Trials@uspto.gov
571-272-7822

Paper 49
Entered: July 5, 2016

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

COX COMMUNICATIONS, INC.,
Petitioner,
v.
AT&T INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY I, L.P. and
AT&T INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY II, L.P.,
Patent Owners.[1]

Case IPR2015-01187 (Patent 6,993,353 B2)[2]
Case IPR2015-01227 (Patent 7,907,714 B2)
Case IPR2015-01273 (Patent 6,487,200 B1)
Case IPR2015-01536 (Patent 8,855,147 B2)

Before MICHAEL R. ZECHER, BRIAN P. MURPHY, and SHEILA F. McSHANE, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

PER CURIAM.

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

---

[1] AT&T Intellectual Proper I, L.P., is the Patent Owner in Case IPR2015-01227, whereas AT&T Intellectual Property II, L.P. is the Patent Owner in Cases IPR2015-01187, IPR2015-01273, and IPR2015-01536.

[2] This Order addresses similar issues in all the referenced cases, therefore, we issue a single Order to be filed in each case. The parties are not authorized to use this style of caption in any other filings.

On July 1, 2016, an email communication was received from Patent Owner requesting a conference call to seek authorization to file a sur-reply in each of the cases identified above, and also to seek authorization to file a motion to strike or a motion to deny consideration of the Petitioner's Reply, as filed in each case.

We do not authorize the filing of a sur-reply, motion to strike, or motion to deny consideration of the Petitioner's Reply in any of the cases. Instead, we authorize Patent Owner to file a paper in each case, limited to two pages per case, with an itemized listing, by page and line number, identifying the statements in the Petitioner's Reply that are deemed by Patent Owner to be beyond the proper scope of a reply. No argument is to be included in the contents of the submission.

We also authorize Petitioner to file a responsive paper, limited to two pages per case, with an item-by-item response to the items listed in Patent Owner's submission. Each item in Petitioner's responsive paper should identify the part of Patent Owner's Response, by page and line number, to which the corresponding item complained of by the Patent Owner is provided as a response, if indeed that is the case. No argument is to be included in the contents of the submission.

It is ORDERED that Patent Owner's submission is due no later than July 11, 2016, and Petitioner's submission is due no later than July 18, 2016.

IPR2015-01187 (Patent 6,993,353 B2)
IPR2015-01227 (Patent 7,907,714 B2)
IPR2015-01273 (Patent 6,487,200 B1)
IPR2015-01536 (Patent 8,855,147 B2)

For PETITIONER:

Steven M. Bauer
Joseph A. Capraro, Jr.
Gerald Worth
Scott Bertulli
John Kitchura
PROSKAUER ROSE LLP
PTABMattersBoston@proskauer.com
jcapraro@proskauer.com
gworth@proskauer.com
sbertulli@proskauer.com
jkitchura@proskauer.com

For PATENT OWNER:

David W. O'Brien
Raghav Bajaj
Jamie McDole
John Russell Emerson
HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP
david.obrien.ipr@haynesboone.com
raghav.bajaj.ipr@haynesboone.com
jamie.mcdole@haynesboone.com
russell.emerson.ipr@haynesboone.com

Arnold Turk
Neil Greenblum
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
aturk@gbpatent.com
ngreenblum@gbpatent.com