONE: That's correct.
12	JUDGE TIERNEY: Okay. So I'd like to begin
13	today's call then for Patent Owner to take a couple
14	minutes and just give us an overview of the relief
15	you're seeking today, after which we'll go ahead and
16	we'll hear from Petitioner on the points you raise. So
17	you have the floor, Patent Owner.
18	MR. BONE: Thank you, Your Honor. I've noted
19	in the e-mail requesting the call, we'd requested
20	relief on two sorry, there was disturbance on the
21	line there.
22	MS. MARTIN: Counsel, hello?

		$\overline{}$
		7
1	JUDGE TIERNEY: Yes?	
2	MS. MARTIN: Hi. My name is Tasha Martin.	
3	I'm the court reporter. I just joined the conference.	
4	JUDGE TIERNEY: Okay. You're a court reporter	
5	for whom? The Patent Owner or Petitioner?	
6	MS. MARTIN: For Mr. Bone.	
7	JUDGE TIERNEY: Mr. Bone, do you have one or	
8	two court reporters on the line today?	
9	MR. BONE: I only requested one.	
10	MR. KUSHAN: So we had Your Honor, we had	
11	requested a court reporter, but I had not appreciated	
12	there was a second court reporter. So why don't we	
13	have Mr. Bone's court reporter drop off and we'll just	
14	proceed with the one we've already suffered through to	
15	get to this point of comprehension if that's okay.	
16	MS. MARTIN: That is fine, Counsel. I	
17	understand. I'm signing off.	
18	MR. KUSHAN: Thank you.	
19	MR. BONE: Thank you.	
20	JUDGE TIERNEY: My understanding is Petitioner	
21	has a court reporter on the line, not Patent Owner, and	
22	Petitioner, you're responsible for submitting a copy of	

8 the transcript as an exhibit in the file. 1 2 MR. KUSHAN: Yes, Your Honor. We will take care of that. 3 JUDGE TIERNEY: Thank you. Now we'll go back 4 5 to where we were. And Patent Owner, if you could 6 please go ahead and give us an overview today. 7 MR. BONE: That's correct. So as noted in my 8 e-mail requesting this call, we had wanted to seek relief on two issues, and they are somewhat related. 9 10 would just state the two issues for the record, and then I'll begin by talking a little bit about the 11 12 first. 13 The first issue is we had wanted to request 14 relief for an additional motion to amend. And the 15 second issue is that we had also wanted to request 16 briefing on the claim-construction standard for this 17 proceeding. 18 Now, in the context of the first issue, which 19 was our wish to bring an additional motion to amend, 20 you may know from the record, Your Honor, that there 21 was a conference call with the Board and the parties on 22 April 16 in which Patent Owner first raised this issue.

And after that -- as a result of that call, the parties were instructed to meet and confer.

Now, Patent Owner provided Petitioner's counsel with two proposed adjustments to the language of the substitute claim. But what ultimately happened is that Petitioner's counsel wanted to receive from us essentially a written briefing on the merits of these changes, which would have been quite voluminous, and we frankly saw as an attempt to frustrate or delay consideration of the issue, frankly something we found a little bit ironic given that there is a parallel District Court proceeding in which the Petitioner had opposed a motion to stay.

So we have a kind of situation where the Petitioner wanted to keep a District Court case going at full speed but then doesn't seem to want us to be able to bring issues to the table timely in this proceeding.

JUDGE TIERNEY: Okay. At this point I want to note the 35 USC 316 does allow for additional motions to amend. However, it is a limited right or ability, I should say ability. It's 316 D 2:

	10
1	"Additional motions to amend may be permitted
2	upon joint request of Petitioner and Patent
3	Owner to materially advance settlement."
4	The Patent Owner is not seeking to materially
5	advance settlement at this time, correct?
6	MR. BONE: Well, I would say with some irony,
7	Your Honor, that I think that you may intuit that
8	settlement of this case is perhaps a distant prospect
9	at this stage.
10	JUDGE TIERNEY: This is a simple I'm asking
11	hopefully and easy question. You're not seeking to
12	file an additional motion under the first prong of
13	316 D 2.
14	MR. BONE: That's correct.
15	JUDGE TIERNEY: It's under the second prong as
16	permitted by regulation, regulation prescribed by
17	director which would be good cause, correct?
18	MR. BONE: That's correct.
19	JUDGE TIERNEY: So what I'd like to hear then
20	is the good cause for the second motion to amend.
21	MR. BONE: Yes, Your Honor. So there's
22	two-fold reason for this. Firstly, just a general

11 it's the general disposition of amendments as we've 1 2 seen empirically in watching inter partes review 3 evolve, amendments appear to be actually quite rarely granted. In fact, we're not aware of any that have 4 5 been granted. We understand --6 JUDGE TIERNEY: I'll point out there was one 7 granted. It should have just went out within the last 8 hour, so . . . 9 MR. BONE: Welcome news I think for patent 10 holders. But the general principle I was trying to get 11 12 at is we understand that the disposition of these 13 proceedings is that motions to amend are firstly only 14 considered if its main claim, the unamended claims, are considered untenable. 15 16 And then therefore, if we were in that unhappy 17 situation, the amended claims would be our last 18 backstop. And therefore we would want to be able to 19 make sure that those claims are not susceptible to, how 20 shall I say, minor issues that could sink them. 21 And in considering the Petitioner's opposition 22 to our motion to amend, some we think relatively minor

12 issues were raised that we felt could be actually quite 1 2 simply addressed with some adjustments to the substitute claim language. And essentially that would 3 be our basis for good cause. 4 5 JUDGE TIERNEY: So let me make sure I 6 understand it correctly. You would actually be 7 modifying the proposed claims and not just modifying 8 the briefing that goes in explaining the basis for the claims. 9 MR. BONE: Well, I think -- the motion for 10 additional amendment would obviously be supported by a 11 12 limited amount of briefing, but it would not be 13 briefing that would disturb the positions we have 14 already made in our prior briefing. JUDGE TIERNEY: So basically the claims that 15 16 are provided in your motion for the remaining claims, 17 you'll be proposing a second set of proposed substitute 18 claims. MR. BONE: Well, that's correct. The language 19 20 change would be quite minor though. 21 JUDGE TIERNEY: And could you walk me

through -- let pull it up on my screen, and then give

22

13 me just one moment for that. I'm pulling up your 1 2 motion to amend. And can you walk me through what you say the 3 minor changes to the claim language would be. 4 5 looking at "Our Proposed Substitute Claim 56." It's a substitute for Claim 46. 6 7 MR. BONE: Claim 53 I believe. 8 JUDGE TIERNEY: Oh, apologies. It's Claim 53, substitute for Claim 46. 9 10 MR. BONE: So if you look at page 2 of our motion to amend, there is underlying language eight 11 12 lines down. And where you would see after a comma 13 "said grid of tiles," that would become "said tiles." 14 That's the first adjustment. JUDGE TIERNEY: And the need for that 15 16 adjustment is --17 MR. BONE: We believe that's simply a clarity 18 issue. In the opposition to amend Petitioner had 19 raised an objection to the way that phrase was written 20 and made an argument that it contained an internal 21 inconsistency, which we don't happen to think that 22 argument is compelling, but we want to make sure that

	14
1	any possible ambiguity there is resolved.
2	JUDGE TIERNEY: Okay. Please continue.
3	MR. BONE: The second request is, if you go to
4	the bottom of page 2, three lines up from the bottom,
5	we would propose to add "by a user" after "wherein the
6	tiles are selectable."
7	JUDGE TIERNEY: At this moment I'm writing
8	this down. And you said added language would be "by a
9	user"?
10	MR. BONE: Yes.
11	JUDGE TIERNEY: And the need for that language
12	is
13	MR. BONE: This arises because of a reference
14	that Petitioner relied on in their opposition to our
15	motion to amend. And it's not a reference over which
16	trial has been instituted. And we had deposed
17	Petitioner's expert on some aspects of that reference,
18	and through that discovery concluded that there was a
19	potential interpretation of that reference which,
20	again, we don't necessarily agree with but could
21	raise a potential issue for this claim language.
22	And we think that adding the "by a user,"

15 which is fully supported by our specification, would 1 2 clarify that particular issue. JUDGE TIERNEY: Let me just ask a question to 3 clarify. I have not gone through in great detail on 4 5 this, so if my questions are overly simplistic, so be 6 it. 7 If it's unselectable by a user, who is it 8 selectable by? 9 MR. BONE: There was a question that came up in the context of this reference -- the reference is 10 Kosts, K-o-s-t-e-s -- as to whether somehow the 11 12 operating system of the computer was able to perform a 13 selection operation. 14 JUDGE TIERNEY: But in terms of at least 15 obviousness, and, I mean, when you say tiles are 16 selectable, isn't it obvious for one of ordinary skill 17 in the art to have a person actually select? And 18 certainly when you read the specification for saying selectable, isn't it the normal reading it's selectable 19 20 by a user? 21 MR. BONE: Well, sir, when you say isn't it 22 obvious, did you actually mean obvious as being

16 unpatentable? 1 2 JUDGE TIERNEY: Two things, two different questions. One is on patentability. I'm not sure why 3 we need to go, and how it's going to -- "by a user" 4 5 would overcome a reference necessarily, so I'm not sure 6 that's necessary there. 7 Too on a claim-construction note, "are 8 selectable, " wouldn't you say the normal reading would be selectable by a user in light of your specification? 9 10 MR. BONE: I believe that is, but, I mean, as you are fully aware, the Board's reasonable 11 12 construction mandate could be stretched to accommodate 13 selection operations. 14 JUDGE TIERNEY: Okay. I see where you're going. I'm just trying to make sure that I'm not 15 16 misunderstanding the position you're taking. 17 MR. BONE: I think we actually fully 18 understand each other here. 19 JUDGE TIERNEY: Okay. Are there any other 20 changes that you're seeking to be made? 21 MR. BONE: That was all. 22 JUDGE TIERNEY: Thank you. And at this point,

	17
1	if I may, is there anything else before I turn to
2	Petitioner?
3	MR. BONE: No, Your Honor.
4	JUDGE TIERNEY: Okay. Let's go to Petitioner.
5	On the issue of this second motion to amend where it's
6	taking out the word "of" on page 2, line 8, and on
7	page 2 third line from the bottom they add "by a user,"
8	could you please explain any objection you have to
9	having them put in a claim of that nature.
10	MR. KUSHAN: So let me first clarify that I
11	believe their first amendment is to change the phrase
12	"grid of tiles" to "tile."
13	MR. BONE: To "tiles" plural.
14	MR. KUSHAN: Yeah, grid of tiles" to "tiles"
15	plural, and is not simply to remove the word "of," but
16	it's changing kind of the concept from going a "grid of
17	tiles" to "tiles" as they've cast it.
18	And the second amendment you have stated
19	correctly.
20	So our position, we have been trying to
21	understand how the changes they have proposed would
22	resolve any of the patentability issues that we had

previously identified, first in our petition, and then in our opposition to the motion to amend.

And we have not been given information from

Patent Owner that helps us resolve that question. We

don't see how any of the amendments they're proposing

would in fact alter the rejection or alter the

trans-patentability that has been stated and found the

way we see the prior art relating to the claim

language.

And so when we were trying to engage the

Patent Owner in discussion about how these amendments

would address things we had previously identified,

unfortunately we didn't get the response to the

substance of our questions.

And so we sit today unable to give you an answer how this would actually materially advance the proceedings, because they're not resolving any of the issues that we identified, both in the petition and in our opposition to the motion.

