UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

COMCAST CABLE COMMUNICATIONS, LLC,

PETITIONER

vs.

PROMPTU SYSTEMS CORPORATION,

PATENT OWNER.

Case IPR2018-00344

Patent 7,047,196

Wednesday, March 24, 2021

CONFERENCE CALL

BEFORE ADMINISTRATIVE PATENT JUDGES

JULIET MITCHELL DIRBA

JAMESON LEE

ROBERT L. KINDER

Reported By:

KATHLEEN WILKINS, STENOGRAPHIC REPORTER, CSR 10068 RPR-RMR-CRR-CCRR-CLR-CRC

Henderson Legal Services, Inc.

202-220-4158

www.hendersonlegal services.com

PROMPTU EXHIBIT 2046 COMCASTS v. PROMPTU IPR2018-00344

```
2
1
               Conference call before Administrative
 2
    Patent Judges Juliet Mitchell Dirba, Jameson Lee,
 3
    Robert L. Kinder, on Wednesday, March 24, 2021,
     commencing at the hour of 2:01 p.m. Eastern time
 4
 5
     thereof, telephonically, before me, Kathleen A.
 6
    Wilkins, RPR-RMR-CRR-CCRR-CLR-CRC, a Certified
 7
     Stenographic Shorthand Reporter, in and for the
 8
     State of California.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

```
3
1
                    APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL
    FOR THE PETITIONER:
3
         FARELLA, BRAUN & MARTEL, LLP
          235 Montgomery Street, 17th Floor
         San Francisco, California 94104
              JAMES L. DAY, ESQ.
         BY:
         Telephone: (415) 954-4414
         Email: Jday@fbm.com
6
          - and -
7
         KEKER, VAN NEST & PETERS
         633 Battery Street
         San Francisco, California 94111
         BY:
              LEO L. LAM, ESQ.
         Telephone: (415) 676-2246
10
         Email: Llam@keker.com
11
    FOR THE PATENT OWNER:
12
         FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER
         901 New York Avenue, NW
13
         Washington, DC 20001-4413
               JOSHUA L. GOLDBERG, ESQ.
         BY:
14
         Telephone: (202) 408 6092
         Email: Joshua.goldberg@finnegan.com
15
          - and -
16
         FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER
         Stanford Research Park
17
         3300 Hillview Avenue, 2nd Floor
18
         Palo Alto, California 94304-1203
         BY: JACOB A. SCHROEDER, ESQ.
19
         Telephone: (650) 849 6765
         Email: Jacob.schroeder@finnegan.com
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

```
4
                         2:01 P.M. EASTERN TIME.
    MARCH 24, 2021
2
                    PROCEEDINGS
                     AFTERNOON SESSION
5
              JUDGE DIRBA: Good afternoon. This is
6
    Judge Dirba. This is a conference call in case
7
    IPR2018-00344 relating to U.S. Patent
    Number 7,047,196. I am joined today by my
    colleagues, Judges Lee and Kinder. The purpose of
    the call today is to discuss our remand procedure
10
    for this case.
11
12
              Do we have someone on the line for
    petitioner?
13
14
              MR. DAY: Yes, your Honor. This is James
    Day on behalf of petitioner.
16
              JUDGE DIRBA: Mr. Day, is there anyone
17
    else on the line for petitioner?
18
              MR. LAM: Yes, your Honor. Leo Lam on
19
    behalf of petitioner as well. Good afternoon or
20
    good morning, depending upon where you are.
              JUDGE DIRBA: Good afternoon, I think.
21
22
    Yes.
23
              And then do we have counsel for patent
    owner on the call?
24
25
              MR. GOLDBERG: Yes, your Honor. Good
```

afternoon. This is Josua Goldberg for patent owner. 2 I also have my cocounsel, Jacob Schroeder, on the 3 line, and we also arranged for a court reporter that's also on the line. 5 JUDGE DIRBA: Thank you. You answered my 6 next question. 7 Is there anyone else on the call? 8 Very good. So as I mentioned, the purpose of the call today is to discuss the remand procedure for this IPR. 10 11 Did the parties have a meet and confer in advance of this conference call today? 12 13 MR. GOLDBERG: Yes, your Honor. 14 JUDGE DIRBA: And did the parties reach 15 agreement? MR. SCHROEDER: Your Honor, this is James 16 17 Day. I believe the parties are in agreement that further briefing would be useful. The two areas 18 19 that we've discussed and I believe we've agreed on are, one, discussing how the construction of the term "received back channel" that the federal 21 circuit confirmed or adopted applies to the 22 23 arguments that the parties made and how that applies 24 to the final written decision that was issued. And 25 then the second area would be to, essentially, point

Henderson Legal Services, Inc.

6

- out subsequent federal circuit or PTAB decisions
- that might have some bearing on either the final
- written decision or the arguments that the parties
- 4 made that weren't addressed to the final written
- 5 decision.
- 5 JUDGE DIRBA: And I have a few questions
- about the second point you raised, Mr. Day. The
- 8 cases that you'd like to point out about substantive
- 9 issues, are those cases that were decided after the
- 10 parties briefing? Is that why you're proposing to
- 11 discuss them now, or has something changed in this
- 12 proceeding? Or could you give me more background on
- that additional information?
- 14 MR. DAY: Yes. So what I'm suggesting and
- what I think we've agreed is it would be cases that
- that postdate the final written decision, though it
- would be -- I can give an example. There was a
- parallel IPR that the final written decision issued
- 19 several months later than this one that we think
- 20 impacts the analysis in this IPR. I know that
- 21 patent owner has some arguments based on later --
- or, in fact, the same federal circuit decision that
- 23 remanded this case. So it's information the board
- 24 would not have had when it issued the written final
- decision but we think is now relevant.

