Trials@uspto.gov 571-272-7822

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MICROSOFT CORPORATION AND MICROSOFT MOBILE, INC., Petitioner,

v.

GLOBAL TOUCH SOLUTIONS, LLC, Patent Owner.

Case IPR2015-01147 (Patent 7,994,726 B2) Case IPR2015-01148 (Patent 7,498,749 B2) Case IPR2015-01149 (Patent 7,329,970 B2) Case IPR2015-01150 (Patent 7,781,980 B2) Case IPR2015-01151 (Patent 8,288,952 B2)¹

Before JUSTIN BUSCH, LYNNE E. PETTIGREW, and BETH Z. SHAW, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

PETTIGREW, Administrative Patent Judge.

ORDER Conduct of the Proceeding 37 C.F.R. § 42.5

¹ We use this caption in this paper to indicate that this Order applies to, and is entered in, all five cases. The parties are not authorized to use this caption.

On December 16, 2015, an initial conference call was held for the following five proceedings: IPR2015-01147, IPR2015-01148, IPR2015-01149, IPR2015-01150, and IPR2015-01151. The following individuals participated in the call: Mr. Goettle, Mr. Murphy, and Ms. Dukmen for Petitioners Microsoft Corporation and Microsoft Mobile, Inc.; Mr. Mandir and Mr. Kelber for Patent Owner, Global Touch Solutions, LLC; and Judges Busch, Pettigrew, and Shaw. The purpose of the call was to discuss any proposed changes to the Scheduling Order and any motions that the parties intend to file.

Patent Owner Counsel

Counsel for Patent Owner confirmed that Mr. Mandir is lead counsel for Patent Owner in IPR2015-01147, IPR2015-01150, and IPR2015-01151, and Mr. Kelber is lead counsel for Patent Owner in IPR2015-01148 and IPR2015-01149.

Scheduling Order

During the call, we indicated that DUE DATE 7, the date for the oral hearing should either party request it, has been set for August 4, 2016, for all five proceedings. We further indicated that the specific format and time allotted will depend on the number of issues, as briefed in the Patent Owner Response and Reply, and the extent to which there is overlap of issues among the cases.

The parties had no specific issues with the Scheduling Order.² We remind the parties that if they stipulate to different dates for any of DUE DATES 1–5, they should promptly file a notice of stipulation identifying the changed due dates.

Motions

Neither party seeks authorization to file any motions at this time. We remind the parties that, except as otherwise provided in our rules, Board authorization is required before filing a motion.

If Patent Owner should decide to file a motion to amend claims, it must schedule a conference call to confer with the Board two weeks prior to such filing. We direct the parties attention to the Board's decisions in *Idle Free Systems, Inc. v. Bergstrom, Inc.*, Case IPR2012-00027 (PTAB June 11, 2013) (Paper 26), which describes the basic guidelines for a motion to amend, and *MasterImage 3D, Inc. v. RealD Inc.*, Case IPR2015-00040 (PTAB July 15, 2015) (Paper 42), which clarifies the scope of "prior art known to Patent Owner."

Settlement

The parties indicated they had nothing to report regarding any possible settlement.

² Paper 9 (IPR2015-01147); Paper 13 (IPR2015-01148); Paper 13 (IPR2015-01149); Paper 9 (IPR2015-01150); Paper 9 (IPR2015-01151).

Protective Order

The parties are reminded that there currently is no protective order in place, and none will be entered unless a party files a motion to seal with a proposed protective order.

ORDER

It is

ORDERED that the due dates set forth in the Scheduling Order remain unchanged; and

FURTHER ORDERED that no motions are authorized at this time, other than those already authorized by Board Rules.

FOR PETITIONER:

Daniel J. Goettle John F. Murphy Sarah C. Dukmen BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP dgoettle@bakerlaw.com johnmurphy@bakerlaw.com msft-gt@bakerlaw.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

William H. Mandir Peter S. Park Brian K. Shelton Fadi N. Kiblawi SUGHRUE MION PLLC wmandir@sughrue.com pspark@sughrue.com bshelton@sughrue.com fkiblawi@sughrue.com

Steven B. Kelber skelber@labgoldlaw.com

Nathan Cristler ncristler@cristlerip.com