JUDGE TIERNEY: Well, Petitioner, what if we were to go ahead and authorize a corrected amendment where instead of -- it would be essentially a second

	19
1	amendment to a second motion to amend, but we would
2	just have it replace the first motion to amend, no new
3	briefing. They would not need to brief anything
4	further. All they're doing is putting cut and paste
5	almost on that Claim 53 with that language they just
6	proposed, and the briefing stands as it's already been
7	filed. Would you have any objection at that point?
8	MR. KUSHAN: Well, we certainly would object,
9	and let me just give you an explanation. The change
10	that they have identified, the "grid of tiles" to
11	"tiles," I believe has come from our opposition where
12	we had pointed out a lack of support for modifying a
13	fair amount of confusion actually in their patent about
14	the attributes of tiles versus the attributes that
15	would be sort of the grid of tiles.
16	And so moving from "grid of tiles" to "tiles"
17	actually we think has a fairly substantive question
18	that's engaged, and that issue has not been briefed as
19	framed.
20	JUDGE TIERNEY: Well, wouldn't that actually
21	put their claim in better condition for in terms of
22	like the next prosecution where we say it's a better

		20
1	position for allowance?	
2	MR. KUSHAN: I don't believe so, Your Honor.	
3	We had presented a prior art that addressed the concept	
4	of using tiles or forms of windows that you know,	
5	that I don't think the issues relative to the prior art	
6	are resolved by the changes they're proposing.	
7	JUDGE TIERNEY: I understand. Let's focus	
8	though on the I was hearing a slate and puts it	
9	indefiniteness that it was hard to understand the	
10	meaning of the claim in light of the specification when	
11	you say "grid of tiles." Wouldn't it at least add some	
12	clarity to the claim language if this went to the	
13	"tiles" language.	
14	MR. KUSHAN: Well, no, see they're still	
15	having difficulty I think there's still a	
16	significant issue of whether that new claim would be	
17	supported under 112.	
18	JUDGE TIERNEY: With this minor change does	
19	that add to the problem or actually at least alleviate	
20	it in terms of construction of the claim?	
21	MR. KUSHAN: I don't think it alleviates it.	
22	I think it's keeping it in same the same posture that	

it is now, which that it's not supported as it's presented.

JUDGE TIERNEY: Well, then let's back. So you're saying that it makes no substantive difference either way.

MR. KUSHAN: Well, we would like -- obviously we briefed and responded to their presentation in the claim amendment based on looking at their specification and addressing what we thought was the new claim language.

But this amendment would disrupt the briefing that has been presented as to the claim term "grid of tiles" which we've had analyzed against the written description.

So the issue that we're having concern with by the amendment is that we would have to rely on our briefing relating to the "grid of tiles" concept and written description, and hope that that is sufficient to guide you as to the support for "tiles" which is a different phrase.

And that's a substantive concern which we don't think has been fully briefed in the record.

22

MR. MICALLEF: Your Honor, let me also try to 1 2 answer your question. 3 JUDGE TIERNEY: Yes, please. MR. MICALLEF: One of the concerns -- I don't 4 5 think the change to the written description is an 6 issue. But one of the concerns that I have is I don't 7 really see why they think this may have an effect on 8 the patentability issues as to Kostes. 9 And so -- and we asked questions of them to 10 that and never got a substantive answer. So it would 11 seem to me, if they are correct that it may have an 12 effect on the patentability issues as to Kostes, then simply letting them put it in there without giving us a 13 14 chance to address it, and also without their showing any good cause for a second amendment, seems like 15 16 that's not the right thing to do under the regulations. 17 JUDGE TIERNEY: I'm aware of the regulations. 18 What I'm trying to find out though is, is Patent 19 Owner -- basically the Patent Owner comes in and says, 20 'I need minor corrections to my claim so I'm not having 21 form over substance here. I want to make sure that my 22 claims are basically found to be patentable by the

Board and upheld. And I don't want to have these procedural hurdles or nit picks" basically is what I'm kind of getting the gist.

So if there's a minor edit they can do please, let it in. That's what I'm hearing from that side.

I understand from your side you're saying there may be -- it's not necessarily more patentable with the amended language, but you're saying their briefing is not as precise because the language changed.

MR. KUSHAN: And we do feel that the term

"grid of tiles" and "tiles" as used as a definitional

element of the claim, they're different. And the

necessary analysis here to go through for 112 support

is going to be different. It's a fact-dependent

analysis to see whether the support is there in either

term.

JUDGE TIERNEY: So what I'm trying to find though is at lease see if there's any way on this phone call -- and maybe that I'll have to take it under advisement with my panel members -- to see if there's some way to balance out -- we do not want to prejudice

the Patent Owner where they feel like they're going to have a procedural or minor hurdle here that's going to prevent them from getting a motion to amend granted.

At the same time we want to obviously allow Petitioner full opportunity to respond to any substantive changes that are made.

And so is there a way that we can find a path through this so that both sides are able to have a proper way of going forward?

Can you give me any proposed solutions to this question that's been posed?

MR. KUSHAN: Well, your Honor, I guess we're kind of at a challenge here to answer your question.

One of the issues that we believe would have to be engaged first is whether the amendment that's being proposed would in some way advance the proceeding.

We appreciate the guidance you're giving us, which is is this going to be a minor issue that they believe is appropriate to fix. And our view is that it's not a minor issue, it does require and raise new issues relative to the briefing that's been completed on the claim amendment.

JUDGE TIERNEY: How much additional briefing 1 2 would be required by this? How many pages are needed to address the -- again, I'll tell you what I'm hearing 3 here is they're minor issues, what Patent Owner is 4 5 saying. I'm looking at the changes. They do not 6 appear on their face to be major changes. 7 sensitive to the face that you have not been able to 8 brief if they are major or minor or changes. 9 How much briefing would be entailed if we did 10 allow these changes to be in, no further briefing by the Patent Owner? 11 MR. MICALLEF: Your Honor, I would say I can't 12 13 imagine it would be much, but I also -- because I 14 haven't been given any information about this on the patentability front before this phone call, I'm not so 15 16 sure I can answer. But it would certainly be minuscule 17 and maybe nothing. 18 MR. KUSHAN: So what I understand is you're 19 proposing to allow us to file a supplemental brief 20 relative to their amendment so they aren't going to be 21 putting additional amendments in. 22 JUDGE TIERNEY: If the panel were to go ahead

and authorize the Patent Owner to go ahead and file 1 2 their motion to amend as a corrected motion to amend, in a sense second motion to amend, it would be a 3 replacement; and the sole replacement would be changes 4 5 they've identified on the phone in that claim language, 6 Claim 53; we would then allow the Petitioner an 7 opportunity to go ahead and put in some we'll call it 8 supplemental briefing, or however you want to term it, of a limited nature. That's one suggestion. 9 10 And I would want to confer with the panel before we went with it. I'm trying to find out on the 11 12 phone if there's some balance we can give here so that 13 both sides feel they've had an opportunity to present 14 their case in the best light. MR. BONE: Your Honor, this is counsel for 15 16 Patent Owner. Maybe I can just ask a quick 17 clarification. 18 JUDGE TIERNEY: Yes. 19 MR. BONE: I mean, I assume that if you were 20 to proceed this way you would actually also ask us to 21 provide our own 112 support for the correcteded

22

amendments?

JUDGE TIERNEY: How much 112 support is needed? Is it just going to be anything more than just identifying where in the specification -- I mean, are we talking column/line? Or are you actually trying to find a briefing on it? Understanding you're saying they're very minor.

MR. BONE: Well. I believe we can do it by

MR. BONE: Well, I believe we can do it by column and line, simple as that.

JUDGE TIERNEY: So they are of a minor nature, and since they are of a minor nature, I'm -- at least myself -- willing to entertain the fact that you'll go ahead and have this replacement.

And so I'm turning to the Petitioner and seeing if there's some way I can propose to the panel when we take it under advisement, is there some way of alleviating any problems that you're saying may arise due to patentability issues that we are not seeing on the phone necessarily?

MR. KUSHAN: So if you're asking us how many pages we need to address the 112 or other issues we can see in the claims, we could do that with a small briefing, five pages max, because I don't know -- I

think what we would want to have is the right to go back and assess the 112 questions and the prior art issues that we identified before and address any issues as they are presented by the amended claim.

But we would limit ourselves to five pages to do that, because we would assume it would be primarily a technical focus of our conference. That would be one approach we could take where we respond to their amendment.

Again, we'd have -- I'm setting aside our concerns about good cause and the timing and sequencing of all this, because you've asked us to focus on just the scenario of an additional briefing.

JUDGE TIERNEY: Again, I understand you're saying that the good cause is not presented here.

However, I am hearing from the Patent Owner that they're saying good cause is just such a minor nature.

And that is something that we're unable to decide on the phone today, whether it is a minor or major nature. And it may need briefing.

But if we're going to have briefing on that issue, then it would be -- it seems to be like why not

allow them the opportunity to put in their corrected claim, identify the column/line and allow you up to five pages of briefing.

I mean, again, I'm just looking for possible solutions to the problem that's been identified.

MR. KUSHAN: If you proceed in that manner we can live with that. We would certainly want to make sure we don't have any delays in the schedule that's been set in the case. And I assume that part of your calculus is to avoid any of those delays.

JUDGE TIERNEY: We are attempting to keep this case on schedule.

So now I have proposed at least a solution that the Petitioner can live with.

Patent Owner, I'm going back to you now. The proposed solution you've been listening to, the proposed solution would allow you to file a corrected motion to amend. Your correction could be on Claim 53. You would put in the edits you've identified, and you would also add in a very brief identification column/line citation for the two edits you're proposing.

The petition then would be given up to five 1 2 pages to go ahead and provide some briefing on solely 3 briefing the patentability issues raised by the, shall we say, minor corrections that were done to Claim 53. 4 5 Patent Owner, do you have any objection to such a proposal? And if so --6 7 MR. BONE: I think that's a good proposal. 8 mean, there's two comments. One is technical, and that 9 is are you expecting therefore that we effectively 10 incorporate by reference the argument portion of the 11 prior motion to amend? 12 JUDGE TIERNEY: What I would suggest doing, 13 just for simplicity -- and this is open -- different 14 ways of handling -- you could just basically take what you filed before, make the minor edits in there, add 15 16 the cite to column/line and just file it. 17 So those are the only changes you'd be making. 18 And then it would be all in one document. So you'd 19 have your briefing, your claim, et cetera. 20 Alternatively you could do as you suggest and 21 have a separate document where you just have Claim 53 22 and a column/line. Which do you prefer?

MR. BONE: I think probably the first, but actually I wanted to possibly sort of defer an answer to that until we discuss the second issue that we have for this call.

And then the other comment I was going to say, just to be a little more argumentative, is it seems to us that five pages may be rather excessive for Petitioner's reply brief. But it may be that the rules don't permit you anything less than five pages.

JUDGE TIERNEY: The rules actually in this instance, since it is not specified by rule, it is up to the panel. And here, since we are taking the unusual step of allowing these lawyers in effect a second motion to amend, I don't necessarily -- let's put it this way. I'm not entirely convinced that five pages are necessary. But I'm trying to alleviate prejudice to all around.

So I'm allowing Patent Owner to try and bring in a claim that they may not have been entitled to necessarily, but I'm also trying to eliminate prejudice to the Petitioner by giving them some flexibility. And if they're saying they need up to five, I would grant

them the up to five with the understanding that they're 1 2 not to use them unless the need to. In other words, don't just add in argument for 3 4 argument sake. 5 MR. BONE: Okay, I understood, Your Honor. 6 JUDGE TIERNEY: And then as to how you wish to 7 file the corrected motion to amend, I'm assuming I will 8 contact -- I'll ask Judge Clements if he has any objection to the proposed solution at this time. 9 10 can hear from Judge Clements. He's on the line. JUDGE CLEMENTS: No objection from me. 11 12 JUDGE TIERNEY: And Judge Clements, could you 13 identify a best way for them to file such a proposed 14 corrected amendment or second motion to amend, however 15 you'd like to style? 16 JUDGE CLEMENTS: I think if the corrected 17 motion to amend were one document, that would probably 18 be the most helpful. And I guess if it is one document

that's replacing the prior motion to amend, if Patent Owner can file maybe a redline agains the previous motion to amend just to make it easier to identify the changes, that would be helpful.

19

20

21

22

JUDGE TIERNEY: Patent Owner, do you have any questions regarding that?

