

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

JTEKT CORPORATION,
Petitioner,

v.

GKN AUTOMOTIVE LTD.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2016-00046
Patent 8,215,440 B2

Before MICHAEL P. TIERNEY, JOSIAH C. COCKS, and
JAMES J. MAYBERRY, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

MAYBERRY, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

SCHEDULING ORDER

A. DUE DATES

This order sets due dates for the parties to take action after institution of the proceeding. The parties may stipulate to different dates for DUE DATES 1 through 5 (earlier or later, but no later than DUE DATE 6). A notice of the stipulation, specifically identifying the changed due dates, must be promptly filed. The parties may not stipulate to an extension of DUE DATES 6 and 7.

In stipulating to different times, the parties should consider the effect of the stipulation on times to object to evidence (37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(1)), to supplement evidence (37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(2)), to conduct cross-examination (37 C.F.R. § 42.53(d)(2)), and to draft papers depending on the evidence and cross-examination testimony (see section B, below).

The parties are reminded that the Testimony Guidelines appended to the Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48,756, 48,772 (Aug. 14, 2012) (Appendix D), apply to this proceeding. The Board may impose an appropriate sanction for failure to adhere to the Testimony Guidelines. 37 C.F.R. § 42.12. For example, reasonable expenses and attorneys' fees incurred by any party may be levied on a person who impedes, delays, or frustrates the fair examination of a witness.

1. INITIAL CONFERENCE CALL

No initial conference call has been scheduled in this proceeding. The parties are directed to contact the Board within a month of the mailing this order if there is a need to discuss proposed changes to this Scheduling Order,

proposed motions, or other initial questions the parties may have regarding conduct of this proceeding. *See* Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48,756, 48,765–66 (Aug. 14, 2012) (providing guidance in preparing for the initial conference call).

2. DUE DATE 1

The patent owner may file—

- a. A response to the petition (37 C.F.R. § 42.120), and
- b. A motion to amend the patent (37 C.F.R. § 42.121).

The patent owner must file any such response or motion to amend by DUE DATE 1. If the patent owner elects not to file anything, the patent owner must arrange a conference call with the parties and the Board. The patent owner is cautioned that any arguments for patentability not raised in the response will be deemed waived.

3. DUE DATE 2

The petitioner must file any reply to the patent owner's response and opposition to the motion to amend by DUE DATE 2.

4. DUE DATE 3

The patent owner must file any reply to the petitioner's opposition to patent owner's motion to amend by DUE DATE 3.

5. DUE DATE 4

a. Each party must file any motion for an observation on the cross-examination testimony of a reply witness (*see* section C, below) by DUE DATE 4.

b. Each party must file any motion to exclude evidence (37 C.F.R. § 42.64(c)) and any request for oral argument (37 C.F.R. § 42.70(a)) by DUE DATE 4.

6. DUE DATE 5

a. Each party must file any response to an observation on cross-examination testimony by DUE DATE 5.

b. Each party must file any opposition to a motion to exclude evidence by DUE DATE 5.

7. DUE DATE 6

Each party must file any reply for a motion to exclude evidence by DUE DATE 6.

8. DUE DATE 7

The oral argument (if requested by either party) is set for DUE DATE 7.

B. CROSS-EXAMINATION

Except as the parties might otherwise agree, for each due date—

1. Cross-examination begins after any supplemental evidence is due. 37 C.F.R. § 42.53(d)(2).

2. Cross-examination ends no later than a week before the filing date for any paper in which the cross-examination testimony is expected to be used. *Id.*

C. MOTION FOR OBSERVATION ON CROSS-EXAMINATION

A motion for observation on cross-examination provides the parties with a mechanism to draw the Board's attention to relevant cross-

examination testimony of a reply witness because no further substantive paper is permitted after the reply. *See* Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48,756, 48,768 (Aug. 14, 2012). The observation must be a concise statement of the relevance of precisely identified testimony to a precisely identified argument or portion of an exhibit. Each observation should not exceed a single, short paragraph. The opposing party may respond to the observation. Any response must be equally concise and specific.

D. MOTION TO AMEND

Patent Owner may file a motion to amend without prior authorization from the Board. Nevertheless, Patent Owner must confer with the Board before filing such a motion. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.121(a). Patent Owner should arrange for a conference call with the panel and opposing counsel at least one week before DUE DATE 1 in order to satisfy the conferral requirement. We direct the parties to the Board's website for representative decisions relating to Motions to Amend among other topics. The parties may access these representative decisions at:

http://www.uspto.gov/ip/boards/bpai/representative_orders_and_opinions.jsp.

E. PROTECTIVE ORDER

No protective order has been entered in this proceeding. The parties are reminded of the requirement for a protective order when filing a motion to seal. 37 C.F.R. § 42.54. If the parties have agreed to a proposed protective order, including the Default Standing Protective Order, 77 Fed. Reg. 48,756, App. B (Aug 14, 2012), they should file a signed copy of the proposed protective order with the motion to seal. If the parties choose to

propose a protective order other than, or departing from, the Default Standing Protective Order, they must submit a joint, proposed protective order, accompanied by a red-lined version based on the Default Standing Protective Order.

The Board has a strong interest in the public availability of the proceedings. We advise the parties that redactions to documents filed in this proceeding should be limited strictly to isolated passages consisting entirely of confidential information, and that the thrust of the underlying argument or evidence must be clearly discernible from the redacted versions. We also advise the parties that information subject to a protective order will become public if identified in a final written decision in this proceeding, and that a motion to expunge the information will not necessarily prevail over the public interest in maintaining a complete and understandable file history. *See* Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. at 48,761.

DUE DATE APPENDIX

DUE DATE 1 June 16, 2016

Patent owner's response to the petition

Patent owner's motion to amend the patent

DUE DATE 2 September 8, 2016

Petitioner's reply to patent owner's response to petition

Petitioner's opposition to motion to amend

DUE DATE 3 October 6, 2016

Patent owner's reply to petitioner's opposition to motion to amend

DUE DATE 4 October 27, 2016

Motion for observation regarding cross-examination of reply witness

Motion to exclude evidence

Request for oral argument

DUE DATE 5 November 10, 2016

Response to observation

Opposition to motion to exclude

DUE DATE 6 November 17, 2016

Reply to opposition to motion to exclude

DUE DATE 7 December 6, 2016

Oral argument (if requested)

IPR2016-00046
Patent 8,215,440 B2

For PETITIONER:

W. Todd Baker
Ryan Smith
Lisa Mandrusiak
OBLON, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, LLP
cpdocketBaker@oblon.com
CPDocketSmith@oblon.com
CPDocketMandrusiak@oblon.com

For PATENT OWNER:

Sangeeta G. Shah
Kristin L. Murphy
BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.
GKNDL0101IPR@brookskushman.com