	11 / 1 /
	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 ¹
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	¹ Case CBM2014-00103 has been consolidated with CBM2014-00102; case CBM2014-00107 has been consolidated with CBM2014-00106; case
22	CBM2014-00109 has been consolidated with CBM2014-00108; case CBM2014-00113 has been consolidated with CBM2014-00112.
23	



```
2
 1
                     APPEARANCES
 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
         (202) 508-4600
 8
         steven.baughman@ropesgray.com
 9
10
11
    ON BEHALF OF THE PATENT OWNER:
12
         MICHAEL CASEY, ESQUIRE
         Davidson Berquist Jackson & Gowdey
13
14
         8300 Greensboro Drive, Suite 500
15
         McLean, Virginia 22102
16
         (571) 765-7700
17
         mcasey@dbjg.com
18
19
20
21
22
23
```



3 1 PROCEEDINGS 2 THE COURT: With that, Mr. Baughman, could 3 you please take the floor? MR. BAUGHMAN: Yes, your Honor. Thank you. 4 It's Steve Baughman for petitioners. 5 And, your Honor, our first request this 6 morning is that the page limits for our reply briefs 7 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. 14 That increase is then implemented in 15 numerous orders and pending trials. Just as some examples, there's the LG Chem case, IPR2014-00692, 16 Paper 48 at 2. That was last week, April 6th. 17 18 the board there said: "We exercised our discretion to revise the page limit of petitioner's reply brief to 19 reflect this change in the rules." 20 21 Another example is the Ford versus Paice 22 case last Thursday, IPR2014-01415. That's Paper 11 at

4 1 2 to 3. 2 And there are numerous others. 3 The director, in her blog, announced that this determination was appropriate for replies generally and noted that commenters had said that 15 5 pages for a petitioner's reply brief is not a 6 7 commensurate number of pages to respond to a patent 8 owner's response. 9 And quoting from the blog: "We have heard you and we agree." 10 11 And just to be clear, it's not the 12 petitioner's goal to use every last page necessarily in each proceeding, but we do request the upper limit 13 that the director has stated is appropriate now for 14 15 all cases be applied to our reply briefs here. 16 THE COURT: Mr. Baughman, is there anything specific in this case that warrants the increase to 25 17 18 pages? 19 MR. BAUGHMAN: Your Honor, we do have consolidated cases here in pairs. But respectfully, 20 21 our position is that the -- that the announcement from 22 the director indicates that the increase is



5 1 appropriate for all replies. And so a case-by-case showing, as would be 2 3 required, for example, for an individual motion to expand page limits shouldn't be required based on 4 the -- the direction from the director. 5 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 limits were extended to 25 pages, the replies would be 10 11 longer than the oppositions themselves, your Honor. 12 The last -- the last of the four cases in the CBM2014-00102, the opposition is only 31 pages. 13 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 speedy, just, and efficient proceedings. 17 This is -- this is going to create just an 18 opportunity to create very long proceedings that are 19 not to the point and will be a drain on the court's 20 21 time and on the patent owner's time. 22 THE COURT: Mr. Casey, that was the patent



DOCKET A L A R M

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.