MR. BONE: No, I think that would be fine.

But as I said, I think we also need to address the second issue we wanted to raise. And also there is a time consideration of -- you know, the proposal does leave it up to -- I mean sort of -- it is basically a good-faith measure that Petitioner won't introduce new material into their reply.

JUDGE TIERNEY: I'm confident that if they introduce new material you will identify it. I would caution you however, we do allow some leeway if their commentary is directed to the new language, it will be taken in the scope of what's been authorized.

If they take it upon themselves to go outside that scope, they do risk the entire briefing to be stricken from the record. And I would not hesitate to strike it should I believe they have exceeded their authority, the authorization given.

MR. BONE: Fair enough, Your Honor.

MR. HEINTZ: Your Honor, if I may, I just want to understand, when we file the corrected amendment or

		34
1	corrected motion, are we saying just file a single	
2	document with redlines, or do we want a clean copy and	
3	like an attachment showing the redlines?	
4	JUDGE TIERNEY: I would prefer it be a clean	
5	copy, and you can submit it in exhibit a redline. If	
6	you'd rather have it as an appendix, I'll leave it to	
7	you and your discretion. You may file it either as an	
8	exhibit or an appendix, whatever suits you.	
9	MR. HEINTZ: Thank you, Your Honor.	
10	JUDGE TIERNEY: Okay. Any further questions	
11	regarding the format?	
12	MR. BONE: No, Your Honor.	
13	JUDGE TIERNEY: Okay. We'll turn to the	
14	District Court claim construction. However, I do want	
15	to make sure before I forget, we will need a timing for	
16	the filing of these papers and leave that issue make	
17	sure we don't forget to address before we adjourn	
18	today.	
19	So going to the second issue, Patent Owner,	
20	you identified an issue regarding how we should	
21	construe claims. If you'd like to give us a little bit	
22	of background on that issue now.	

MR. BONE: Yes, thank you, Your Honor.

So as I alluded to earlier -- and you've actually corrected me -- I would have said two hours ago that to date no Patent Owner motion has been granted. However, you're telling me that in fact one has now. But still the statics are one out of more than 20 I believe.

And there has also been the recent PTAB road shows that went across the country in which some slides were presented by the PTAB panels which offered, in our view, new guidance to patent owners to how to make -- the PTAB standards for supporting an amendment.

The point is, that at the time that we made our original motion to amend, which is in January of this year, we did not have the benefit of that guidance, nor did we have the benefit of the statistics which show that granted motions to amend are extremely rare.

And we've read, given one of the guiding opinions in this area, which I believe was written by yourself, Your Honor, in CBM 2012-00001, which says that the BRI standard in inter partes review is

justified in large part because the Patent Owner has the ability to amend the claims.

And that's commensurate with the rest of the way the office behaves, which is that if the Board claim construction standard, the fact that a Patent Owner can amend allows them to essentially cope with issues that raises.

So we're here in the situation of our motions to amend having been filed and briefed, and Petitioner having had a chance to reply.

And we think that, you know, given the history of this and the evolving standard of the way that amendments are justified, it seems that in fact what would be proper in our instance is to have the Phillips standard of claims construction applied when the Board ultimately rules on this case rather than the BRI standard.

And mindful of the scheduling in this case, we were hoping to be able to have the parties submit a brief on this issue. We believe that could be done before the currently scheduled oral hearing, but basically we would like to have that issue briefed.

37 JUDGE TIERNEY: I'm not entirely clear on why 1 2 we would use the District Court standard in place of BRI at this point. Can you please focus in on that 3 issue for me and why we would want to use the District 4 5 Court standard. I understand you say you weren't 6 aware, so you didn't necessrily brief it. But why is 7 this case needing a District Court standard? 8 MR. BONE: Well, the reason is, Your Honor, is that at point at which we had justified our motion to 9 10 amend, we were not aware that in fact the standard for that is very high. And we think that empirically the 11 12 standard that had in fact been articulated by the Board 13 is actually -- I mean, dare I say inconsistent with the 14 overall principle of BRI. It actually makes it too hard for a Patent Owner. 15 16 And therefore it would be more -- given the 17 high likelihood that a motion to amend ultimately is 18 unsuccessful, it would seem more appropriate to have 19 the Phillips standard apply. 20 JUDGE TIERNEY: The alternative, you're saying 21 you're filing a motion to amend, and we've just spent 22 all this time talking about the need for a motion to

38 amend, and I relieved some of the burdens for you. 1 2 But at the same time we're also going to apply 3 a District Court standard which contemplates no 4 amendments being entered. 5 MR. BONE: So I think if you appreciate the 6 way it works is that a claim construction is applied 7 under some standards to the claims of the patent in 8 unamended form. And it's only if the claims there are 9 found unpatentable that you get to consider the need for a motion to amend. 10 The point is, I guess, that if a motion to 11 12 amend can almost never be successful, that would seem 13 to vitiate the idea of applying BRI to the unamended 14 claim. 15 JUDGE TIERNEY: So you're saying we should 16 find first if your motion to amend is -- well, I'm 17 still trying to figure out why you're filing a motion 18 to amend if you're saying it's going to be 19 unsuccessful. 20 MR. BONE: Well, at the time we filed it we were not aware that it would be unsuccessful. 21 22 So let me just restate it one more time.

understanding is that the Board only ever rules on a motion to amend in any situation if the underlying claims are found unpatentable, that is the unamended claims. And of course we would ultimately hope that our unamended claims survive this defeat is obviously our goal.

One puts in a motion to amend as something of a backstop; in other words, a fallback position. The point being that you would get to that on a motion to amend would be considered, and it's consistent with the BRI construction being applied to the unamended claim.

Now, if ultimately you apply the BRI standards to those claims but still a motion to amend is almost impossible to grant, that seems to me to be inconsistent with the overall application of the BRI standard.

JUDGE TIERNEY: I beg to differ on the impossible to grant language. I think that's not an entirely correct proposition at this point.

MR. BONE: Well, we're still looking at one out of 25 or so, which admittedly is not impossible. I concede that.

40 JUDGE TIERNEY: I just want to point out, 1 2 these are the early cases. We have not hit a steady state yet for our process. And that's actually -- I 3 understand there are some difficulties, and you're 4 5 saying there was difficulty understanding how the 6 motion to amend would progress. 7 In a sense, I think you can tell today, I've 8 been somewhat inclined to allow you an opportunity to 9 try and make some changes to your motion to amend to 10 try and alleviate some of the burdens here. 11 MR. BONE: Yes, I appreciate that. 12 JUDGE TIERNEY: So that's why I'm not entirely 13 convinced today that we're using an impossible 14 standard. It may be -- I agree it may not be as easy 15 as it would be in an ex parte prosecution. But I'm not 16 sure that wouldn't necessarily vitiate the brief 17 standard. 18 However, I'll allow Judge Clements to chime in 19 if he sees something differently or hears something 20 differently. 21 JUDGE CLEMENTS: No, my views are consistent 22 with Judge Tierney.

41 MR. HEINTZ: Your Honor, may I make one 1 2 additional brief point on this topic? JUDGE TIERNEY: Of course. Let's hear it. 3 MR. HEINTZ: Sure. As you know, we only 4 5 amended Independent Claim 46 and its dependents. We 6 did not attempt to amend Claim 1 or the other 7 independent claim, Claim 22. 8 And the reason for that, a large part of the reason for that, had to do with the restrictions on the 9 10 page limits for these motions. As I think I've expressed before, we were 11 12 under tremendous pressure to get everything into the 13 15 pages. And as a result of that page limit, we 14 didn't try to amend the other claims, and we didn't 15 present the possibly different claim amendments that we 16 might have tried in a ex parte process. 17 And even despite how much we tried to do in 18 our conditional motion for amendment, we also, as you 19 know, addressed the prior art that was perceived to be 20 the most relevant. Even there, Microsoft identified 21 this Myers reference as something that we should have

done and has taken the position, which has not yet been

22

ruled on, that the failure to address this one reference means or motion must fail for that reason alone.

And so the point is that it is very -- your ability to amend the claim as a Patent Owner in these proceedings is very much curtailed. And when the application of the BRI rests on the ability to amend the claims, we believe that given these very significant -- not impossible, but very significant restrictions that have been placed on it as a result of the rules, and more particularly the evolving case law that's happened, that under these conditions when you weigh those two factors, the application of the BRI is not justified.

And we mean no disrespect for that. We understand the Board's position and your well-reasoned opinion, but just under the circumstances we think it's a very significant restriction on the ability to amend such that the BRI should not really be applied.

JUDGE TIERNEY: I would just like to say I understand you're saying that there are certain hurdles that are being imposed, and I'm trying to find out if

there's a way in this case to try and lessen those hurdles or remove some of the hurdles.

For example, in the second motion to amend we are authorizing it here. Is there another hurdle that you feel in particular was overly hampering your ability to respond that we need to consider at this point?

MR. HEINTZ: Well, I would say if we had more pages to write the motion to amend we could have amended the other claims.

JUDGE TIERNEY: And refresh my recollection.

Apologies. I have a few cases on my docket. I don't remember on this particular one. Did we have a request for an additional amount of pages that we denied?

MR. HEINTZ: You did not have a request, but we discussed at length this issue with yourself and Judge Chang in particular. I remember her talking about it. And the overwhelming impression we got was that we needed to do this in 15 pages.

You may remember one of the questions we raised was, we had an independent claim and 20 claims that depended from it. And so if we tried to amend the

independent claim, that would mean we'd asked if we could use an appendix, to put the claim amendments into an appendix rather than have it could against 15 pages.

And we were told no, you were not allowed to do that.

And so I will tell the Court that we did not specifically request, after being told that we couldn't put it in an appendix, request additional pages. But it was my impression, and I spoke to Dr. Bone after the call, it was our impression that we were being told you had to get it done in 15 pages.

JUDGE TIERNEY: I appreciate that. I thank

you for the answer. Is there something at this point

though that you feel is a procedural hurdle which is

prejudicing you unnecessarily, if we were to go forward

with the broadest reasonable, that you wish the Board

to consider and in any way modify or reduce the

procedural hurdle? Is there something we can talk

about today or --

MR. HEINTZ: Well, beyond allowing us to submit an amendment for the other independent claims as we were not able to address in our previous amendment -- sorry, motion to amend, no.

MR. BONE: I will just add this, Your Honor. 1 2 We don't see it as much as a procedural hurdle as 3 actually something that could still be accommodated in this proceeding given that we would expect to brief the 4 claim-construction standard and show that it would 5 6 still -- even changing the standard would still support 7 the patentability of our main claims under the 8 constructions we put on. 9 JUDGE TIERNEY: Is that something you can 10 raise at hearing though? Because at this point we are pretty much near the end of the briefing schedule, and 11 12 I would not want you to bring in additional issues that 13 would require additional briefing and could obviously 14 impact the schedule. 15 But if it's something that you feel necessary, 16 is there a reason why you would not be able to bring it 17 up at hearing if we authorize some discussion at this 18 point? MR. BONE: I believe that we could do that 19 20 with appropriate authorization. 21 JUDGE TIERNEY: And now we've had a long 22 discussion with the Patent Owner. I would like to hear

Petitioner's points of view on this issue.

MR. KUSHAN: Thank you. Hearing the discussion raises a number of concerns. First of all, it's not simply your discretion to shift gears on the claims construction. There's a rule that was promulgated after a notice of common rule making that says you're to stop and follow and use the broadest reasonable construction.

JUDGE TIERNEY: And let's stay away from -what I'd like to hear more from on the Petitioner, I
understand substantively that there's a disagreement.
I understand what the Board's rule is. And I've
written a case I think was referred to on this, and to
use the broadest interpretation.