1 JUDGE DIRBA: Okay. Before I ask 2 additional questions about that, Mr. Goldberg, do 3 you agree with Mr. Day's summary? 4 MR. GOLDBERG: I think generally, yes, 5 your Honor. Our overall view is that we think, as Mr. Day was mentioning, that there are some issues 6 7 in the federal circuit decision that issued in this case and the related 345 case that are relevant and 8 9 would be worthwhile to raise to your Honors in some 10 additional briefing. And beyond that, we don't have 11 strong feelings on additional briefing, but we are okay with the additional briefing that petitioners 12 13 have proposed. 14 I think that the one other part of our 15 agreement that we had reached among the parties is that there would not be any additional briefing on 16 17 whether or not the Murdock reference qualifies as 18 prior art. 19 JUDGE DIRBA: And, Mr. Day, do you agree 20 with that? 21 MR. DAY: I do agree with that, your 22 Honor. The only caveat is I guess we would reserve 23 the right to respond if there was any sort of an 24 argument on that, but I don't expect that. And I do 25 think the parties agree that we would set that

8 aside. 1 2 JUDGE DIRBA: Okay. So if I'm 3 understanding correctly, Mr. Day, it's petitioner, 4 primarily, who seeks this additional briefing, and 5 if I understand Mr. Goldberg, patent owner is 6 amenable to, won't object to the additional briefing but wouldn't independently request it. Is that 7 8 correct, Mr. Day? 9 And then I'll ask you, Mr. Goldberg. MR. DAY: It's correct that I think we 10 11 want additional briefing. I suspect the patent 12 owner also wants additional briefing. JUDGE DIRBA: Mr. Goldberg, do you also 13 14 want additional briefing? I understood your comments to indicate that you were amenable to it, 16 that you wouldn't object to additional briefing, but 17 you also had no objection to not having any additional briefing. 18 19 MR. GOLDBERG: Yes, that's correct, your 20 I think that the only issue that we wanted 21 to make you aware of at all is that other decision in the 345 is out there, but we don't need 22 additional briefing on it and would be okay if there 23 24 was not any additional briefing. But you'll -- your 25 Honors can see for themselves that in the briefing

9 at the federal circuit, there was the decision that 2 issued and a request for rehearing on it. And we 3 don't need to get into the details here unless you'd like to hear. But our view would be that that 5 decision is something that matters. 6 JUDGE DIRBA: And to make sure I 7 understand your position, Mr. Goldberg, you believe that that decision matters because of -- because of 8 9 what it says and how it relates to the issues here? In other words, if I'm understanding you correctly, 10 it is clear the ways in which it matters in this 11 12 proceeding? 13 MR. GOLDBERG: Yes, your Honor. We had 14 sought rehearing on the decision and articulated the 15 reasons. To just make it very simple for you now, our basic position is that there's going to be issue 16 preclusion created by what happened in the 345 case 17 that's going to be relevant to the 344 case. And 18 19 that is something that merely us telling you that 20 that exists as far as we're concerned would be sufficient and we don't need briefing on it, but it 21 is something that we would brief if we were -- if 22 you were going to give briefing in this case in 23 24 general.

Henderson Legal Services, Inc.

JUDGE DIRBA: And petitioner, Mr. Day, you

202-220-4158

10

- 1 mentioned in your discussion -- I'd like to drill in
- a little bit and understand better what topics you
- would like to address in this additional briefing.
- 4 It does sound -- or it's my understanding you agree
- 5 that the briefing would be limited to only certain
- 6 issues. And I'd like to better understand which
- 7 issues you believe require or need additional
- 8 briefing.
- 9 MR. DAY: Sure, your Honor. One, if
- 10 patent owner is going to make an issue preclusion
- 11 argument, we'd like to respond to that. But I
- think, getting back to the two topics that I started
- with, the term that the federal circuit construed,
- 14 or confirmed our construction, appears in several
- different limitations in the claims that were not
- addressed in the final written decision, and we
- think it would be useful to point that out.
- 18 Frankly, it doesn't require a bunch of argument.
- 19 It's just, you know, that decision impacts more than
- just the limitation that was addressed in the final
- 21 written decision.
- Also, the second ground that we asserted,
- the Murdock ground, was rejected based on that
- 24 limitation. So it's -- again, I don't think it
- takes much argument. It would just be pointing out

11 those other places where the same term impacts 2 either the arguments that were made and were not 3 addressed or the final written decision that may not, you know, be readily apparent and are not 5 apparent from the federal circuit decision itself. 6 On the second topic, I -- again, if patent 7 owner is going to make some sort of legal argument based on a federal circuit decision on a different 8 9 IPR, I would like to be able to respond to that. And then there was an IPR decision in a 10 related patent that issued later than this one that 11 addressed several of the dependent claims that have 12 virtually either identical or virtually identical 13 14 language of the dependent claims at issue here. And we think that decision is relevant. Again, I don't think it takes a lot of argument, but it's something 16 that we think the board should be aware of. 17 JUDGE DIRBA: That's very helpful. 18 19 Patent owner, if I understood -- or 20 Mr. Goldberg, if I understood you correctly, you referenced an issue preclusion argument created by 21 the 345 case which I haven't -- I haven't looked at 22 23 in sufficient detail to know automatically what it 24 is that you're referencing.

Henderson Legal Services, Inc.

Are you of the opinion that you need

12

1 additional briefing to make that argument? Is it

2 your position that the board should respond to

- determine whether or not issue preclusion applies in
- 4 this case? Did you previously argue the issue
- 5 preclusion in the case? Can you give me a little
- 6 bit more information about your position on that?
- 7 MR. GOLDBERG: Yes, your Honor. There
- 8 are -- there are claims in the 345 patent -- in the
- 9 345 proceeding that relates to the same patent
- that's at issue in the 344 proceeding. And there
- 11 are some claims that have the same limitation in
- 12 them. And in the -- in both proceedings at the
- board, we had argued that the claims were not
- unpatentable because of that limitation.
- And in the 345 proceeding, the board found
- the claims were not unpatentable because of that
- 17 limitation and the federal circuit subsequently
- 18 affirmed.
- The same limitation exists in Claim 27 and
- its dependent claims in the 344 proceeding, but the
- 21 board in the original final written decision did not
- 22 address that issue because it found all of the
- 23 claims got unpatentable for other reasons.
- So the issue -- preclusion issue is
- 25 essentially that this particular limitation that was

