

# EXHIBIT A

## PROPOSED STIPULATION: *INTER PARTES* REVIEW DETERMINATIONS

U.S. Patent No. 7,917,843 (“’843 Patent”) was the subject of a proceeding at the Patent Office called *inter partes* review, also referred to as “IPR.” An IPR permits a petitioner to request cancellation of patent claims as unpatentable on the basis of prior art consisting of patents or printed publications. Specifically:

- On December 2, 2013, Google filed an IPR arguing that the Asserted Claims of the ’843 Patent were unpatentable on four grounds: (1) because they are obvious in light of U.S. Patent No. 5,859,636, also referred to as the “Pandit” reference, (2) because they are obvious in light of U.S. Patent No. 5,946,647, also referred to as the “Miller” reference, (3) because they are obvious in light of U.S. Patent No. 5,644,735, also referred to as the “Luciw” reference, (4) because they are obvious in light of the April 1998 issue of the SIGCHI Bulletin, also referred to as LiveDoc/DropZones.
- On June 11, 2014, the Patent Office made the following rulings as part of instituting IPR: (1) it ruled that Google had demonstrated a reasonable likelihood of prevailing on the obviousness ground of unpatentability based on Pandit, (2) it ruled that Google had not demonstrated a reasonable likelihood that it would prevail with respect to any of claims 1-44 in a § 103(a) challenge over Miller, (3) it ruled that Google has not demonstrated a reasonable likelihood that it would prevail with respect to any of claims 1-7, 10-29, and 32-44 in a § 103(a) challenge over Luciw, (4) it ruled that Google had not demonstrated a reasonable likelihood that it would prevail with respect to any of claims 1-44 in a §103(a) challenge over LiveDoc/DropZones.
- On June 9, 2015, the Patent Office issued a Final Written Decision in the IPR, holding that the Asserted Claims of the ’843 Patent were unpatentable in light of Pandit.
- On August 10, 2016, the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, also known as the “Federal Circuit,” held that Google did not prove unpatentability in light of Pandit.

The litigation in this court was stayed and therefore became inactive on February 24, 2014, in order to allow for final resolution of the IPR. The case restarted on October 23, 2018 after the IPR proceedings were completed.