Procedurally, though, what I'd like to know is, at this stage of the proceeding if the Patent Owner were to bring up the issue saying at the oral hearing that they would like us to apply the District Court claim construction and get some discussion of that, is there any procedural issue that you wish to raise regarding that, or do you believe it's going to improperly prejudicing the Petitioner's case should we

47 authorize them to bring it up at the hearing? 1 2 MR. KUSHAN: I'm coming up with an answer to that question. And there it may be yes to both. 3 So I think we will accommodate whatever the 4 5 Board tells us to accommodate in terms of briefing. I 6 think one of the challenges we've had in briefing to 7 date is that the pleadings you've seen from the Patent 8 Owner has presented a number of different proposed readings and interpretations of their claims. And 9 10 that's somewhat confusing to have to deal with. JUDGE TIERNEY: Let's back up. We do have --11 12 the rule is BRI applies. The default there is BRI will 13 apply. At hearing, the Patent Owner wishes to raise 14 the issue that it may be best to, for this particular case, raise the District Court claim construction and 15 16 would give us an explanation of it. 17 MR. MICALLEF: Let me object. I am also 18 actually counsel in the parallel litigation, so I know 19 something about the claim interpretations that Patent 20 Owner has been asserting there.

> PLANET DEPOS 888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295 Microsoft v. SurfCast - Ex. 1115, p. 48

And I would like to point out that they have

asserted those claim interpretations in the Patent

21

22

48 Owner's response, including one interpretation that is 1 2 much broader than the Petitioner adopted in the institution decision, and they haven't even asserted 3 4 any patentability argument. So listen. If Your Honor wants to hear 5 6 argument on which standard should apply as opposed to 7 which claim interpretation, we will do it. 8 JUDGE TIERNEY: And all I'm saying is, it's not what I wish to hear, it's that I want to provide 9 10 the parties an opportunity to present their case in the best light that they believe would be appropriate. 11 12 And here I'm hearing the Patent Owner saying 13 they believe appropriate to use some of their time --14 or briefing, as what they proposed -- but I'd rather have it at the hearing if they wish to bring it up and 15 16 save some of the time and argue why a District Court 17 claim construction would be appropriate. 18 If they wish to do so, I want to know how much 19 procedural or prejudicial aspect there is to the 20 Petitioner to have them do so. 21 MR. KUSHAN: Well, Your Honor, if you're going

to confine them to the same amount of time that you've

22

already scheduled or anticipated providing, and that's how they choose to argue their case, that helps address some of our concern.

One of the issues, obviously, is that once the arguments have proceeded, we assume that we'll be able to rebut or address in response whichever issues we think merit a response at the oral hearing.

If in fact there is some inclinication of the Panel to take up and employ — use some of these alternative constructions, then I would hope there would be an opportunity to respond to that. But I understand we don't really want to disrupt the schedule.

My feeling is at this point, as long as you're keeping the parameters locked down as to the amount of time, then we'll work within that structure, and we'll address whatever issues come up during the hearing.

So I don't think we wish to have any additional overlay of briefing on the issue at this point in the proceeding, and we just want to get to the oral hearing and get to the motion proceedings.

JUDGE TIERNEY: Judge Clements, would you find

it acceptable to just allow the Patent Owner to raise 1 2 it as briefing -- sorry, raise it at the hearing even though there's no technical briefing on that particular 3 point? 4 5 JUDGE CLEMENTS: Yes, I would be fine with 6 that. 7 JUDGE TIERNEY: So I think this is a way of 8 ensuring that the schedule goes forward without disruption is to authorize the Patent Owner to bring it 9 10 up to the extent they believe it's in their best interest. 11 12 So hearing from my copanelist, the Patent 13 Owner is authorized to go ahead and raise the issue of 14 whether or not BRI or District Court claim construction 15 should apply at the oral hearing. 16 And of course should the Petitioner believe a 17 rebuttal is necessary, they would be able to create 18 their rebuttal at that time. No additional briefing, 19 though, is authorized at this time on that particular 20 issue. 21 Any demonstratives to be provided on District 22 Court claim constructions should be limited to whether

	51
1	or not we should use District Court construction over
2	BRI and not just try and merely reargue the case. So
3	we will limit, then, the demonstratives to only this
4	specific issue, BRI or not to BRI.
5	Any questions by Patent Owner?
6	MR. BONE: No questions, Your Honor.
7	JUDGE TIERNEY: Okay. Anything from the
8	Petitioner on this point?
9	MR. KUSHAN: No, Your Honor.
10	JUDGE TIERNEY: Okay. Now, before I said we
11	would go back to the issue of filing the corrected
12	amendment and some briefing on that, we had to set
13	dates. Could the parties please provide us with what
14	dates they think best.
15	Let's start with the Patent Owner. When would
16	you like to submit your corrected amendment? Or shall
17	we term it a second motion to amend? What would you
18	like to do in this case?
19	MR. BONE: Given the way that you
20	characterized it on this call, I think it's probably
21	proper to call it a corrected motion.
22	JUDGE TIERNEY: Okay.

	52
1	MR. BONE: I think May 30th would be the
2	latest.
3	JUDGE TIERNEY: And then Petitioner, do you
4	have any objections to May 30th?
5	MR. KUSHAN: No.
6	JUDGE TIERNEY: And then about what time would
7	you be able to provide your up to five pages of
8	briefing?
9	MR. MICALLEF: Your Honor, I'm kind of
10	scratching my head about why Patent Owner said
11	May 30th. It's a redline that they already have. They
12	could file it tomorrow.
13	I mean, that's fine. The reason I'm
14	scratching my head also is because there's an awful lot
15	to do both in these proceedings and in the related
16	parallel litigation, which is in the middle of expert
17	discovery.
18	JUDGE TIERNEY: And I'll just make it easy.
19	Petitioner, if you need to they're asking for
20	10 days to submit what is, as you said, a very simple
21	thing. Do you wish to have two weeks to then respond?
22	MR KUSHAN. That would be fine. Your Honor

PLANET DEPOS 888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295 Microsoft v. SurfCast - Ex. 1115, p. 53

53 JUDGE TIERNEY: Okay. So pick me a date, 1 2 throw me a date that we can go with. 3 MR. KUSHAN: So we're just going into our calendar. So that would be the 13th -- June 13th, Your 4 5 Honor. 6 JUDGE TIERNEY: I find that acceptable. 7 Any objection by Patent Owner? 8 MR. BONE: No objection, Your Honor. JUDGE TIERNEY: Okay. So both sides are 9 10 having what I believe to be ample time to do this. If there's an objection, let me know now. Either side 11 12 have any objection to these dates? Hearing none, the 13 Panel adopts -- Judge Clements that includes you. Do 14 you have any objection to May 30 and June 13th? 15 JUDGE CLEMENTS: No objection from me. 16 JUDGE TIERNEY: Hearing from the Panel member, 17 the Panel concurs. We look forward to seeing the 18 corrected motion to amend May 30, and we will receive 19 some -- I don't know how we want to term it --20 additional briefing due June 13th from the Petitioner. 21 Going back to Patent Owner, you had two issues 22 you wished to discuss today. Are there any additional

> PLANET DEPOS 888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295 Microsoft v. SurfCast - Ex. 1115, p. 54

54 issues that have arisen today that you need to address? 1 2 MR. BONE: There's just one very kind of 3 clerical issue which I had not put in the original e-mail to the Court, but I don't think it's 4 5 particularly controversial. It just concerns some 6 exhibits. 7 So we had previously filed a motion to seal 8 two depositions transcripts for the inventor and also a company officer on our side. And that motion to seal 9 10 was granted. Now, the way the PRPS record is, is that in 11 12 fact both parties have put in transcripts of those 13 depositions. The ones that we put in are now I believe 14 properly sealed. The ones that Petitioner put in are currently designated "parties and Board's eyes only," 15 16 and therefore we would want to just file an additional 17 motion to seal to make sure those versions are 18 maintained under seal. That's the first issue. 19 And the second --20 JUDGE TIERNEY: Before we go to the second, 21 let me just turn to Mr. Clements and hear his thoughts 22 on how he would like to present it.

JUDGE CLEMENTS: Yeah, I guess I'm not opposed 1 2 to a second motion to seal identifying those two exhibits. I don't remember them being identified in 3 the previous motion to seal. I hope we didn't overlook 4 5 those in the original motion to seal. 6 MR. BONE: No, we had only identified at that 7 point the versions that we had submitted. 8 JUDGE TIERNEY: Another motion to seal is authorized. 9 10 And next question? MR. BONE: It's a similar topic. We had, in 11 12 our reply to Petitioner's opposition to amend, 13 submitted a copy of a deposition transcript of 14 Petitioner's expert in the District Court case. Now, we understand that Petitioner may well 15 16 object to that exhibit or portions of it. We submitted 17 it, again, "parties and Board's eyes only" pending 18 resolution of any objections. 19 It's our understanding that Petitioners 20 indicated that they would object to it as an exhibit, 21 but they do not need it to be maintained as a 22 confidential document. Therefore, we would simply just

56 want to authorize the Board to making that document 1 2 publicly, accessible whereas it's currently "parties' and Board's eyes only." 3 JUDGE TIERNEY: I have no objection to just 4 5 identifying it in your motion to seal that you're going 6 to file on the other papers. Just go ahead and point 7 out that you wish PRPS flag to be reset as public. 8 MR. BONE: Okay. MR. MICALLEF: Your Honor --9 JUDGE TIERNEY: Yes. 10 MR. MICALLEF: I'm a little confused. There 11 12 have been, as Mr. Bone just mentioned, that this was a 13 deposition of an expert in the pending litigation. 14 There have been no depositions of experts in the 15 pending litigation as of yet. 16 MR. BONE: Okay. I'm sorry, Mr. Micallef, my 17 mistake. It's -- the person in question is 18 Mr. Belfiore. I possibly misstated him. He's not an 19 expert. 20 MR. MICALLEF: Okay, I see. And I believe 21 it's a little bit more complicated than that. 22 JUDGE TIERNEY: Should we remain "parties and

> PLANET DEPOS 888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295 Microsoft v. SurfCast - Ex. 1115, p. 57

	57
1	Board eyes only" out of an abundance of caution?
2	MR. MICALLEF: Some of it's public and some of
3	it I think is still confidential. But I have to go
4	back and confirm. I mean, I have no problem with the
5	public stuff being on the public record.
6	JUDGE TIERNEY: Why don't we go ahead and just
7	leave that as "parties and Board only" at this point
8	until we get further clarification and not worry about
9	it. I mean, unless there's some objection, it's safer
10	to err on the side of caution here than releasing
11	something to the public that should not be released.
12	MR. MICALLEF: Thank you, Your Honor.
13	MR. BONE: That's fair enough.
14	JUDGE TIERNEY: Okay. Anything else Patent
15	Owner?
16	MR. BONE: Nothing else. Again, I would just
17	let backup counsel, Mr. Heintz, chime in if he has
18	anything further to say.
19	MR. HEINTZ: Nothing here, thank you.
20	JUDGE TIERNEY: Petitioner, do you have
21	anything to add today that we need to discuss or are we
22	adjourned assentially?