13

- already fought about in the other IPR that the board
- found warranted finding the claims not unpatentable
- 3 and that the federal circuit then affirmed made the
- 4 claims not unpatentable also applies in this
- 5 proceeding.
- 6 And the reason that I say we don't feel
- 7 that there necessarily needs to be any briefing
- 8 about this is because the details of what I just
- 9 said in a lot more detail are already set forth in a
- 10 request for rehearing that we had filed at the
- 11 federal circuit. And the Court in that request for
- 12 rehearing essentially just said to go back down for
- 13 the board to deal with it. The details of these --
- of this issue are already set forth. But we --
- JUDGE DIRBA: And the request for -- go
- ahead.
- MR. GOLDBERG: That was a request for
- 18 rehearing of the federal circuit decision, because
- in the federal circuit decision that issued -- so
- 20 the 344 and the 345 cases, they were consolidated
- 21 for purposes of appeal. So there's only a single
- decision that addressed both cases. And in the 344,
- we had pointed out to the federal circuit this
- 24 issue. And in the federal circuit's decision, they
- just didn't address it, for whatever reason. So our

14 request for rehearing said, you guys didn't address 2 this, can you please address it now? And then they 3 essentially said go back and talk to the board about 4 it. 5 JUDGE DIRBA: Okay. I don't believe that 6 I have a copy of that request for rehearing, 7 Mr. Goldberg. I'll just make you aware of that. 8 MR. GOLDBERG: Yes. 9 JUDGE DIRBA: So I can't consider it if I don't have a copy of it. But that's helpful 10 11 information. I appreciate that. 12 Is it your argument, then, that based on 13 what happened, that we -- that the board is 14 precluded from making a different decision than it 15 did before, or are you simply arguing that based on the analysis and the reasoning we had in that other 16 17 case, that that would apply to the limitations here, and so, therefore, we should come up to the same 18 19 conclusion here as we did in the other case? 20 MR. GOLDBERG: It's both. And to be clear, because I just want to make sure that I'm not 21 22 misrepresenting anything, when I keep saying the

Henderson Legal Services, Inc.

rehearing was, go back and talk to the board, it was

board -- the court decision on the request for

just, they denied our request for rehearing.

23

24

15 wasn't a long opinion that said that. I just -- as 1 2 practical matter, when they denied our request for 3 rehearing, that means we're coming and talking to 4 you. 5 MR. DAY: Your Honor, may I add one point? 6 JUDGE DIRBA: Absolutely. 7 MR. DAY: I just want to make the point 8 that Promptu filed this request for rehearing, and 9 we did not respond to that. So one side of this issue has been briefed, but the other side has not. 10 11 And so that's part of why we think if this is going to be an issue the board considers, we ought to be 12 13 granted some briefing to respond. 14 JUDGE DIRBA: I understand that. 15 Mr. Day, do you have a proposal for how you would like to handle the additional briefing 16 17 that you are contemplating? 18 MR. DAY: Yes, your Honor. So the parties 19 have talked about two alternatives, and we don't 20 necessarily agree on which is our favorite. But the two alternatives are, option 1, both parties file an 21 22 opening brief simultaneously of up to ten pages, and 23 then both parties file simultaneously an opposition 24 brief of up to ten pages. Second alternative, 25 option 2, would be sequential briefing where

16 petitioner goes first, patent owner, and then a 2 reply, and then a surreply. 3 Again, we've talked about a ten-page limit, but we didn't really agree on that across the 5 board. But I think those are the two sequential -the two approaches to briefing that we've discussed. 6 7 JUDGE DIRBA: And for the simultaneous 8 briefing option where both parties file an opening 9 brief and both parties file a response brief, are you proposing that the petitioner's opening brief 10 11 would be directed to the issues that you raise, how -- let's see. I'm going back to my notes 12 here -- how the other federal circuit decision 13 14 impacts other limitations and how the -- how that 15 decision is otherwise relevant to the case, and that the patent owner's opening brief would address the 16 17 issue preclusion argument; is that correct? Or did you have a different idea in mind for how to split 18 19 up the topics? 20 MR. DAY: No. That's correct, your Honor. I was thinking that both parties would make, you 21 22 know, whatever arguments they were going to make, 23 the ones we've articulated to you, and then each 24 party would have a chance to respond. 25 JUDGE DIRBA: What timeline for that

17

- briefing would you propose?
- MR. DAY: You know, we did not discuss
- 3 that. I would like to -- I'd like to have some
- 4 time. Maybe, say, three or four weeks to get the
- 5 briefs ready and then three or four weeks to
- 6 respond. But, again, we did not discuss that.
- JUDGE DIRBA: And, Mr. Goldberg, what
- 8 would your -- if we were to authorize additional
- 9 briefing here, what would your proposal be for the
- specific briefing procedure?
- MR. GOLDBERG: I think, as Mr. Day had
- mentioned, that we had kind of talked through the
- two possibilities. Our preferred option would be to
- have the petitioner file a first brief, and then us
- 15 to file a response to that, and then for petitioner
- to file a reply, and then for us to file a surreply.
- 17 And as far as page limits go, we think ten pages
- makes sense for the first brief that the parties
- 19 file in either the sequential or simultaneous
- 20 scenario. I think our view would be that five pages
- 21 would be sufficient for whatever the second brief
- filed by each party, either in the sequential or
- 23 simultaneous framework.
- MR. DAY: And, your Honor, we disagree
- with the limitation to five pages for responding to

18 an argument that was made in ten pages. We feel 2 like we should get ten pages for a response. 3 JUDGE DIRBA: And that's directed to the 4 issue preclusion argument that the patent owner has 5 referenced, correct? 6 MR. DAY: Yeah. That's the only argument we know that they're going to make. But, yes, if it 7 8 took them ten pages to lay out that argument, which 9 seems doubtful, but it did, it doesn't seem fair that we would be responding to that in five pages. 10 11 JUDGE DIRBA: Okay. Let me take a few 12 moments. 13 (Pause in proceedings.) 14 JUDGE DIRBA: Thank you for your patience. 15 Mr. Goldberg, I have an additional question regarding your arguments regarding issue 16 preclusion or -- you referenced some arguments also 17 around that same issue that you had made in your 18 19 request for a hearing to the federal circuit. 20 Do any of those issues relate to the arguments that petitioner is proposing that we 21 address? In other words, is there a relationship 22 between the topics of petitioner you want to 23 24 address, which is namely how the CAFC decision 25 impacts other limitations in these claims, and your

