

Capital Reporting Company  
Apple v. Smartflash, April 13, 2015

1

1 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

2

3 BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

4

5 APPLE INC.,

6 Petitioner

7

v.

8

SMARTFLASH LLC,

9

Patent Owner

10

11

Cases<sup>1</sup>

12

CBM2014-00102(Patent 8,118,221 B2)

13

CBM2014-00106(Patent 8,033,458 B2)

14

CBM2014-00108(Patent 8,061,598 B2)

15

CBM2014-00112(Patent 7,942,317 B2)

16

17

Monday, April 13, 2015

18

11:02 a.m.

19

20 Reported by: Chaz Bennett, Capital Reporting Company

21

<sup>1</sup> Case CBM2014-00103 has been consolidated with CBM2014-00102; case  
CBM2014-00107 has been consolidated with CBM2014-00106; case  
CBM2014-00109 has been consolidated with CBM2014-00108; case  
CBM2014-00113 has been consolidated with CBM2014-00112.

22

23

(866) 448 - DEPO

Capital Reporting Company  
Apple v. Smartflash, April 13, 2015

2

1 A P P E A R A N C E S

2

3 ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER:

4 STEVEN J. BAUGHMAN, ESQUIRE

5 Ropes & Gary, LLP

6 700 12th Street, Northwest, #900

7 Washington, D.C. 20005

8 (202) 508-4600

9 steven.baughman@ropesgray.com

10

11 ON BEHALF OF THE PATENT OWNER:

12 MICHAEL CASEY, ESQUIRE

13 Davidson Berquist Jackson & Gowdey

14 8300 Greensboro Drive, Suite 500

15 McLean, Virginia 22102

16 (571) 765-7700

17 mcasey@dbjg.com

18

19

20

21

22

23

(866) 448 - DEPO

Capital Reporting Company  
Apple v. Smartflash, April 13, 2015

3

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 THE COURT: With that, Mr. Baughman, could  
3 you please take the floor?

4 MR. BAUGHMAN: Yes, your Honor. Thank you.

5 It's Steve Baughman for petitioners.

6 And, your Honor, our first request this  
7 morning is that the page limits for our reply briefs  
8 be increased to the new limits that the PTO director  
9 announced as applicable immediately. That's 25 pages  
10 per reply.

11 It's based on Director Lee's March 27th blog  
12 announcement which, for the record, is  
13 [www.uspto.gov/blog](http://www.uspto.gov/blog).

14 That increase is then implemented in  
15 numerous orders and pending trials. Just as some  
16 examples, there's the LG Chem case, IPR2014-00692,  
17 Paper 48 at 2. That was last week, April 6th. And  
18 the board there said: "We exercised our discretion to  
19 revise the page limit of petitioner's reply brief to  
20 reflect this change in the rules."

21 Another example is the Ford versus Paice  
22 case last Thursday, IPR2014-01415. That's Paper 11 at

(866) 448 - DEPO

Capital Reporting Company  
Apple v. Smartflash, April 13, 2015

4

1 2 to 3.

2 And there are numerous others.

3 The director, in her blog, announced that  
4 this determination was appropriate for replies  
5 generally and noted that commenters had said that 15  
6 pages for a petitioner's reply brief is not a  
7 commensurate number of pages to respond to a patent  
8 owner's response.

9 And quoting from the blog: "We have heard  
10 you and we agree."

11 And just to be clear, it's not the  
12 petitioner's goal to use every last page necessarily  
13 in each proceeding, but we do request the upper limit  
14 that the director has stated is appropriate now for  
15 all cases be applied to our reply briefs here.

16 THE COURT: Mr. Baughman, is there anything  
17 specific in this case that warrants the increase to 25  
18 pages?

19 MR. BAUGHMAN: Your Honor, we do have  
20 consolidated cases here in pairs. But respectfully,  
21 our position is that the -- that the announcement from  
22 the director indicates that the increase is

(866) 448 - DEPO

**Capital Reporting Company  
Apple v. Smartflash, April 13, 2015**

5

1 appropriate for all replies.

2           And so a case-by-case showing, as would be  
3 required, for example, for an individual motion to  
4 expand page limits shouldn't be required based on  
5 the -- the direction from the director.

6           THE COURT: Thank you.

7           Mr. Casey, would you like to respond?

8           MR. CASEY: Yes, your Honor.

9           In three of the four cases where the page  
10 limits were extended to 25 pages, the replies would be  
11 longer than the oppositions themselves, your Honor.  
12 The last -- the last of the four cases in the  
13 CBM2014-00102, the opposition is only 31 pages.

14           So I don't think that this is a -- is a  
15 necessary step and, in fact, it encourages a briefing  
16 that will be extended and will not meet the goals of  
17 speedy, just, and efficient proceedings.

18           This is -- this is going to create just an  
19 opportunity to create very long proceedings that are  
20 not to the point and will be a drain on the court's  
21 time and on the patent owner's time.

22           THE COURT: Mr. Casey, that was the patent

(866) 448 - DEPO

# 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.