PLANET DEPOS 888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM IPR2013-00292, IPR2013-00293, IPR2013-00294 and IPR2013-00295 Microsoft v. SurfCast - Ex. 1115, p. 58

	58
1	MR. KUSHAN: We have nothing further to add,
2	Your Honor.
3	JUDGE TIERNEY: Well, this has been a little
4	longer call than I anticipated, but thank you everyone
5	for your patience today. I believe we covered a lot of
6	ground.
7	Hearing no further issues, we're adjourned.
8	We look forward to the papers being filed by the
9	parties. Until then, we're adjourned. Thank you.
10	(Proceedings adjourned at 2:00 p.m.)
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	

1 CERTIFICATE OF SHORTHAND REPORTER - NOTARY PUBLIC 2 I, Denice Zelma Lombard, Certified Shorthand 3 Reporter, the officer before whom the foregoing proceedings were taken, do hereby certify that the 4 5 foregoing transcript is a true and correct record of 6 the proceedings; that said proceedings were taken by me 7 stenographically and thereafter reduced to typewriting 8 by me; and that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to this case and 9 10 have no interest, financial or otherwise, in its 11 outcome. 12 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my 13 hand and affixed my notarial seal this 22nd day of May 14 2014. 15 16 My commission expires June 14, 2018. 17 18 19 Denice Lombara 20 21 NOTARY PUBLIC IN AND FOR

22

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

	l		l	1
A	34:17	allowance	28:9 32:14	24:17 38:5 40:11
ability	adjourned	20:1	33:22 35:12	44:11
9:21,22 36:2 42:5	57:22 58:7,9,10	allowed	41:18 44:20,22	appreciated
42:7,18 43:6	adjustment	44:4	51:12,16	7:11
able	13:14,16	allowing	amendments	approach
9:17 11:18 15:12	adjustments	31:13,18 44:19	11:1,3 18:5,11	28:8
24:8 25:7 36:19	9:4 12:2	allows	25:21 26:22	appropriate
44:21 45:16	admittedly	36:6	36:13 38:4	24:19 37:18
49:5 50:17 52:7	39:21	alluded	41:15 44:2	45:20 48:11,13
abundance	adopted	35:2	amount	48:17
57:1	48:2	alter	12:12 19:13	April
acceptable	adopts	18:6,6	43:14 48:22	1:10 8:22
50:1 53:6	53:13	alternative	49:15	area
accessible	advance	37:20 49:10	ample	35:20
56:2	10:3,5 18:16	Alternatively	53:10	argue
accommodate	24:16	30:20	analysis	48:16 49:2
16:12 47:4,5	advisement	Alto	23:14,16	argument
accommodated	23:21 27:15	4:7	analyzed	13:20,22 30:10
45:3	affixed	ambiguity	21:13	32:3,4 48:4,6
add	59:13	14:1	answer	argumentative
14:5 17:7 20:11	agains	amend	18:16 22:2,10	31:6
20:19 29:20	32:20	8:14,19 9:21 10:1	24:13 25:16	arguments
30:15 32:3 45:1	ago	10:20 11:13,22	31:2 44:12 47:2	49:5
57:21 58:1	35:4	13:2,11,18	anticipated	arisen
added	agree	14:15 17:5 18:2	49:1 58:4	54:1
14:8	14:20 40:14	19:1,2 24:3 26:2	apologies	arises
adding	Agreement	26:2,3 29:18	13:8 43:12	14:13
14:22	2:14	30:11 31:14	Appeal	art
additional	ahead	32:7,14,17,19	1:2 2:2	15:17 18:8 20:3,5
8:14,19 9:20 10:1	6:15 8:6 18:21	32:21 35:14,17	appear	28:2 41:19
10:12 12:11	25:22 26:1,7	36:2,6,9 37:10	11:3 25:6	articulated
25:1,21 28:13	27:12 30:2	37:17,21 38:1	appendix	37:12
41:2 43:14 44:7	50:13 56:6 57:6	38:10,12,16,18	34:6,8 44:2,3,7	aside
45:12,13 49:19	al	39:2,7,10,13	application	28:10
50:18 53:20,22	1:12	40:6,9 41:6,14	39:15 42:7,13	asked
54:16	alleviate	42:5,7,18 43:3,9	applied	22:9 28:12 44:1
address	20:19 31:16	43:22 44:22	36:15 38:6 39:11	asking
18:12 22:14 25:3	40:10	51:17 53:18	42:19	10:10 27:19
27:20 28:3 33:4	alleviates	55:12	applies	52:19
34:17 42:1	20:21	amended	47:12	aspect
44:21 49:2,6,17	alleviating	11:17 23:8 28:4	apply	48:19
54:1	27:16	41:5 43:10	37:19 38:2 39:12	aspects
addressed	allow	amendment	46:18 47:13	14:17
12:2 20:3 41:19	9:20 24:4 25:10	12:11 17:11,18	48:6 50:15	asserted
addressing	25:19 26:6 29:1	18:21 19:1 21:8	applying	47:22 48:3
21:9	29:2,17 33:12	21:11,16 22:15	38:13	asserting
adjourn	40:8,18 50:1	24:15,22 25:20	appreciate	47:20
aujourn			- FF	1.00-81
	l	l	[8	l

assess	57:17	36:4,15 37:12	8:16 9:7 12:8,12	59:9
28:2	balance	39:1 44:15 47:5	12:13,14 19:3,6	cases
assume	23:22 26:12	56:1 57:1,7	21:11,17 23:9	40:2 43:12
26:19 28:6 29:9	based	Board's	24:21 25:1,9,10	cast
49:5	21:8	16:11 42:16	26:8 27:5,22	17:17
assuming	basically	46:12 54:15	28:13,20,21	cause
32:7	12:15 22:19,22	55:17 56:3	29:3 30:2,3,19	10:17,20 12:4
attachment	23:2 30:14 33:7	Bone	33:16 45:11,13	22:15 28:11,15
34:3	36:22	4:3 5:7,7,15,19,22	47:5,6 48:14	28:17
attempt	basis	6:11,18 7:6,7,9	49:19 50:2,3,18	caution
9:9 41:6	12:4,8	7:19 8:7 10:6,14	51:12 52:8	33:12 57:1,10
attempting	Bayshore	10:18,21 11:9	53:20	CBM
29:11	4:5	12:10,19 13:7	bring	35:21
attributes	beg	13:10,17 14:3	8:19 9:17 31:18	certain
19:14,14	39:17	14:10,13 15:9	45:12,16 46:17	42:21
AUSTIN	BEHALF	15:21 16:10,17	47:1 48:15 50:9	certainly
3:5	3:2,10 4:2	16:21 17:3,13	broader	15:18 19:8 25:16
authority	behaves	26:15,19 27:7	48:2	29:7
33:19	36:4	30:7 31:1 32:5	broadest	CERTIFICATE
authorization	Belfiore	33:3,20 34:12	44:15 46:7,14	59:1
33:19 45:20	56:18	35:1 37:8 38:5	burdens	Certified
authorize	believe	38:20 39:20	38:1 40:10	59:2
18:21 26:1 45:17	13:7,17 16:10	40:11 44:8 45:1		certify
47:1 50:9 56:1	17:11 19:11	45:19 51:6,19	C	59:4
authorized	20:2 24:14,19	52:1 53:8 54:2	C	cetera
33:14 50:13,19	27:7 33:18 35:7	55:6,11 56:8,12	3:1 4:1,1 5:1	30:19
55:9	35:20 36:20	56:16 57:13,16	calculus	challenge
authorizing	42:8 45:19	Bone's	29:10	24:13
43:4	46:21 48:11,13	7:13	calendar	challenges
avoid	50:10,16 53:10	bottom	53:4	47:6
29:10	54:13 56:20	14:4,4 17:7	California	chance
aware	58:5	BRI	1:19 4:7	22:14 36:10
11:4 16:11 22:17	benefit	35:22 36:16 37:3	call	Chang
37:6,10 38:21	35:15,16	37:14 38:13	5:2 6:9,13,19 8:8	43:17
awful	best	39:11,12,15	8:21 9:1 23:20	change
52:14	26:14 32:13	42:7,13,19	25:15 26:7 31:4	12:20 17:11 19:9
	47:14 48:11	47:12,12 50:14	44:9 51:20,21	20:18 22:5
<u> </u>	50:10 51:14	51:2,4,4	58:4	changed
back	better	brief	care	23:10
8:4 21:3 28:2	19:21,22	19:3 25:8,19	8:3	changes
29:15 47:11	beyond	29:20 31:8	case	9:8 13:4 16:20
51:11 53:21	44:19	36:20 37:6	9:15 10:8 26:14	17:21 20:6 24:6
57:4	bit	40:16 41:2 45:4	29:9,12 36:16	25:5,6,8,10 26:4
background	8:11 9:11 34:21	briefed	36:18 37:7	30:17 32:22
34:22	56:21	19:18 21:7,22	42:11 43:1	40:9
backstop	Board	36:9,22	46:13,22 47:15	changing
11:18 39:8	1:2 2:2 8:21 23:1	briefing	48:10 49:2 51:2	17:16 45:6
backup			51:18 55:14	
L	<u> </u>	1	<u>.</u>	<u> </u>

characterized	clarity	complicated	9:10 33:6	18:21 26:2 29:1
51:20	13:17 20:12	56:21	considered	29:17 32:7,14
chime	clean	comprehension	11:14,15 39:10	32:16 33:22
40:18 57:17	34:2,4	7:15	considering	34:1 35:3 51:11
choose	clear	computer	11:21	51:16,21 53:18
49:2	37:1	15:12	consistent	correcteded
circumstances	Clements	concede	39:10 40:21	26:21
42:17	1:18 5:3 32:8,10	39:22	construction	correction
citation	32:11,12,16	concept	16:12 20:20	29:18
29:21	40:18,21 49:22	17:16 20:3 21:17	34:14 36:5,15	corrections
cite	50:5 53:13,15	concern	38:6 39:11 46:5	22:20 30:4
30:16	54:21 55:1	21:15,21 49:3	46:8,19 47:15	correctly
claim	clerical	concerns	48:17 50:14	12:6 17:19
9:5 11:14 12:3	54:3	22:4,6 28:11 46:3	51:1	counsel
13:4,5,6,7,8,9	COLUMBIA	54:5	constructions	5:4,8 6:22 7:16
14:21 17:9 18:8	59:22	concluded	45:8 49:10 50:22	9:4,6 26:15
19:5,21 20:10	column	14:18	construe	47:18 57:17
20:12,16,20	27:8	concurs	34:21	59:8
21:8,9,12 22:20	column/line	53:17	contact	country
23:13 24:22	27:4 29:2,21	condition	32:8	35:9
26:5,6 28:4 29:2	30:16,22	19:21	contained	couple
29:18 30:4,19	come	conditional	13:20	6:13
30:21 31:19	19:11 49:17	41:18	contemplates	course
34:14 36:5 38:6	comes	conditions	38:3	39:4 41:3 50:16
38:14 39:11	22:19	42:12	context	court
41:5,6,7,7,15	coming	confer	8:18 15:10	5:14 7:3,4,8,11,12
42:5 43:21 44:1	47:2	9:2 26:10	continue	7:13,21 9:12,15
44:2 46:19	comma	conference	14:2	34:14 37:2,5,7
47:15,19,22	13:12	1:17 2:1 7:3 8:21	controversial	38:3 44:5 46:18
48:7,17 50:14	commensurate	28:7	54:5	47:15 48:16
50:22	36:3	confident	convinced	50:14,22 51:1
claims	comment	33:10	31:15 40:13	54:4 55:14
11:14,17,19 12:7	31:5	confidential	copanelist	covered
12:9,15,16,18	commentary	55:22 57:3	50:12	58:5
22:22 27:21	33:13	confine	cope	create
34:21 36:2,15	comments	48:22	36:6	50:17
38:7,8 39:3,4,5	30:8	confirm	copy	CSR
39:13 41:14	commission	57:4	5:17 7:22 34:2,5	1:22 2:15
42:8 43:10,21	59:16	confused	55:13	curiosity
44:20 45:7 46:5	common	56:11	CORPORATI	5:13
47:9	46:6	confusing	1:4 3:2	currently
claim-construct	company	47:10	correct	36:21 54:15 56:2
8:16 16:7 45:5	54:9	confusion	6:9,11 8:7 10:5	curtailed
clarification	compelling	19:13	10:14,17,18	42:6
26:17 57:8	13:22	consider	12:19 22:11	cut
clarify	completed	38:9 43:6 44:16	39:19 59:5	19:4
15:2,4 17:10	24:21	consideration	corrected	D
			Į	
			<i></i>	