19

- 1 argument that issue preclusion applies from some
- 2 aspect of what the federal circuit decided?
- MR. GOLDBERG: I hesitate in answering
- 4 just because I think this is one of those points
- 5 where it just depends on your perspective, because
- 6 when -- when we talk about petitioner's arguments
- 7 concerning the impact of the federal circuit
- 8 decision on other limitations, I could say, well,
- yes, what we're talking about is the same thing
- 10 because the federal circuit decision addresses
- another limitation, and we are going to be talking
- 12 about that other limitation when we say that that's
- why the claims are not unpatentable here as well.
- 14 It's all -- has its genesis in the federal circuit's
- decision.
- So in that sense, yes, it's the same
- thing. But I think, you know, they're going to
- 18 focus on other parts of the decision that we would
- 19 focus on.
- MR. DAY: Your Honor, may I offer --
- 21 sorry.
- JUDGE DIRBA: Let me ask an additional
- question, Mr. Goldberg.
- 24 Are there any other -- the federal circuit
- decision we're speaking of is the decision from this

20

- 1 proceeding, which, as you mentioned, that the
- federal circuit was consulted with the 345 IPR. Is
- that the only federal circuit decision that's
- 4 relevant?
- 5 MR. GOLDBERG: That's the only decision
- 6 that is relevant in the sense that it creates
- binding -- what we would view as binding authority
- 8 on this issue. Now, in addressing how this issue
- 9 preclusion works, there may be issues that, just
- 10 like in the sense that they're case law, maybe would
- get cited in explaining this issue to the board.
- 12 But that would be the only case that is -- I guess I
- would characterize it as the law of the case. I'm
- 14 sure that petitioner's counsel would disagree with
- me on that, but that's kind of the way I would frame
- 16 it.
- JUDGE DIRBA: Mr. Day, a response?
- MR. DAY: Yes, your Honor. I don't
- 19 disagree that it's in the same category. We also
- would like to update the board on subsequent
- 21 authority with a category similar. But if the
- question was getting at who would raise this, it's
- 23 we would not raise this issue in an opening brief,
- 24 and they -- and I believe patent owner would not
- 25 argue it in response to anything that we would say

21 in an opening brief. 2 So their laying out their position would 3 have nothing to do with anything we said in an 4 opening brief. And so that's why, if we went in a 5 sequential order, we would be -- it would be a new argument unrelated to the arguments we had made in 6 7 our first opening brief. And so that's -- that's my concern about a 8 9 reply being very short, you know, short, half as long, is we would be responding to what might be an 10 11 extensive argument, I don't know, in half the pages. 12 JUDGE DIRBA: Okay. Mr. Day, anything 13 further that you want to say on this topic? 14 MR. DAY: No, your Honor. 15 JUDGE DIRBA: Mr. Goldberg? 16 MR. GOLDBERG: No, your Honor. 17 JUDGE DIRBA: Okay. The panel has 18 conferred. We'll grant additional briefing as the parties request. We're inclined to -- we decided to 19 20 grant a simultaneous opening brief and then a 21 simultaneous response brief. Both of those briefs -- or I suppose all four of those briefs will 22 23 be ten pages each. They're all limited generally to 24 discussing the issues that we addressed today.

Henderson Legal Services, Inc.

particular, or I suppose, for example, someone had

202-220-4158

22

- 1 mentioned not having any additional briefing on
- whether Murdock qualifies as prior art. The
- 3 topics -- and we'll issue an order in due course
- 4 laying this out. But the topics should be limited
- 5 to the impacts of the federal circuit decision that
- 6 we have in this case on this case, as well as
- 7 additional authority that is particularly relevant
- 8 to the arguments made during the proceeding. Each
- 9 of the briefs I mentioned would be ten pages. We'll
- 10 allow three weeks for both parties to file their
- opening briefs, and then an additional three weeks
- 12 for both parties to file their response brief.
- Mr. Day, are there any questions?
- MR. DAY: No, your Honor.
- JUDGE DIRBA: Mr. Goldberg?
- MR. GOLDBERG: Not for your Honor. But if
- 17 I can just give my colleague, Jacob, a moment to see
- if he has any.
- MR. SCHROEDER: No, I do not. This is
- Jacob Schroeder. Thank you.
- JUDGE DIRBA: Thank you. And one
- 22 additional clarification for Mr. Day. I would
- 23 expect the petitioner would not address the issue of
- 24 preclusion arguments that patent owner has discussed
- today in his opening brief. Rather, I would expect

