

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

GOOGLE INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

ALFONSO CIOFFI, MEGAN ELIZABETH ROZMAN,
MELANIE ANN ROZMAN, AND MORGAN LEE ROZMAN,
Patent Owners.

Case CBM2017-00010
Patent RE43,528

Mailed: November 17, 2016

Before Carrie Johnson, *Trial Paralegal*

NOTICE OF FILING DATE ACCORDED TO PETITION
AND
TIME FOR FILING PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

The petition for covered business method patent review filed in the
above proceeding has been accorded the filing date of November 4, 2016.

Case: CBM2017-00010
Patent No. RE43,528

Patent Owner may file a preliminary response to the petition no later than three months from the date of this notice. The preliminary response is limited to setting forth the reasons why the requested review should not be instituted. Patent Owner may also file an election to waive the preliminary response to expedite the proceeding. For more information, please consult the Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48756 (Aug. 14, 2012), which is available on the Board Web site at <http://www.uspto.gov/PTAB>.

Patent Owner is advised of the requirement to submit mandatory notice information under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(a)(2) within 21 days of service of the petition.

The parties are encouraged to use the heading on the first page of this Notice for all future filings in the proceeding.

The parties are advised that under 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c), recognition of counsel *pro hac vice* requires a showing of good cause. The parties are authorized to file motions for *pro hac vice* admission under 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c). Such motions shall be filed in accordance with the “Order -- Authorizing Motion *for Pro Hac Vice* Admission” in Case IPR2013-00639, Paper 7, a copy of which is available on the Board Web site under “Representative Orders, Decisions, and Notices.”

The parties are reminded that unless otherwise permitted by 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(b)(2), all filings in this proceeding must be made electronically in the Patent Review Processing System (PRPS), accessible from the Board Web site at <http://www.uspto.gov/PTAB>. To file documents, users must first obtain a user ID and password by registering with PRPS. Information regarding how to register with and use PRPS is available at the Board Web site.

Case: CBM2017-00010
Patent No. RE43,528

If there are any questions pertaining to this notice, please contact Carrie Johnson at 571-272-5169 or the Patent Trial and Appeal Board at 571-272-7822.

PETITIONER:

James L. Day
Daniel Callaway
FARELLA BRAUN MARTEL LLP
jday@fbm.com
dcallaway@fbm.com

PATENT OWNERS:

SLATER MATSIL, LLP
c/o Steven Slater or Ira Matsil
17950 Preston Road, Suite 1000
Dallas TX 75252-5793

Eric W. Benisek
Robert S. McArthur
VASQUEZ BENISEK & LINDGREN LLP
3685 Mt. Diablo Boulevard, Suite 300
Lafayette, CA 94549

William Ellsworth Davis , III
THE DAVIS FIRM, PC-LONGVIEW
222 North Fredonia Street
Longview, TX 75601

Charles Ainsworth
Robert Christopher Bunt
Robert M. Parker
PARKER, BUNT & AINSWORTH, P.C.
100 E. Ferguson, Suite 1114
Tyler, Texas 75702

**NOTICE CONCERNING ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION
(ADR)**

The Patent Trial and Appeal Board (PTAB) strongly encourages parties who are considering settlement to consider alternative dispute resolution as a means of settling the issues that may be raised in an AIA trial proceeding. Many AIA trials are settled prior to a Final Written Decision. Those considering settlement may wish to consider alternative dispute resolution techniques early in a proceeding to produce a quicker, mutually agreeable resolution of a dispute or to at least narrow the scope of matters in dispute. Alternative dispute resolution has the potential to save parties time and money.

Many non-profit organizations, both inside and outside the intellectual property field, offer alternative dispute resolution services. Listed below are the names and addresses of several such organizations. The listings are provided for the convenience of parties involved in cases before the PTAB; the PTAB does not sponsor or endorse any particular organization's alternative dispute resolution services. In addition, consideration may be given to utilizing independent alternative dispute resolution firms. Such firms may be located through a standard keyword Internet search.

CPR INSTITUTE FOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION	AMERICAN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW ASSOCIATION (AIPLA)	AMERICAN ARBITRATIO N ASSOCIATIO N (AAA)	WORLD INTELLECTUA L PROPERTY ORGANIZATI ON (WIPO)	AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION (ABA)
Telephone: (212) 949-6490	Telephone: (703) 415-0780	Telephone: (212) 484-3266	Telephone: 41 22 338 9111	Telephone : (202) 662-1000
Fax: (212) 949-8859	Fax: (703) 415-0786	Fax: (212) 307-4387	Fax: 41 22 733 5428	N/A
575 Lexington Ave New York, NY 10022	241 18th Street, South, Suite 700 Arlington, VA 22202	140 West 51st Street New York, NY 10020	34, chemin des Colombettes CH-1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland	1050 Connecticut Ave, NW Washington D.C. 20036
www.cpradr.org	www.aipla.org	www.adr.org	www.wipo.int	www.americanbar.org

If parties to an AIA trial proceeding consider using alternative dispute resolution, the PTAB would like to know whether the parties ultimately decided to engage in alternative dispute resolution and the reasons why or why not. If the parties actually engage in alternative dispute resolution, the PTAB would be interested to learn what mechanism (e.g., arbitration,

Case: CBM2017-00010

Patent No. RE43,528

mediation, etc.) was used and the general result. Such a statement from the parties is not required but would be helpful to the PTAB in assessing the value of alternative dispute resolution to parties involved in AIA trial proceedings. To report an experience with ADR, please forward a summary of the particulars to the following email address:
PTAB_ADR_Comments@uspto.gov