	ı	1	ı	ı
D	depositions	disrupt	edit	9:7 12:3 18:22
4:1 5:1 9:22	54:8,13 56:14	21:11 49:12	23:4	36:6 57:22
10:13	description	disruption	edits	et
dare	21:14,18 22:5	50:9	29:19,21 30:15	1:12 30:19
37:13	designated	distant	effect	evolve
date	54:15	10:8	22:7,12 31:13	11:3
35:4 47:7 53:1,2	despite	District	effectively	evolving
dates	41:17	9:12,15 34:14	30:9	36:12 42:11
51:13,14 53:12	detail	37:2,4,7 38:3	eight	ex
day	15:4	46:18 47:15	13:11	40:15 41:16
59:13	differ	48:16 50:14,21	either	example
days	39:17	51:1 55:14	21:5 23:16 34:7	43:3
52:20	difference	59:22	53:11	exceeded
DC	21:4	disturb	element	33:18
3:7	different	12:13	23:13	excessive
deal	16:2 21:20 23:13	disturbance	eliminate	31:7
47:10	23:15 30:13	6:20	31:20	exhibit
decide	41:15 47:8	DLA	empirically	5:17 8:1 34:5,8
28:19	differently	3:12	11:2 37:11	55:16,20
decision	40:19,20	docket	employ	exhibits
48:3	difficulties	43:12	49:9	54:6 55:3
default	40:4	document	employed	expect
47:12	difficulty	30:18,21 32:17,18	-	45:4
defeat	20:15 40:5	34:2 55:22 56:1	engage	expecting
39:5	directed	doing	18:10	30:9
defer	33:13	19:4 30:12	engaged	expert
31:2	director	Dr	19:18 24:15	14:17 52:16
definitional	10:17	44:8	ensuring	55:14 56:13,19
23:12	disagreement	Drive	50:8	experts
delay	46:11	3:14	entailed	56:14
9:9	discovery	drop	25:9	expires
delays	14:18 52:17	7:13	entered	59:16
29:8,10	discretion	due	38:4	explain
demonstratives	34:7 46:4	27:17 53:20	entertain	17:8
50:21 51:3	discuss		27:11	explaining
Denice	31:3 53:22 57:21	E	entire	12:8
1:22 2:14 59:2	discussed	E	33:16	explanation
denied	43:16	3:1,1 4:1,1,1,5	entirely	19:9 47:16
43:14	discussion	5:1,1	31:15 37:1 39:19	expressed
depended	18:11 45:17,22	earlier	40:12	41:11
43:22	46:3,19	35:2	entitled	extent
dependents	Display	early	31:19	50:10
41:5	1:14	40:2	err	extremely
deposed	disposition	easier	57:10	35:17
14:16	11:1,12	32:21	ESQUIRE	eyes
deposition	disrespect	easy	3:3,4,11 4:3	54:15 55:17 56:3
55:13 56:13	42:15	10:11 40:14	essentially	57:1
The second secon		52:18		
	1	ı	<u> </u>	ı

e-mail	34:16 37:21	forward	51:19	58:6
6:19 8:8 54:4	38:17 51:11	24:9 44:14 50:8	giving	GROUP
	financial	53:17 58:8	22:13 24:17	4:4
F	59:10	found	31:21	guess
face	find	9:10 18:7 22:22	go	24:12 32:18
25:6,7	22:18 23:18 24:7	38:9 39:3	6:15 8:4,6 14:3	38:11 55:1
fact	26:11 27:5	Fountain	16:4 17:4 18:21	guidance
11:4 18:6 27:11	38:16 42:22	3:13	23:14 25:22	24:17 35:11,16
35:5 36:5,13	49:22 53:6	framed	26:1,7 27:11	guide
37:10,12 49:8	fine	19:19	28:1 30:2 33:15	21:19
54:12	7:16 33:3 50:5	frankly	44:14 50:13	guiding
factors	52:13,22	9:9,10	51:11 53:2	35:19
42:13	first	Freedom	54:20 56:6 57:3	
fact-dependent	8:12,13,18,22	3:14	57:6	Н
23:15	10:12 13:14	front	goal	hampering
fail	17:10,11 18:1	25:15	39:6	43:5
42:2	19:2 24:15 31:1	frustrate	goes	hand
failure	38:16 46:3	9:9	12:8 50:8	59:13
42:1	54:18	full	going	handling
fair	firstly	9:16 24:5	5:4,5 9:15 16:4	30:14
19:13 33:20	10:22 11:13	fully	16:15 17:16	happen
57:13	five	15:1 16:11,17	23:15 24:1,2,9	13:21
fairly	27:22 28:5 29:3	21:22	24:18 25:20	happened
19:17	30:1 31:7,9,15	further	27:2 28:21	9:5 42:12
fallback	31:22 32:1 52:7	19:4 25:10 34:10	29:15 31:5	hard
39:8	fix	57:8,18 58:1,7	34:19 38:2,18	20:9 37:15
feel	24:19		46:21 48:21	head
23:11 24:1 26:13	flag	G	53:3,21 56:5	52:10,14
43:5 44:13	56:7	G	good	hear
45:15	flexibility	5:1	10:17,20 12:4	6:16 10:19 32:10
feeling	31:21	gears	22:15 28:11,15	41:3 45:22
49:14	floor	46:4	28:17 30:7	46:10 48:5,9
felt	6:17	general	good-faith	54:21
12:1	focus	10:22 11:1,11	33:8	hearing
figure	20:7 28:7,12 37:3	getting	grant	20:8 23:5 25:3
38:17	follow	23:3 24:3	31:22 39:14,18	28:16 36:21
file	46:7	gist	granted	45:10,17 46:2
8:1 10:12 25:19	foregoing	23:3	11:4,5,7 24:3	46:17 47:1,13
26:1 29:17	59:3,5	give	35:5,17 54:10	48:12,15 49:7
30:16 32:7,13	forget	6:14 8:6 12:22	great	49:17,21 50:2
32:20 33:22	34:15,17	18:15 19:9	15:4	50:12,15 53:12
34:1,7 52:12	form	24:10 26:12	grid	53:16 58:7
54:16 56:6	22:21 38:8	34:21 47:16	13:13 17:12,14,16	hears
filed	format	given	19:10,15,16	40:19
1:11 19:7 30:15	34:11	9:11 18:3 25:14	20:11 21:12,17	Heintz
36:9 38:20 54:7	forms	30:1 33:19	23:12	3:11 5:11,11
58:8	20:4	35:19 36:11	ground	33:21 34:9 41:1
filing	10.55-7895(1951)	37:16 42:8 45:4	O 72.80781888	41:4 43:8,15
	ľ	AND THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPER	l s	10 Sec. 100

	l .	1	ı	ı
44:19 57:17,19	24:2 43:4 44:13	20:9	19:18 20:16	11:6 12:5,15,21
hello	44:17 45:2	independent	21:15 22:6	13:8,15 14:2,7
6:22	hurdles	41:5,7 43:21 44:1	24:18,20 28:22	14:11 15:3,14
helpful	23:2 42:21 43:2,2	44:20	31:3 33:5 34:16	16:2,14,19,22
32:18,22		indicated	34:19,20,22	17:4 18:20
helps	I	55:20	36:20,22 37:4	19:20 20:7,18
18:4 49:2	idea	information	43:16 46:1,17	21:3 22:3,17
hereunto	38:13	1:15 18:3 25:14	46:20 47:14	23:18 25:1,22
59:12	identification	instance	49:19 50:13,20	26:18 27:1,9
hesitate	5:4 29:20	31:11 36:14	51:4,11 54:3,18	28:14 29:11
33:17	identified	instituted	Issued	30:12 31:10
Hi	18:1,12,18 19:10	14:16	1:10	32:6,8,10,11,12
7:2	26:5 28:3 29:5	institution	issues	32:12,16 33:1
high	29:19 34:20	48:3	8:9,10 9:17 11:20	33:10 34:4,10
37:11,17	41:20 55:3,6	instructed	12:1 17:22	34:13 37:1,20
history	identify	9:2	18:18 20:5 22:8	38:15 39:17
36:11	5:6 29:2 32:13,21	inter	22:12 24:14,21	40:1,12,18,21
hit	33:11	1:4 11:2 35:22	25:4 27:17,20	40:22 41:3
40:2	identifying	interest	28:3,3 30:3 36:7	42:20 43:11,17
holders	27:3 55:2 56:5	50:11 59:10	45:12 49:4,6,17	44:11 45:9,21
11:10	imagine	internal	53:21 54:1 58:7	46:9 47:11 48:8
Honor	25:13	13:20	33.21 34.1 30.7	49:22,22 50:5,7
5:11 6:3,18 7:10	impact	interpretation	J	51:7,10,22 52:3
8:2,20 10:7,21	45:14	14:19 46:14 48:1	James	52:6,18 53:1,6,9
17:3 20:2 22:1	imposed	48:7	3:11 5:11	53:13,15,16
24:12 25:12	42:22	interpretations	January	54:20 55:1,8
26:15 32:5	impossible	47:9,19,22	35:14	56:4,10,22 57:6
33:20,21 34:9	39:14,18,21 40:13	introduce	Jeff	57:14,20 58:3
34:12 35:1,21	42:9	33:8,11	6:3	Judge's
37:8 41:1 45:1	impression	intuit	JEFFREY	1:17 2:1
48:5,21 51:6,9	43:18 44:8,9	10:7	3:3	June
52:9,22 53:5,8	improperly	inventor	Job	53:4,14,20 59:16
56:9 57:12 58:2	46:22	54:8	1:21	justified
Honorable	inclined	Inventors	Joe	36:1,13 37:9
1:18	40:8	1:12	6:4	42:14
hope	inclinication	IPR2013-00292	joined	
21:18 39:4 49:10	49:8	1:7	7:3	K
55:4	includes	IPR2014-00271	joining	K
hopefully	53:13	1:6	5:3	3:6
10:11	including	ironic	joint	keep
hoping	48:1	9:11	10:2	9:15 29:11
36:19	inconsistency	irony	JOSEPH	keeping
hour	13:21	10:6	3:4	20:22 49:15
11:8	inconsistent	issue	Judge	kind
hours	37:13 39:15	8:13,15,18,22	5:2,3,3,9,13,16,20	9:14 17:16 23:3
35:3	incorporate	9:10 13:18	6:1,5,8,12 7:1,4	24:13 52:9 54:2
hurdle	30:10	14:21 15:2 17:5	7:7,20 8:4 9:19	know
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	indefiniteness		10:10,15,19	8:20 20:4 27:22
			35	

			1	ı
33:6 36:11 41:4	43:16	45:21 49:14	meet	44:16
41:19 46:15	lessen	longer	9:2	modifying
47:18 48:18	43:1	58:4	member	12:7,7 19:12
53:11,19	letting	look	53:16	moment
Kostes	22:13	13:10 53:17 58:8	members	13:1 14:7
22:8,12	let's	looking	23:21	motion
Kosts	17:4 20:7 21:3	13:5 21:8 25:5	mentioned	8:14,19 9:13
15:11	31:14 41:3 46:9	29:4 39:20	56:12	10:12,20 11:22
Kushan	47:11 51:15	lot	merely	12:10,16 13:2
3:3 6:3,4,7 7:10	light	52:14 58:5	51:2	13:11 14:15
7:18 8:2 17:10	16:9 20:10 26:14	PACA SILID	merit	17:5 18:2,19
17:14 19:8 20:2	48:11	M	49:7	19:1,2 24:3 26:2
20:14,21 21:6	likelihood	M	merits	26:2,3 29:18
23:11 24:12	37:17	3:11	9:7	30:11 31:14
25:18 27:19	limit	main	Method	32:7,14,17,19
29:6 46:2 47:2	28:5 41:13 51:3	11:14 45:7	1:13	32:21 34:1 35:4
48:21 51:9 52:5	limited	maintained	Micallef	35:14 37:9,17
52:22 53:3 58:1	9:21 12:12 26:9	54:18 55:21	3:4 6:4 22:1,4	37:21,22 38:10
K-o-s-t-e-s	50:22	major	25:12 47:17	38:11,16,17
15:11	limits	25:6,8 28:20	52:9 56:9,11,16	39:2,7,9,13 40:6
	41:10	making	56:20 57:2,12	40:9 41:18 42:2
L	line	30:17 46:6 56:1	Michael	43:3,9 44:22
lack	5:6 6:2,21 7:8,21	mandate	1:18	49:21 51:17,21
19:12	17:6,7 27:8	16:12	Microsoft	53:18 54:7,9,17
language	32:10	manner	1:4 3:2 41:20	55:2,4,5,8 56:5
9:4 12:3,19 13:4	lines	29:6	middle	motions
13:11 14:8,11	13:12 14:4	Martin	52:16	9:20 10:1 11:13
14:21 18:9 19:5	listen	6:22 7:2,2,6,16	mindful	35:17 36:8
20:12,13 21:10	48:5	material	36:18	41:10
23:8,9 26:5	listening	33:9,11	minor	move
33:13 39:18	29:16	materially	11:20,22 12:20	5:21
large	litigation	10:3,4 18:16	13:4 20:18	moving
36:1 41:8	47:18 52:16	Matthew	22:20 23:4 24:2	6:1 19:16
latest	56:13,15	1:18	24:18,20 25:4,8	Myers
52:2	little	max	27:6,9,10 28:17	41:21
law	8:11 9:11 31:6	27:22	28:19 30:4,15	
4:4 42:11	34:21 56:11,21	mean	minuscule	N
lawyers	58:3	15:15,22 16:10	25:16	N
31:13	live	26:19 27:3 29:4	minutes	3:1 4:1,1,1 5:1
lead	29:7,14	30:8 33:7 37:13	6:14	name
5:7	LLP	42:15 44:1	misstated	7:2
lease	3:5,12 4:4	52:13 57:4,9	56:18	nature
23:19	locked	meaning	mistake	17:9 26:9 27:9,10
leave	49:15	20:10	56:17	28:17,20
33:7 34:6,16 57:7	Lombard	means	misunderstandi	near
leeway	1:22 2:14 59:2	42:2	16:16	45:11
33:12	long	measure	modify	necessarily
length		33:8		14:20 16:5 23:7
L	I	I	l z	I