23

- the petitioner would address those arguments after
- 2 patent owner has had a chance to articulate those
- 3 arguments in its opening brief. Petitioner would
- 4 address the response to those in its responsive
- 5 brief.
- 6 MR. DAY: Understood, your Honor.
- JUDGE DIRBA: Is there anything further
- 8 from either party?
- 9 MR. DAY: Your Honor, I did have one other
- thing I wanted to ask about.
- 11 JUDGE DIRBA: Go ahead. And who is this
- 12 speaking?
- MR. DAY: Sorry. Mr. Day for petitioner.
- The parties filed, each side filed a
- motion to exclude. And in the final decision, both
- of those motions were denied as moot. So my
- 17 question is just whether the panel would like us to
- refile those, mention them in this briefing, or is
- there anything else we can do just to, you know, get
- those on your radar again?
- JUDGE DIRBA: We will take that under
- 22 advisement. I don't suspect that we will need
- 23 additional briefing. I'm assuming that the issues
- 24 are the same; you're just saying that the motion is
- 25 perhaps no longer moot because we might resolve

```
24
    things differently in this proceeding; is that
2
    correct?
3
              MR. DAY: That is correct, your Honor.
    But I'm not suggesting further briefing.
5
               JUDGE DIRBA: Okay. We will consider that
    and I'll address that in the order.
6
7
               MR. DAY: Thank you, your Honor.
               JUDGE DIRBA: Okay. Final request for
8
    Mr. Goldberg. Please file as an exhibit a copy of
    the transcript from this proceeding or this hearing
10
    as soon as it's available.
11
12
              MR. GOLDBERG: Will do. Thank you, your
13
    Honor.
              JUDGE DIRBA: Excellent. Thank you all.
14
15
    We're adjourned.
               MR. DAY: Thank you.
16
17
              MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you. Have a good
18
    day.
19
               (Proceedings concluded at 2:32 p.m.)
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

2	I, Kathleen A. Wilkins, Registered
3	Professional Reporter in and for the State of
4	California, County of Contra Costa, the officer
5	before whom the proceedings were taken, do hereby
6	certify that the foregoing transcript is a true and
7	accurate record of these proceedings; that said
8	proceedings were taken in Stenotype note by me on
9	the 24th day of March, 2021, commencing at 2:01 p.m.
10	and ending at 2:32 p.m.
11	I further certify that present on behalf
12	of Party Promptu Systems Corporation, Patent Owner,
13	was Joshua L. Goldberg, Esq. and Jacob A. Schroeder,
1 4	Esq., Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett &
15	Dunner, and on behalf of Comcast Cable
16	Communications, LLC, Petitioner, was James L. Day,
17	Esq., of Farella, Braun & Martel, LLP and Leo L.
18	Lam, Esq., of Keker, Van Nest & Peters.
19	I, further certify that I am not related
2 0	to, nor associated with any of the parties or their
21	attorneys, nor do I have any disqualifying interest,

personal or financial in the actions within.

Dated this 26th day of March, 2021, at Contra Costa County, California.

Kathleen a. Wilkins

(Reporter's signature)

22

23

24

25

A	afternoon 4:3	argued 12:13	back 5:21	8:16,18,23
able 11:9	4:5,19,21 5:1	arguing 14:15	10:12 13:12	8:24,25 9:21
Absolutely	agree 7:3,19	argument 7:24	14:3,24	9:23 10:3,5,8
15:6	7:21,25 10:4	10:11,18,25	16:12	12:1 13:7
accurate 25:7	15:20 16:4	11:7,16,21	background	15:13,16,25
actions 25:22	agreed 5:19	12:1 14:12	6:12	16:6,8 17:1,9
add 15:5	6:15	16:17 18:1,4	based 6:21	17:10 21:18
additional	agreement	18:6,8 19:1	10:23 11:8	22:1 23:18
6:13 7:2,10	5:15,17 7:15	21:6,11	14:12,15	23:23 24:4
II '	ahead 13:16	arguments	basic 9:16	briefs 17:5
7:11,12,16	23:11	5:23 6:3,21	Battery 3:8	21:22,22
8:4,6,11,12	allow 22:10	11:2 16:22	bearing 6:2	22:9,11
8:14,16,18	alternative	18:16,17,21	behalf 4:15,19	bunch 10:18
8:23,24 10:3	15:24	19:6 21:6	25:11,15	
10:7 12:1	alternatives	22:8,24 23:1	believe 5:17	С
15:16 17:8	15:19,21	23:3	5:19 9:7 10:7	C 4:2
18:15 19:22	Alto 3:18	arranged 5:3	14:5 20:24	Cable 1:4
21:18 22:1,7	amenable 8:6	art 7:18 22:2	better 10:2,6	25:15
22:11,22 23:23	8:15	articulate 23:2	beyond 7:10	CAFC 18:24
23.23 address 10:3	analysis 6:20	articulated	binding 20:7,7	California 2:8
