

EXHIBIT 2

Trials@uspto.gov
571-272-7822

Paper No. 14
Date Entered: April 25, 2014

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

REDFIN CORPORATION
Petitioner

v.

CORELOGIC SOLUTIONS, LLC
Patent Owner

Case CBM2014-00027
Patent 5,361,201

Before MICHAEL P. TIERNEY, JONI Y. CHANG and
BRIAN J. McNAMARA, *Administrative Patent Judges.*

McNAMARA, *Administrative Patent Judge.*

INITIAL CONFERENCE SUMMARY
Conduct of the Proceeding
37C.F.R. § 42.5

Case CBM2014-00027
Patent 5,361,201

An initial conference in CBM2014-00027, which involves U.S. Patent 5,361,201 (the '201 Patent) was conducted on April 23, 2014. Redfin Corporation ("Petitioner") was represented by Richard T. Black and Joel B. Ard. Corelogic Solutions, LLC ("Patent Owner") was represented by Thomas A. Rozylowicz. The following subjects were discussed during the conference:

Related Matters

The final written decision in related CBM2012-00007 (Paper 58), entered on January 30, 2014, is currently on appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit. The parties reported that the litigation pending in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Texas currently is stayed.

Scheduling Order

Patent Owner noted that the only substantive issue in this proceeding concerns patentable subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and that the United States Supreme Court recently heard arguments on this issue in Case No. 13-298, *Alice Corporation Pty. v. CLS Bank International*, ("*CLS Bank*"). Patent Owner requested that the date for filing a Patent Owner Response in this proceeding be delayed to allow time for the Supreme Court to issue its decision in *CLS Bank*. Patent Owner noted that such a delay would be more efficient and cost effective than proceeding on the current schedule by avoiding the need for Patent Owner to update its Patent Owner Response should the Supreme Court issue a ruling in the current term, which is expected to end on June 30, 2014. We did not agree to revise the schedule during the hearing, but noted that we would consider Patent Owner's request.

Upon due consideration, we agree that Patent Owner's request has merit and that the Scheduling Order should be revised to set the date for the Patent Owner

Case CBM2014-00027
Patent 5,361,201

Response to be a date after June 30, 2014. An Amended Scheduling Order is being entered separately. The intervals between the remaining DUE DATES in the Amended Scheduling Order are approximately the same as the intervals in the Scheduling Order entered on March 20, 2014 (Paper 13).

The parties are reminded that, without obtaining prior authorization from the Board, they may stipulate to different dates for DATES 1-3, as provided in the Scheduling Order, by filing an appropriate notice with the Board. The parties may not stipulate to any other changes to the Scheduling Order.

Protective Order

The parties have not discussed a protective order at this time. No protective order has been entered. 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, they should file a signed copy of the proposed protective order with the motion to seal. If the parties propose a protective order other than or departing from the default Standing Protective Order, Office Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48756, App. B (Aug. 14, 2012), they must submit a joint, proposed protective order, accompanied by a red-lined version based on the default protective order in Appendix B to the Board's Office Patent Trial Practice Guide. *See, id.* at 48769.

Initial Disclosures and Discovery

The parties have not stipulated to any initial disclosures at this time. The parties are reminded of the discovery provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 42.51-52 and Office Trial Practice Guide. *See, 77 Fed. Reg.* at 48761-2. Discovery requests and objections are not to be filed with the Board without prior authorization. If the parties are unable to resolve discovery issues between them, the parties may request a conference with the Board. A motion to exclude, which does not require

Case CBM2014-00027
Patent 5,361,201

Board authorization, must be filed to preserve any objection. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.64; Office Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. at 48767. There are no discovery issues pending at this time.

The parties are reminded of the provisions for taking testimony found at 37 C.F.R. § 42.53 and the Office Trial Practice Manual at 77 Fed. Reg. at 48772, App. D.

Motions

The parties indicated that there are currently no motions to be addressed.

The parties are reminded that, except as otherwise provided in the Rules, Board authorization is required before filing a Motion. 37 C.F.R. § 42.20(b). A party seeking to file a motion should request a conference to obtain authorization to file the motion. No motions are authorized in this proceeding at this time.

A Motion to Amend the patent is not available in this proceeding because the '201 Patent is expired.

Settlement

The parties stated that there are no settlement discussions currently underway.

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.