

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

REGIONS FINANCIAL CORPORATION, ADVANCE AMERICA, CASH
ADVANCE CENTERS, INC., and CNU ONLINE HOLDINGS, LLC
F/K/A CASH AMERICA NET HOLDINGS, LLC
Petitioners

v.

RETIREMENT CAPITAL ACCESS MANAGEMENT COMPANY LLC
Patent Owner

Case CBM2014-00012
US Patent 6,625,582

Before GLENN J. PERRY and TRENTON A. WARD, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

WARD, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

ORDER
Conduct of the Proceeding
37 C.F.R. § 42.5

An initial conference call was held on April 9, 2014 and attended by the above-identified panel members and respective counsel for the parties. The following matters were discussed.

Scheduling Order

The parties indicated that they have no concerns with the Scheduling Order (Paper 17) entered on March 25, 2014. As indicated in the Scheduling Order, the parties may stipulate to different dates for Due Dates 1-3. Paper 17, 2. To the extent that the parties reach an agreement on different dates for Due Dates 1-3, the parties will need to file a notice of stipulation.

Motions

Counsel for Patent Owner indicated that Patent Owner does not intend to file a motion to amend at this time. Should Patent Owner decide to file a motion to amend, it first must confer with the Board. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.121(a). With respect to a possible motion to amend, Patent Owner is reminded that, unlike a challenge to a patented claim, where the burden is on the petitioner to demonstrate unpatentability, with a motion to amend, the burden is on the patent owner to demonstrate patentability. We direct the parties to the discussion in *Idle Free Systems, Inc. v. Bergstrom, Inc.* of the requirements for a motion to amend claims. *See* Decision—Motion to Amend Claims, IPR2012-00027, Paper 26; *see also* Final Written Decision, IPR2012-00027, Paper 66.

Protective Order

The parties indicated that, at this time, they do not expect to rely upon confidential information. Thus, no protective order is required at this time. Should

a party discover that certain potentially confidential materials are required for their case, the party is encouraged to seek a conference with the Board to discuss a possible protective order prior to filing a motion to seal.

Settlement

The parties indicated that they have not had discussions regarding settlement.

ORDER

Accordingly, it is hereby

ORDERED that no motions are authorized other than those already authorized by rule or in the Scheduling Order.

For Petitioners:

John Caracappa
Harold Fox
Gretchen Miller
William Barrow
STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP
jcaracappa@steptoe.com
hfox@steptoe.com
gmiller@steptoe.com
wbarrow@steptoe.com

Christopher J. Chan
Mia K. Fiedler
SUTHERLAND ASBILL & BRENNAN LLP
chris.chan@sutherland.com
mia.fiedler@sutherland.com

CBM2014-00012
US Patent 6,625,582

Mark T. Deming
mdeming@polsinelli.com
POLSINELLI PC

For Patent Owner:

Casey Griffith
Shital Desai
KLEMCHUK KUBASTA LLP
casey.griffith@kk-llp.com
sita.desai@kk-llp.com