12:22 13:25	14:16	9:14 16:23	bit 10:2 12:6	3:4,8,18 25:4
	answered 5:5	aside 8:1	board 1:2 6:23	25:24
14:1,2 16:16	answering	aspect 19:2	11:17 12:2	call 1:15 2:1
18:22,24	19:3	asserted 10:22	12:13,15,21	4:6,10,24 5:7
22:23 23:1,4 24:6	apparent 11:4	associated	13:1,13 14:3	5:9,12
addressed 6:4	11:5	25:20	14:13,23,24	case 1:10 4:6
	appeal 1:2	assuming	15:12 16:5	4:11 6:23 7:8
10:16,20	13:21	23:23	20:11,20	7:8 9:17,18
11:3,12 13:22 21:24	APPEARAN	attorneys	Braun 3:3	9:23 11:22
addresses	3:1	25:21	25:17	12:4,5 14:17
19:10	appears 10:14	authority 20:7	brief 9:22	14:19 16:15
addressing	applies 5:22	20:21 22:7	15:22,24	20:10,12,13
20:8	5:23 12:3	authorize 17:8	16:9,9,10,16	22:6,6
adjourned	13:4 19:1	automatically	17:14,18,21	cases 6:8,9,15
24:15	apply 14:17	11:23	20:23 21:1,4	13:20,22
Administrati	appreciate	available	21:7,20,21	category 20:19
1:16 2:1	14:11	24:11	22:12,25	20:21
adopted 5:22	approaches	Avenue 3:12	23:3,5	caveat 7:22
advance 5:12	16:6	3:17	briefed 15:10	certain 10:5
advisement	area 5:25	aware 8:21	briefing 5:18	CERTIFICATE
23:22	areas 5:18	11:17 14:7	6:10 7:10,11	25:1
affirmed 12:18	argue 12:4		7:12,16 8:4,6	Certified 2:6
13:3	20:25	B	8:11,12,14	certify 25:6,11
1 3.3				
	-	-	•	-

	_		_	
25:19	1:4 25:16	Costa 25:4,24	11:15 12:21	directed 16:11
chance 16:24	concern 21:8	counsel 3:1	13:18,19,22	18:3
23:2	concerned	4:23 20:14	13:24 14:14	disagree 17:24
changed 6:11	9:20	County 25:4	14:23 16:13	20:14,19
channel 5:21	concerning	25:24	16:15 18:24	discuss 4:10
characterize	19:7	course 22:3	19:8,10,15	5:9 6:11 17:2
20:13	concluded	court 5:3	19:18,25,25	17:6
circuit 5:22 6:1	24:19	13:11 14:23	20:3,5 22:5	discussed
6:22 7:7 9:1	conclusion	created 9:17	23:15	5:19 16:6
10:13 11:5,8	14:19	11:21	decisions 6:1	22:24
12:17 13:3	confer 5:11	creates 20:6	denied 14:25	discussing
13:11,18,19	conference	CSR 1:24	15:2 23:16	5:20 21:24
13:23 16:13	1:15 2:1 4:6		dependent	discussion
18:19 19:2,7	5:12	D	11:12,14	10:1
19:10,24	conferred	D 4:2	12:20	disqualifying
20:2,3 22:5	21:18	Dated 25:23	depending	25:21
circuit's 13:24	confirmed	day 3:4 4:14	4:20	doubtful 18:9
19:14	5:22 10:14	4:15,16 5:17	depends 19:5	drill 10:1
cited 20:11	consider 14:9	6:7,14 7:6,19	detail 11:23	due 22:3
Claim 12:19	24:5	7:21 8:3,8,10	13:9	Dunner 3:12
claims 10:15	considers	9:25 10:9	details 9:3	3:16 25:15
11:12,14	15:12	15:5,7,15,18	13:8,13	
12:8,11,13	consolidated	16:20 17:2	determine	E
12:16,20,23	13:20	17:11,24	12:3	E 4:2,2
13:2,4 18:25	construction	18:6 19:20	different 10:15	Eastern 2:4
19:13	5:20 10:14	20:17,18	11:8 14:14	4:1
clarification	construed	21:12,14	16:18	either 6:2 11:2
22:22	10:13	22:13,14,22	differently	11:13 17:19
clear 9:11	consulted	23:6,9,13,13	24:1	17:22 23:8
14:21	20:2	24:3,7,16,18	Dirba 1:17 2:2	Email 3:5,10
cocounsel 5:2	contemplating	25:9,16,23	4:5,6,16,21	3:14,19
colleague	15:17	Day's 7:3	5:5,14 6:6	Esq 3:4,9,13
22:17	Contra 25:4,24	DC 3:13	7:1,19 8:2,13	3:18 25:13
colleagues 4:9	copy 14:6,10	deal 13:13	9:6,25 11:18	25:14,17,18
Comcast 1:4	24:9	decided 6:9	13:15 14:5,9	essentially
25:15	Corporation	19:2 21:19	15:6,14 16:7	5:25 12:25
come 14:18	1:7 25:12	decision 5:24	16:25 17:7	13:12 14:3
coming 15:3	correct 8:8,10	6:3,5,16,18	18:3,11,14	example 6:17
commencing	8:19 16:17	6:22,25 7:7	19:22 20:17	21:25
2:4 25:9	16:20 18:5	8:21 9:1,5,8	21:12,15,17	Excellent
comments	24:2,3	9:14 10:16	22:15,21	24:14
8:15	correctly 8:3	10:19,21	23:7,11,21	exclude 23:15
Communica	9:10 11:20	11:3,5,8,10	24:5,8,14	exhibit 24:9
Ľ				

	1	1		1
exists 9:20	financial 25:22	17:17 23:11	Henderson	9:16 10:10
12:19	finding 13:2	goes 16:1	3:12,16	11:14,21
expect 7:24	Finnegan 3:12	going 9:16,18	25:14	12:3,4,10,22
22:23,25	3:16 25:14	9:23 10:10	hesitate 19:3	12:24,24
explaining	first 16:1 17:14	11:7 15:11	Hillview 3:17	13:14,24
20:11	17:18 21:7	16:12,22	Honor 4:14,18	15:10,12
extensive	five 17:20,25	18:7 19:11	4:25 5:13,16	16:17 18:4
21:11	18:10	19:17	7:5,22 8:20	18:16,18
	Floor 3:3,17	Goldberg 3:13	9:13 10:9	19:1 20:8,8
F	focus 19:18,19	4:25 5:1,13	12:7 15:5,18	20:11,23
fact 6:22	foregoing 25:6	7:2,4 8:5,9	16:20 17:24	22:3,23
fair 18:9	forth 13:9,14	8:13,19 9:7	19:20 20:18	issued 5:24
far 9:20 17:17	fought 13:1	9:13 11:20	21:14,16	6:18,24 7:7
Farabow 3:12	found 12:15	12:7 13:17	22:14,16	9:2 11:11
