Trials@uspto.gov
Tel: 571-272-7822

Paper 38
Entered: August 24, 2017

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

TAIWAN SEMICONDUCTOR MANUFACTURING COMPANY, LTD.
and GLOBALFOUNDRIES U.S. INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

GODO KAISHA IP BRIDGE 1,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2016-01376
Case IPR2016-01377
Case IPR2016-01378
Case IPR2016-01379[1]
Patent 6,197,696 B1

Before, JUSTIN T. ARBES, MICHAEL J. FITZPATRICK, and JENNIFER MEYER CHAGNON, *Administrative Patent Judges.*

CHAGNON, *Administrative Patent Judge.*

ORDER
Trial Hearing
37 C.F.R. § 42.70

---

[1] This Order addresses issues common to all cases; therefore, we issue a single Order to be entered in each case. Also, GlobalFoundries U.S. Inc.'s motions for joinder in Cases IPR2017-00921, IPR2017-00922, IPR2017-00923, and IPR2017-00924 were granted.

Pursuant to Paper 12,[2] oral argument in these *inter partes* reviews, if requested by either party and granted by the Board, is scheduled for September 12, 2017. Both parties requested oral hearing pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.70. Paper 31; Paper 32. The requests for oral hearing are *granted*.

The hearing will commence at 2:00 PM EDT, on September 12, 2017, on the ninth Floor of the Madison Building East, 600 Dulany Street, Alexandria, Virginia. The hearing will be open to the public for in-person attendance, which will be accommodated on a first-come, first-serve basis. The Board will provide a court reporter for the hearing and the reporter's transcript will constitute the official record of the hearing.

The identified *inter partes* reviews involve the same patent and similar asserted prior art. A combined hearing, therefore, is appropriate under the circumstances. Each side will have sixty (60) minutes total to present its argument. Petitioner will proceed first to present its case as to the challenged claims in all four proceedings, and may argue its motions to exclude and reserve rebuttal time. Thereafter, Patent Owner will respond to Petitioner's arguments. Thereafter, Petitioner may make use of the time it has reserved, if any, to rebut any issues raised during Patent Owner's presentation.

Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.70(b), demonstrative exhibits must be served at least seven business days prior to the hearing. The parties shall confer with each other regarding any objections to demonstrative exhibits, and file demonstrative exhibits with the Board at least two business days prior to the

[2] For convenience we cite to the papers in IPR2016-01376. Similar papers are available in each proceeding.

hearing. For any issue that cannot be resolved after conferring with the opposing party, the parties may file jointly a one-page list of objections at least two business days prior to the hearing. The list should identify with particularity which demonstrative exhibits are subject to objection and include a short statement (no more than one sentence) of the reason for each objection. No argument or further explanation is permitted. We will consider the objections and schedule a conference call if necessary. Otherwise, we will reserve ruling on the objections until the hearing or after the hearing. Any objection to demonstrative exhibits that is not presented timely will be considered waived. Each party also shall provide a hard copy of its demonstrative exhibits to the court reporter at the hearing.

The parties are directed to *St. Jude Medical, Cardiology Division, Inc. v. The Board of Regents of the University of Michigan*, Case IPR2013-00041 (PTAB Jan. 27, 2014) (Paper 65), for guidance regarding the appropriate content of demonstrative exhibits. The parties are reminded that each presenter must identify clearly and specifically each demonstrative exhibit (e.g., by slide or screen number) referenced during the hearing to ensure the clarity and accuracy of the reporter's transcript. The parties also should note that one member of the panel will be attending the hearing electronically from a remote location and that if a demonstrative exhibit is not filed or otherwise made fully available or visible to the judge presiding over the hearing remotely, that demonstrative exhibit will not be considered. The judge presiding remotely will not be able to view the screen in the hearing room.

The Board expects lead counsel for each party to be present in person at the hearing, although any backup counsel may make the actual

presentation, in whole or in part.[3] If either party anticipates that its lead counsel will not be attending the hearing, that party should contact the Board by e-mail at Trials@uspto.gov no later than two days prior to the hearing to initiate a joint telephone conference with the other party and the Board to discuss the matter.

Questions regarding specific audio-visual equipment should be directed to the Board at (571) 272-9797. Requests for audio-visual equipment are to be made by e-mail to Trials@uspto.gov at least five business days in advance of the hearing date. If the request is not received timely, the equipment may not be available on the day of the hearing.

It is so ORDERED.

[3] Counsel for Petitioner GlobalFoundries U.S. Inc. is permitted to attend the hearing, but may not present arguments. *See, e.g.*, IPR2017-00921, Paper 10, 8. Should the parties have any questions regarding procedures for the hearing, the parties may request a conference call.

PETITIONER TAIWAN SEMICONDUCTOR MANUFACTURING COMPANY, LTD.:

Darren M. Jiron
E. Robert Yoches
J. Preston Long
Joshua L. Goldberg
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER, LLP
darren.jiron@finnegan.com
bob.yoches@finnegan.com
j.preston.long@finnegan.com
joshua.goldberg@finnegan.com

PETITIONER GLOBALFOUNDRIES U.S. INC.:

Christopher Carroll
Shamita Etienne-Cummings
WHITE & CASE, LLP
christopher.carroll@whitecase.com
setienne@whitecase.com

PATENT OWNER:

Andrew N. Thomases
Jordan M. Rossen
James L. Davis, Jr.
ROPES & GRAY LLP
andrew.thomases@ropesgray.com
jordan.rossen@ropesgray.com
james.l.davis@ropesgray.com

J. Steven Baughman
PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON & GARRISON LLP
sbaughman@paulweiss.com