27:18 31:14,20	3:6	operation	5:12,15,21 6:9	49:15
40:16		15:13	6:10,13,17 7:5	part
necessary	0	operations	7:21 8:5,22 9:3	29:9 36:1 41:8
16:6 23:14 31:16	0	16:13	10:3,4 18:4,11	parte
45:15 50:17	4:1 5:1	opinion	22:19,19 24:1	40:15 41:16
necessrily	object	42:17	25:4,11 26:1,16	partes
37:6	19:8 47:17 55:16	opinions	28:16 29:15	1:4 11:2 35:22
need	55:20	35:20	30:5 31:18	particular
13:15 14:11 16:4	objection	opportunity	32:20 33:1	15:2 43:5,13,17
19:3 22:20	13:19 17:8 19:7	24:5 26:7,13 29:1	34:19 35:4 36:1	47:14 50:3,19
27:20 28:20	30:5 32:9,11	40:8 48:10	36:6 37:15 42:5	particularly
31:22 32:2 33:4	53:7,8,11,12,14	49:11	45:22 46:16	42:11 54:5
34:15 37:22	53:15 56:4 57:9	opposed	47:8,13,20	parties
38:9 43:6 52:19	objections	9:13 48:6 55:1	48:12 50:1,9,13	5:5 8:21 9:1
54:1 55:21	52:4 55:18	opposition	51:5,15 52:10	36:19 48:10
57:21	obvious	11:21 13:18	53:7,21 57:15	51:13 54:12,15
needed	15:16,22,22	14:14 18:2,19	owners	55:17 56:2,22
25:2 27:2 43:19	obviously	19:11 55:12	35:11	57:7 58:9 59:9
needing	12:11 21:6 24:4	oral	Owner's	paste
37:7	39:5 45:13 49:4	36:21 46:17 49:7	48:1	19:4
neither	obviousness	49:21 50:15		patent
59:8	15:15	ordinary	P	1:1,2,8,9 2:1 3:10
never	October	15:16	P	4:2 5:5,8,12,15
22:10 38:12	1:11	original	3:1,1,3 4:1,1 5:1	5:21 6:8,10,13
new	offered	35:14 54:3 55:5	page	6:17 7:5,21 8:5
19:2 20:16 21:9	35:10	outcome	13:10 14:4 17:6,7	8:22 9:3 10:2,4
24:20 33:8,11	office	59:11	41:10,13	11:9 18:4,11
33:13 35:11	1:1 36:4	outside	pages	19:13 22:18,19
news	officer	33:15	1:21 25:2 27:20	24:1 25:4,11
11:9	54:9 59:3	overall	27:22 28:5 29:3	26:1,16 28:16
nit	Oh	37:14 39:15	30:2 31:7,9,16	29:15 30:5
23:2	13:8	overcome	41:13 43:9,14	31:18 32:19
normal	okay	16:5	43:19 44:3,7,10	33:1 34:19 35:4
15:19 16:8	5:16 6:12 7:4,15	overlay	52:7	35:11 36:1,5
notarial	9:19 14:2 16:14	49:19	Palo	37:15 38:7 42:5
59:13	16:19 17:4 32:5	overlook	4:7	45:22 46:16
NOTARY	34:10,13 51:7	55:4	panel	47:7,13,19,22
59:1,21	51:10,22 53:1,9	overly	23:21 25:22	48:12 50:1,9,12
note	56:8,16,20	15:5 43:5	26:10 27:14	51:5,15 52:10
9:20 16:7	57:14	overview	31:12 49:9	53:7,21 57:14
noted	once	6:14 8:6	53:13,16,17	patentability
6:18 8:7	49:4	overwhelming	panels	16:3 17:22 22:8
notice	ones	43:18	35:10	22:12 25:15
46:6	54:13,14	Ovid	papers	27:17 30:3 45:7
number	open	1:12	34:16 56:6 58:8	48:4
46:3 47:8	30:13	Owner	parallel	patentable
NW	operating	1:8 3:10 4:2 5:5,8	9:11 47:18 52:16	22:22 23:7
	15:12		parameters	
	1	1	<u> </u>	1

	1	1	1	
path	53:1	31:2 41:15 56:18	20:19 29:5 57:4	proposition
24:7	picks	posture	problems	39:19
patience	23:2	20:22	27:16	prosecution
58:5	PIPER	potential	procedural	19:22 40:15
pending	3:12	14:19,21	23:2 24:2 44:13	prospect
55:17 56:13,15	place	precise	44:17 45:2	10:8
perceived	37:2	23:9	46:20 48:19	provide
41:19	placed	prefer	Procedurally	26:21 30:2 48:9
perform	42:10	30:22 34:4	46:15	51:13 52:7
15:12	pleadings	prejudice	proceed	provided
permit	47:7	23:22 31:17,20	7:14 26:20 29:6	9:3 12:16 50:21
31:9	please	prejudicial	proceeded	providing
permitted	5:6 8:6 14:2 17:8	48:19	49:5	49:1
10:1,16	22:3 23:4 37:3	prejudicing	proceeding	PRPS
person	51:13	44:14 46:22	8:17 9:12,18	54:11 56:7
15:17 56:17	plural	prescribed	24:16 45:4	PTAB
petition	17:13,15	10:16	46:16 49:20	35:8,10,12
18:1,18 30:1	point	present	proceedings	public
Petitioner	7:15 9:19 11:6	26:13 41:15	11:13 18:17 42:6	56:7 57:2,5,5,11
1:5 3:2 6:1,2,6,16	16:22 19:7	48:10 54:22	49:21 52:15	59:1,21
7:5,20,22 9:12	35:13 37:3,9	presentation	58:10 59:4,6,6	publicly
9:15 10:2 13:18	38:11 39:9,19	21:7	process	56:2
14:14 17:2,4	40:1 41:2 42:4	presented	40:3 41:16	pull
18:20 24:5 26:6	43:7 44:12	20:3 21:2,12 28:4	progress	12:22
27:13 29:14	45:10,18 47:21	28:15 35:10	40:6	pulling
31:21 33:8 36:9	49:14,20 50:4	47:8	promulgated	13:1
46:10 48:2,20	51:8 55:7 56:6	pressure	46:6	Pursuant
50:16 51:8 52:3	57:7	41:12	prong	2:14
52:19 53:20	pointed	pretty	10:12,15	put
54:14 55:15	19:12	45:11	proper	17:9 19:21 22:13
57:20	points	prevent	24:9 36:14 51:21	26:7 29:1,19
Petitioners	6:16 46:1	24:3	properly	31:15 44:2,7
55:19	portion	previous	54:14	45:8 54:3,12,13
Petitioner's	30:10	32:20 44:21 55:4	proposal	54:14
9:3,6 11:21 14:17	portions	previously	30:6,7 33:6	puts
31:8 46:1,22	55:16	18:1,12 54:7	propose	20:8 39:7
55:12,14	posed	primarily	14:5 27:14	putting
Phillips	24:11	28:6	proposed	19:4 25:21
36:14 37:19	position	principle	9:4 12:7,17 13:5	p.m
phone	16:16 17:20 20:1	11:11 37:14	17:21 19:6	1:20 58:10
2:7 23:19 25:15	39:8 41:22	prior	24:10,16 29:13	
26:5,12 27:18	42:16	12:14 18:8 20:3,5	29:16,17 32:9	Q
28:19	positions	28:2 30:11	32:13 47:8	question
phrase	12:13	32:19 41:19	48:14	5:18,19 10:11
13:19 17:11	possible	probably	proposing	15:3,9 18:4
21:20	14:1 29:4	31:1 32:17 51:20	12:17 18:5 20:6	19:17 22:2
pick	possibly	problem	25:19 29:22	24:11,13 47:3
				55:10 56:17
	'	'	<u> </u>	•

	I	1	I	I
questions	9:6 53:18	relied	56:7	rules
15:5 16:3 18:14	recollection	14:14	resolution	31:8,10 36:16
22:9 28:2 33:2	43:11	relief	55:18	39:1 42:11
34:10 43:20	record	6:14,20 8:9,14	resolve	
51:5,6	8:10,20 21:22	relieved	17:22 18:4	<u> </u>
quick	33:17 54:11	38:1	resolved	S
26:16	57:5 59:5	rely	14:1 20:6	3:1 4:1 5:1
quite	redline	21:16	resolving	Sacramento
9:8 11:3 12:1,20	32:20 34:5 52:11	remain	18:17	1:19
	redlines	56:22	respond	safer
R	34:2,3	remaining	24:5 28:8 43:6	57:9
R	reduce	12:16	49:11 52:21	sake
1:18 3:1 4:1 5:1	44:16	remember	responded	32:4
raise	reduced	43:13,17,20 55:3	21:7	Santoro
6:16 14:21 24:20	59:7	remove	response	1:12
33:5 45:10	reference	17:15 43:2	18:13 48:1 49:6,7	save
46:20 47:13,15	14:13,15,17,19	replace	responsible	48:16
50:1,2,13	15:10,10 16:5	19:2	5:16 7:22	saw
raised	30:10 41:21	replacement	rest	9:9
8:22 12:1 13:19	42:2	26:4,4 27:12	36:3	saying
30:3 43:21	referred	replacing	restate	15:18 21:4 23:6,8
raises	46:13	32:19	38:22	25:5 27:5,16
36:7 46:3	refresh	reply	Reston	28:15,17 31:22
rare	43:11	31:8 33:9 36:10	3:16	34:1 37:20
35:18	regarding	55:12	restriction	38:15,18 40:5
rarely	33:2 34:11,20	Reported	42:18	42:21 46:17
11:3	46:21	1:22	restrictions	48:8,12
read	regulation	reporter	41:9 42:10	says
15:18 35:19	10:16,16	5:14 7:3,4,11,12	rests	22:19 35:21 46:7
reading	regulations	7:13,21 59:1,3	42:7	scenario
15:19 16:8	22:16,17	reporters	result	28:13
readings	rejection	7:8	9:1 41:13 42:10	schedule
47:9	18:6	representative	review	29:8,12 45:11,14
really	related	6:2	1:5 11:2 35:22	49:13 50:8
22:7 42:19 49:12	8:9 52:15 59:8	request	Richard	scheduled
reargue	relating	8:13,15 10:2 14:3	4:3 5:7	36:21 49:1
51:2	18:8 21:17	43:13,15 44:6,7	right	scheduling
reason	relative	requested	9:21 22:16 28:1	36:18
10:22 37:8 41:8,9	20:5 24:21 25:20	5:14 6:9,19 7:9	risk	scope
42:2 45:16	relatively	7:11	33:16	33:14,16
52:13	11:22	requesting	road	scratching
reasonable	released	6:19 8:8	4:5 35:8	52:10,14
16:11 44:15 46:8	57:11	require	rule	screen
rebut	releasing	24:20 45:13	31:11 46:5,6,12	12:22
49:6	57:10	required	47:12	seal
rebuttal	relevant	25:2	ruled	54:7,9,17,18 55:2
50:17,18	41:20	reset	42:1	55:4,5,8 56:5
receive	71.20	reset	72.1	59:13
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>		0,,,,,