3:16 25:14	12:22 13:2	14:7,8,20	23:6,9 24:3,7	13:19
Farella 3:3	four 17:4,5	17:7,11	24:13	issues 6:9 7:6
25:17	21:22	18:15 19:3	Honors 7:9	9:9 10:6,7
favorite 15:20	frame 20:15	19:23 20:5	8:25	16:11 18:20
federal 5:21	framework	21:15,16	hour 2:4	20:9 21:24
6:1,22 7:7	17:23	22:15,16		23:23
9:1 10:13	Francisco 3:4	24:9,12	I	
11:5,8 12:17	3:8	25:13	idea 16:18	J
13:3,11,18	Frankly 10:18	good 4:5,19,20	identical 11:13	Jacob 3:18 5:2
13:19,23,24	further 5:18	4:21,25 5:8	11:13	22:17,20
16:13 18:19	21:13 23:7	24:17	impact 19:7	25:13
19:2,7,10,14	24:4 25:11	grant 21:18,20	impacts 6:20	Jacob.schro
19:24 20:2,3	25:19	granted 15:13	10:19 11:1	3:19
22:5		ground 10:22	16:14 18:25	James 3:4
feel 13:6 18:1	G	10:23	22:5	4:14 5:16
feelings 7:11	G 4:2	guess 7:22	inclined 21:19	25:16
file 15:21,23	Garrett 3:12	20:12	independently	Jameson 1:18
16:8,9 17:14	3:16 25:14	guys 14:1	8:7	2:2
17:15,16,16	general 9:24		indicate 8:15	Jday@fbm.c
17:19 22:10	generally 7:4	H	information	3:5
22:12 24:9	21:23	half 21:9,11	6:13,23 12:6	joined 4:8
filed 13:10	genesis 19:14	handle 15:16	14:11	Joshua 3:13
15:8 17:22	getting 10:12	happened	interest 25:21	25:13
23:14,14	20:22	9:17 14:13	IPR 5:10 6:18	Joshua.gold
final 5:24 6:2,4	give 6:12,17	hear 9:4	6:20 11:9,10	3:14
6:16,18,24	9:23 12:5	hearing 18:19	13:1 20:2	Josua 5:1
10:16,20	22:17	24:10	IPR2018-003	Judge 4:5,6,16
11:3 12:21	go 13:12,15	helpful 11:18	1:10 4:7	4:21 5:5,14
23:15 24:8	14:3,24	14:10	issue 8:20	6:6 7:1,19
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

8:2,13 9:6,25	Lee 1:18 2:2	meet 5:11	object 8:6,16	pages 15:22
11:18 13:15	4:9	mention 23:18	objection 8:17	15:24 17:17
14:5,9 15:6	legal 11:7	mentioned 5:8	offer 19:20	17:20,25
15:14 16:7	Leo 3:9 4:18	10:1 17:12	OFFICE 1:1	18:1,2,8,10
16:25 17:7	25:17	20:1 22:1,9	officer 25:4	21:11,23
18:3,11,14	let's 16:12	mentioning	okay 7:1,12	22:9
19:22 20:17	limit 16:4	7:6	8:2,23 14:5	Palo 3:18
21:12,15,17	limitation	merely 9:19	18:11 21:12	panel 21:17
22:15,21	10:20,24	mind 16:18	21:17 24:5,8	23:17
23:7,11,21	12:11,14,17	misrepresen	ones 16:23	parallel 6:18
24:5,8,14	12:19,25	14:22	opening 15:22	Park 3:17
Judges 1:16	17:25 19:11	Mitchell 1:17	16:8,10,16	part 7:14 15:11
2:2 4:9	19:12	2:2	20:23 21:1,4	particular
Juliet 1:17 2:2	limitations	moment 22:17	21:7,20	12:25 21:25
Juliet 1.17 Z.Z	10:15 14:17	moments	22:11,25	particularly
K	16:14 18:25	18:12	23:3	22:7
Kathleen 1:24	19:8	Montgomery	opinion 11:25	parties 5:11,14
2:5 25:2	limited 10:5	3:3	15:1	5:17,23 6:3
keep 14:22	21:23 22:4	months 6:19	opposition	6:10 7:15,25
Keker 3:7	limits 17:17	moot 23:16,25	15:23	15:18,21,23
25:18	line 4:12,17	morning 4:20	option 15:21	16:8,9,21
kind 17:12	5:3,4	motion 23:15	15:25 16:8	17:18 21:19
20:15	little 10:2 12:5	23:24	17:13	22:10,12
Kinder 1:19	Llam@keker	motions 23:16	order 21:5	23:14 25:20
2:3 4:9	3:10	Murdock 7:17	22:3 24:6	parts 19:18
know 6:20	LLC 1:4 25:16	10:23 22:2	original 12:21	party 16:24
10:19 11:4	LLP 3:3 25:17	10.23 22.2	ought 15:12	17:22 23:8
11:23 16:22	long 15:1	N	overall 7:5	25:12
17:2 18:7	21:10	N 4:2	owner 1:8 3:11	patent 1:1,2,8
19:17 21:9	longer 23:25	necessarily	4:24 5:1 6:21	1:11,16 2:2
21:11 23:19	looked 11:22	13:7 15:20	8:5,12 10:10	3:11 4:7,23
	lot 11:16 13:9	need 8:22 9:3	11:7,19 16:1	5:1 6:21 8:5
L	101 11.10 13.9	9:21 10:7	18:4 20:24	8:11 10:10
L 1:19 2:3 3:4	M	11:25 23:22	22:24 23:2	11:6,11,19
3:9,13 25:13	making 14:14	needs 13:7	25:12 25:12	12:8,9 16:1
25:16,17	March 1:14 2:3	Nest 3:7 25:18	owner's 16:16	16:16 18:4
Lam 3:9 4:18	4:1 25:9,23	new 3:12 21:5	OWING 5 10.10	20:24 22:24
4:18 25:18	Martel 3:3	note 25:8	Р	23:2 25:12
language	25:17	notes 16:12	P 4:2	patience 18:14
11:14	matter 15:2	Number 4:8	p.m 2:4 4:1	Pause 18:13
law 20:10,13	matters 9:5,8	NW 3:12	24:19 25:9	personal
lay 18:8	9:11		25:10	25:22
laying 21:2	means 15:3	0	page 17:17	perspective
22:4	11104110 10.0	O 4:2	Page / . /	hersherrive
	<u> </u>	- ·· -	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

19:5	previously	R 4:2	7:8 9:18	S
Peters 3:7	12:4	radar 23:20	11:15 16:15	S 4:2
25:18	primarily 8:4	raise 7:9 16:11	20:4,6 22:7	San 3:4,8
petitioner 1:5	prior 7:18 22:2	20:22,23	remand 4:10	saying 14:22
3:2 4:13,15	procedure	raised 6:7	5:9	23:24
4:17,19 8:3	4:10 5:9	reach 5:14	remanded	says 9:9
9:25 16:1	17:10	reached 7:15	6:23	scenario 17:20
