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

Paper 7
Entered: April 12, 2017

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

PANTIES PLUS, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

BRAGEL INTERNATIONAL, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2017-00044
Patent 7,144,296 B2

Before MITCHELL G. WEATHERLY, KEVIN W. CHERRY, and JAMES A. WORTH, *Administrative Patent Judges.*

WEATHERLY, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

CASE MANAGEMENT AND SCHEDULING ORDER
37 C.F.R. § 42.5

A. GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

1. Requests for an Initial Conference Call

Unless at least one of the parties requests otherwise, we will not conduct an initial conference call as described in the Office Patent Trial

Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48,756, 48,765–66 (Aug. 14, 2012) ("Practice Guide"). In lieu of such a call, we instruct the parties as follows:

(1) If a party wishes to request an initial conference call, that party shall request the call no later than twenty-five (25) days after the institution of trial;

(2) A request for a conference call shall include: (a) a list of proposed motions, if any, to be discussed during the call and (b) a list of dates and times when the parties are available for the call; and

(3) The parties shall be prepared to discuss during the initial conference call their concerns, if any, relating to the schedule in this proceeding as set forth below.

Absent good cause shown, we will not conduct an initial conference call later than 30 days after the institution of a trial.

2. Protective Order

A protective order does not exist in this proceeding unless the parties file one and the Board approves it. If either party files a motion to seal before entry of a protective order, a jointly proposed protective order should be presented as an exhibit to the motion. We encourage the parties to adopt the Board's default protective order if they conclude that a protective order is necessary. *See* Default Protective Order, Practice Guide, App. B. If the parties choose to propose a protective order deviating from the default protective order, they must submit the proposed protective order jointly along with a marked-up comparison of the proposed and default protective orders showing the differences.

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* Practice Guide, at 48,761.

3. Motions to Amend

Patent Owner may file a motion to amend without prior authorization from the Board. Nevertheless, the Patent Owner must confer with the Board as required under 37 C.F.R. § 42.121(a) no later than ten (10) business days before DUE DATE 1. We direct the parties' attention to the Board's precedential decision relating to Motions to Amend in *MasterImage 3D, Inc. v. RealD Inc.*, IPR2015-00040, Paper 42, which is accessible at: https://www.uspto.gov/sites/default/files/documents/MasterImage 3D v RealD IPR2015-00040_Paper 42.pdf. We also 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.

4. Dispute Resolution During Trial

The Panel encourages parties to resolve disputes arising during the trial on their own and in accordance with the precepts set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 42.1(b). To the extent that a dispute arises between the parties, we order the parties to meet and confer to resolve their dispute before contacting the

Board. If attempts to resolve the dispute fail, a party may request a conference call with the Board and the other party in order to seek authorization to move for relief.

In any request for a conference call with the Board to resolve a dispute, the requesting party shall: (a) certify that it has conferred with the other party in an effort to resolve the dispute; (b) identify with specificity the issues for which agreement has not been reached; (c) identify the precise relief to be sought; and (d) propose specific dates and times at which both parties are available for the conference call.

5. Depositions

The parties are advised that the Testimony Guidelines appended to the Practice Guide, App. 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.

Whenever a party submits a deposition transcript as an exhibit in this proceeding, the submitting party shall file the full transcript of the deposition rather than excerpts of only those portions being cited. After a deposition transcript has been submitted as an exhibit, all parties who subsequently cite to portions of the transcript shall cite to the first-filed exhibit rather than submitting another copy of the same transcript.

6. 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*.

7. 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* Practice Guide, at 48,768. 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.

B. 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. Any stipulated extension of DUE DATE 4 shall not modify the original deadline set forth in this Order by which a party must request oral argument.

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.

1. 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.

2. 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.

3. 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.

4. DUE DATE 4

a. Each party must file any motion for an observation on the cross-examination testimony of a reply witness (*see* section A.7, above) by DUE DATE 4.

b. Each party must file any motion to exclude evidence (37 C.F.R § 42.64(c)) by DUE DATE 4.

c. Each party must file any request for oral argument (37 C.F.R. § 42.70(a)) by DUE DATE 4.

5. DUE DATE 5

a. Each party must file any reply 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.

6. DUE DATE 6

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

7. DUE DATE 7

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

DUE DATE APPENDIX

DUE DATE 1 ..... July 12, 2017

Patent owner's response to the petition

Patent owner's motion to amend the patent

DUE DATE 2 ..... October 12, 2017

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

Petitioner's opposition to motion to amend

DUE DATE 3 ..... November 13, 2017

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

DUE DATE 4 ..... December 4, 2017

Motion for observation regarding cross-examination of reply witness

Motion to exclude evidence

Request for oral argument

DUE DATE 5 ..... December 18, 2017

Response to observation

Opposition to motion to exclude

DUE DATE 6 ..... December 29, 2017

Reply to opposition to motion to exclude

DUE DATE 7 ..... January 16, 2018

Oral argument (if requested)

PETITIONER:

Sergey Kolmykov
Gaston Kroub
KROUB, SILBERSHER & KOLMYKOV PLLC
skolmykov@kskiplaw.com
gkroub@kskiplaw.com

PATENT OWNER:

Thomas J. Daly
Katherine L. Quigley
Sami I. Schilly
LEWIS ROCA ROTHGERBER CHRISTIE LLP
tdaly@llrc.com
kquigley@llrc.com
sschilly@llrc.com