	1	ı	ı	ı
sealed	setting	situation	standard	style
54:14	28:10	9:14 11:17 36:8	8:16 35:22 36:5	32:15
second	settlement	39:2	36:12,15,17	submit
7:12 8:15 10:15	10:3,5,8	skill	37:2,5,7,10,12	34:5 36:19 44:20
10:20 12:17	shift	15:16	37:19 38:3	51:16 52:20
14:3 17:5,18	46:4	slate	39:16 40:14,17	submitted
18:22 19:1	Shorthand	20:8	45:5,6 48:6	55:7,13,16
22:15 26:3 31:3	59:1,2	slides	standards	submitting
31:14 32:14	show	35:9	35:12 38:7 39:12	5:17 7:22
33:5 34:19 43:3	35:17 45:5	small	stands	substance
51:17 54:19,20	showing	27:21	19:6	18:14 22:21
55:2	22:14 34:3	sole	start	substantive
see	shows	26:4	51:15	19:17 21:4,21
13:12 16:14 18:5	35:9	solely	starting	22:10 24:6
18:8 20:14 22:7	side	30:2	5:2	substantively
23:16,19,21	23:5,6 53:11 54:9	solution	state	46:11
27:21 45:2	57:10	29:13,16,17 32:9	8:10 40:3	substitute
56:20	sides	solutions	stated	9:5 12:3,17 13:5
seeing	24:8 26:13 53:9	24:10 29:5	17:18 18:7	13:6,9
27:14,17 53:17	SIDLEY	somewhat	STATES	successful
seek	3:5	8:9 40:8 47:10	1:1	38:12
8:8	significant	sorry	statics	suffered
seeking	20:16 42:9,9,18	6:20 44:22 50:2	35:6	7:14
6:15 10:4,11	signing	56:16	statistics	sufficient
16:20	7:17	sort	35:16	21:18
seen	similar	19:15 31:2 33:7	stay	suggest
11:2 47:7	55:11	Sources	9:13 46:9	30:12,20
sees	simple	1:15	steady	suggestion
40:19	10:10 27:8 52:20	specific	40:2	26:9
select	simplicity	51:4	stenographically	Suite
15:17	30:13	specifically	59:7	3:15 4:6
selectable	simplistic	44:6	step	suits
14:6 15:8,16,19	15:5	specification	31:13	34:8
15:19 16:8,9	simply	15:1,18 16:9	stop	supplemental
selection	12:2 13:17 17:15	20:10 21:8 27:3	46:7	25:19 26:8
15:13 16:13	22:13 46:4	specified	Street	support
sense	55:22	31:11	3:6	19:12 21:19
26:3 40:7	Simultaneous	speed	stretched	23:14,16 26:21
sensitive	1:14	9:16	16:12	27:1 45:6
25:7	single	spent	stricken	supported
separate	34:1	37:21	33:17	12:11 15:1 20:17
30:21	sink	spoke	strike	21:1
sequencing	11:20	44:8	33:18	supporting
28:11	sir	Square	structure	35:12
set	15:21	3:13	49:16	sure
12:17 29:9 51:12	sit	stage	stuff	11:19 12:5 13:22
59:12	18:15	10:9 46:16	57:5	16:3,5,15 22:21
) (2016-01) (477-04-06)	p-roaditisticies	Vennikkiteki pitetako (TAPA)	0.764/492762791	was arrange from first transfer and the Ta
L	I	I	I .	ı

25:16 29:8	20:20 47:5	18:20 19:20	6:15 7:8 8:6	two
	thank	20:7,18 21:3	18:15 28:19	6:20 7:8 8:9,10
41:4 54:17	5:9,20 6:18 7:18	22:3,17 23:18	34:18 40:7,13	9:4 16:2,2 29:21
SurfCast	7:19 8:4 16:22	25:1,22 26:18	44:18 53:22	30:8 35:3 42:13
1:7 3:10 4:2 5:8	34:9 35:1 44:11	27:1,9 28:14	54:1 57:21 58:5	52:21 53:21
survive	46:2 57:12,19	29:11 30:12	today's	54:8 55:2
39:5	58:4,9	31:10 32:6,12	6:13	two-fold
V A	thing	33:1,10 34:4,10	told	10:22
11:19	22:16 52:21	34:13 37:1,20	44:4,6,9	typewriting
77 TO 1 TO	things	38:15 39:17	tomorrow	59:7
1:13 15:12	16:2 18:12	40:1,12,22 41:3	52:12	
The state of the s	think	42:20 43:11	topic	U
T	10:7 11:9,22	44:11 45:9,21	41:2 55:11	U
T	12:10 13:21	46:9 47:11 48:8	TRADEMARK	4:1
4:1	14:22 16:17	49:22 50:7 51:7	1:1	ultimately
table	19:17 20:5,15	51:10,22 52:3,6	transcript	9:5 36:16 37:17
9:17	20:21,22 21:22	52:18 53:1,6,9	5:17 8:1 55:13	39:4,12
take	22:5,7 28:1 30:7	53:16 54:20	59:5	unable
6:13 8:2 23:20	31:1 32:16 33:3	55:8 56:4,10,22	transcripts	18:15 28:18
27:15 28:8	33:4 36:11	57:6,14,20 58:3	54:8,12	unamended
30:14 33:15	37:11 38:5	tile	trans-patentabi	11:14 38:8,13
49:9	39:18 40:7	17:12	18:7	39:3,5,11
taken	41:11 42:17	tiles	tremendous	underlying
33:14 41:22 59:4	46:13 47:4,6	13:13,13 14:6	41:12	13:11 39:2
59:6	49:7,18 50:7	15:15 17:12,13	trial	understand
talk	51:14,20 52:1	17:14,14,17,17	1:2 2:2 14:16	7:17 11:5,12 12:6
44:17	54:4 57:3	19:10,11,14,15	tried	16:18 17:21
talking	third	19:16,16 20:4	41:16,17 43:22	20:7,9 23:6
8:11 27:4 37:22	17:7	20:11,13 21:13	true	25:18 28:14
43:17	thought	21:17,19 23:12	59:5	33:22 37:5 40:4
Tasha	21:9	23:12	try	42:16,21 46:11
7:2	thoughts	time	22:1 31:18 40:9	46:12 49:12
technical	54:21	10:5 24:4 32:9	40:10 41:14	55:15
28:7 30:8 50:3	three	33:6 35:13	43:1 51:2	understanding
Telephonic	14:4	37:22 38:2,20	trying	6:8 7:20 27:5
1 1 1 2 2 1	throw	38:22 48:13,16	11:11 16:15	32:1 39:1 40:5
tell	53:2	48:22 49:16	17:20 18:10	55:19
25:3 40:7 44:5	Tierney	50:18,19 52:6	22:18 23:18	understood
telling	1:18 5:2,3,9,13,16	53:10	26:11 27:4	32:5
35:5	5:20 6:1,5,8,12	timely	31:16,20 38:17	unfortunately
tells	7:1,4,7,20 8:4	9:17	42:22	18:13
47:5	9:19 10:10,15	timing	Tuesday	unhappy
term	10:19 11:6 12:5	28:11 34:15	1:20	11:16
21:12 23:11,17	12:15,21 13:8	Title	turn	UNITED
26:8 51:17	13:15 14:2,7,11	1:13	17:1 34:13 54:21	1:1
53:19	15:3,14 16:2,14	today	turning	unnecessarily
terms	16:19,22 17:4	5:6,10,14,21 6:9	27:13	44:14
15:14 19:21		, , ,		
10.11.17.21		l i		unpatentable

16:1 38:9 39:3	26:8,10 28:1	40:13 53:3 58:7	x	1:11
unselectable	29:7 33:21 34:2	58:9	1:3,16	20005
15:7	34:14 37:4 40:1	we've		3:7
unsuccessful	45:12 48:9,18	7:14 11:1 21:13	Y	2004
37:18 38:19,21	49:12,20 53:19	35:19 37:21	Yeah	1:10
untenable	54:16 56:1	45:21 47:6	17:14 55:1	2012-00001
11:15	wanted	WHEREOF	year	35:21
unusual	8:8,13,15 9:6,15	59:12	35:15	2014
31:13	31:2 33:5	whichever		1:20 59:14
upheld	wants	49:6	Z	2018
23:1	48:5	willing	Zelma	59:16
USC	Washington	27:11	59:2	20190
9:20	3:7	windows		3:16
use	watching	20:4	1	202
32:2 37:2,4 44:2	11:2	wish	1	3:8
46:7,14 48:13	way	8:19 32:6 44:15	1:21 41:6	22
49:9 51:1	13:19 18:8 21:5	46:20 48:9,15	10	41:7
user	23:19,22 24:7,9	48:18 49:18	52:20	22nd
14:5,9,22 15:7,20	24:16 26:20	52:21 56:7	112	59:13
16:4,9 17:7	27:14,15 31:15	wished	20:17 23:14	2225
10.4,9 17.7	32:13 36:4,12	53:22	26:21 27:1,20	4:5
v	38:6 43:1 44:16	wishes	28:2	25
v	50:7 51:19	47:13	11911	39:21
1:6	54:11	WITNESS	3:14	39.21
versions		59:12	13th	3
54:17 55:7	ways 30:14	word	53:4,4,14,20	30
versus	weeks	17:6,15	14	1:11 53:14,18
19:14	52:21	words	59:16	30th
view	The state of the s	32:3 39:8	15	52:1,4,11
24:19 35:11 46:1	weigh 42:13		41:13 43:19 44:3	300
views		work	44:10	3:15
40:21	Welcome	49:16	1501	316
Virginia	11:9	works	3:6	9:20,22 10:13
3:16	well-reasoned	38:6	16	35
vitiate	42:16	worry	8:22	9:20
38:13 40:16	went	57:8		9.20
VLP	11:7 20:12 26:11	wouldn't	2	4
4:4	35:9	16:8 19:20 20:11	2	419-2010
voluminous	weren't	40:16	9:22 10:13 13:10	4:8
9:8	37:5	write	14:4 17:6,7	46
7.0	we'll	43:9	2:00	13:6,9 41:5
W	6:15,16 7:13 8:4	writing	1:20 58:10	
walk	26:7 34:13 49:5	14:7	20	5
12:21 13:3	49:16,16	written	1:10,20 35:7	53
want	we're	9:7 13:19 21:13	43:21	13:7,8 19:5 26:6
9:16,19 11:18	5:2,3 11:4 21:15	21:18 22:5	200	29:18 30:4,21
13:22 22:21	24:12 28:18,21	35:20 46:13	4:6	56
23:1,22 24:4	36:8 38:2 39:20	X	2000	13:5
25.1,22 21.1		A		
L			82	

59 1:21 59133 1:21 6 6,724,403 1:9 650
1:21 59133 1:21 6 6,724,403 1:9
59133 1:21 6 6,724,403 1:9
1:21 6 6,724,403 1:9
6 6,724,403 1:9
6,724,403 1:9
6,724,403 1:9
1:9
650
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
4:8
7
703
3:17
736-8000
3:8
773-4000
3:17
8
8
17:6
866-702-0697
2:7
9
94303
4:7