17:14,15	proceeding	readily 11:4	reply 16:2	Schroeder
18:21,23	6:12 9:12	ready 17:5	17:16 21:9	3:18 5:2,16
22:23 23:1,3	12:9,10,15	really 16:4	Reported 1:23	22:19,20
23:13 25:16	12:20 13:5	reason 13:6,25	reporter 1:24	24:17 25:13
petitioner's	20:1 22:8	reasoning	2:7 5:3 25:1	second 5:25
16:10 19:6	24:1,10	14:16	25:3	6:7 10:22
20:14	proceedings	reasons 9:15	request 8:7	11:6 15:24
petitioners	12:12 18:13	12:23	9:2 13:10,11	17:21
7:12	24:19 25:5,7	received 5:21	13:15,17	see 8:25 16:12
places 11:1	25:8	record 25:7	14:1,6,23,25	22:17
please 14:2	Professional	reference 7:17	15:2,8 18:19	seeks 8:4
24:9	25:3	referenced	21:19 24:8	sense 17:18
point 5:25 6:7	Promptu 1:7	11:21 18:5	require 10:7	19:16 20:6
6:8 10:17	15:8 25:12	18:17	10:18	20:10
15:5,7	proposal	referencing	Research 3:17	sequential
pointed 13:23	15:15 17:9	11:24	reserve 7:22	15:25 16:5
pointing 10:25	propose 17:1	refile 23:18	resolve 23:25	17:19,22
points 19:4	proposed 7:13	regarding	respond 7:23	21:5
position 9:7	proposing	18:16,16	10:11 11:9	SESSION 4:3
9:16 12:2,6	6:10 16:10	Registered	12:2 15:9,13	set 7:25 13:9
21:2	18:21	25:2	16:24 17:6	13:14
possibilities	PTAB 6:1	rehearing 9:2	responding	short 21:9,9
17:13	purpose 4:9	9:14 13:10	17:25 18:10	Shorthand 2:7
postdate 6:16	5:8	13:12,18	21:10	side 15:9,10
practical 15:2	purposes	14:1,6,24,25	response 16:9	23:14
precluded	13:21	15:3,8	17:15 18:2	similar 20:21
14:14		rejected 10:23	20:17,25	simple 9:15
preclusion	Q	relate 18:20	21:21 22:12	simply 14:15
9:17 10:10	qualifies 7:17	related 7:8	23:4	simultaneous
11:21 12:3,5	22:2	11:11 25:19	responsive	16:7 17:19
12:24 16:17	question 5:6	relates 9:9	23:4	17:23 21:20
18:4,17 19:1	18:16 19:23	12:9	right 7:23	21:21
20:9 22:24	20:22 23:17	relating 4:7	Robert 1:19	simultaneou
preferred	questions 6:6	relationship	2:3	15:22,23
17:13	7:2 22:13	18:22	RPR-RMR-C	single 13:21
present 25:11	R	relevant 6:25	1:25 2:6	soon 24:11
<u> </u>				

sorry 19:21	23:21	time 2:4 4:1	virtually 11:13	10:21 11:3
23:13	taken 25:5,8	17:4	11:13	12:21
sort 7:23 11:7	takes 10:25	timeline 16:25	vs 1:6	
sought 9:14	11:16	today 4:8,10		X
sound 10:4	talk 14:3,24	5:9,12 21:24	W	
speaking	19:6	22:25	want 8:11,14	Υ
19:25 23:12	talked 15:19	topic 11:6	14:21 15:7	Yeah 18:6
specific 17:10	16:3 17:12	21:13	18:23 21:13	York 3:12
split 16:18	talking 15:3	topics 10:2,12	wanted 8:20	
Stanford 3:17	19:9,11	16:19 18:23	23:10	
started 10:12	Telephone 3:5	22:3,4	wants 8:12	0
State 2:8 25:3	3:9,14,19	TRADEMARK	warranted	
STATES 1:1	telephonically	1:1	13:2	1
Stenographic	2:5	transcript	Washington	1 15:21
1:24 2:7	telling 9:19	24:10 25:6	3:13	10068 1:24
Stenotype	ten 15:22,24	TRIAL 1:2	wasn't 15:1	17th 3:3
25:8	17:17 18:1,2	true 25:6	way 20:15	
Street 3:3,8	18:8 21:23	two 5:18 10:12	ways 9:11	2
strong 7:11	22:9	15:19,21	we'll 21:18	2 15:25
subsequent	ten-page 16:3	16:5,6 17:13	22:3,9	2:01 2:4 4:1
6:1 20:20	term 5:21		we're 9:20	25:9
subsequently	10:13 11:1	U	15:3 19:9,25	2:32 24:19
12:17	Thank 5:5	U.S 4:7	21:19 24:15	25:10
substantive	18:14 22:20	understand	we've 5:19,19	20001-4413
6:8	22:21 24:7	8:5 9:7 10:2	6:15 16:3,6	3:13
sufficient 9:21	24:12,14,16	10:6 15:14	16:23	202 3:14
11:23 17:21	24:17	understandi	Wednesday	2021 1:14 2:3
suggesting	thereof 2:5	8:3 9:10 10:4	1:14 2:3	4:1 25:9,23
6:14 24:4	thing 19:9,17	understood	weeks 17:4,5	235 3:3
summary 7:3	23:10	8:14 11:19	22:10,11	24 1:14 2:3 4:1
suppose 21:22	things 24:1	11:20 23:6	went 21:4	24th 25:9
21:25	think 4:21 6:15	UNITED 1:1	weren't 6:4	26th 25:23
sure 9:6 10:9	6:19,25 7:4,5	unpatentable	Wilkins 1:24	27 12:19
14:21 20:14	7:14,25 8:10	12:14,16,23	2:6 25:2	2nd 3:17
surreply 16:2	8:20 10:12	13:2,4 19:13	words 9:10	
17:16	10:17,24	unrelated 21:6	18:22	3
suspect 8:11	11:15,16,17	update 20:20	works 20:9	3300 3:17
23:22	15:11 16:5	useful 5:18	worthwhile 7:9	344 9:18 12:10
Systems 1:7	17:11,17,20	10:17	wouldn't 8:7	12:20 13:20
25:12	19:4,17	V	8:16	13:22
—	thinking 16:21		written 5:24	345 7:8 8:22
T	three 17:4,5	Van 3:7 25:18	6:3,4,16,18	9:17 11:22
take 18:11	22:10,11	view 7:5 9:4	6:24 10:16	12:8,9,15
		17:20 20:7		
<u> </u>				

		1
13:20 20:2		
4 408 3:14		
415 3:5,9		
5		
6 60923:14		
633 3:8 650 3:19		
676-2246 3:9 6765 3:19		
7		
7,047,196 1:11 4:8		
8 849 3:19		
9		
901 3:12 94104 3:4		
94111 3:8 94304-1203		
3:18 954-4414 3:5		