

RECORD OF ORAL HEARING
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ABB, INC.,

Petitioner

V.

ROY-G-BIV CORP.,

Patent Owner

Case IPR2013-00062 and IPR2013-00282

Patent U.S. 6,516,236

Case IPR2013-00074 and IPR2013-00286

Patent U.S. 8,073,557

Oral Hearing Held January 23, 2014

Before THOMAS L. GIANNETTI, JENNIFER S. BISK, and JEREMY M.
PLENZLER (VIA VIDEO HOOKUP), *Administrative Patent Judges.*

1 APPEARANCES:

2 ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER:

3 RICK MC LEOD
4 Klarquist Sparkman, LLP
5 One World Trade Center
6 121 S.W. Salmon Street, Suite 1600
7 Portland, OR 97204-2988
8

9 ON BEHALF OF THE PATENT OWNER:

10 RICHARD BLACK
11 ROY-G-BIV Corporation
12 154 E Bingen Point Way
13 Bingen, Washington 98605
14
15

16 The above-entitled matter came on for hearing on Thursday, January
17 23, 2014 commencing at 1:00 p.m., at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office,
18 600 Dulany Street, Alexandria, Virginia.
19
20
21

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

23 JUDGE GIANNETTI: So we are here for our final hearing in
24 two IPR matters, Inter Partes Reviews, IPR 2013-00062 and IPR
25 2013-00074.

26 I'm Judge Giannetti. This is Judge Bisk. And Judge Plenzler
27 is appearing remotely from Detroit on the screen. This is the first hearing I
28 have had with a remote judge. I understand our equipment has been
29 working very well, and let's keep our fingers crossed that it continues to do
30 that.

31 All right. So may I have appearances of counsel first for the
32 Petitioner?

1 MR. MCLEOD: Rick McLeod, Your Honor. I have with me
2 Robert Nupp, the in-house counsel for ABB.

3 JUDGE GIANNETTI: I'm sorry, the second name was?

4 MR. MCLEOD: Robert Nupp.

5 MR. NUPP: Robert Nupp.

6 JUDGE GIANNETTI: Welcome. And for the Patent Owner?

7 MR. BLACK: Thank you. Good afternoon,

8 Your Honors. This is Richard Black on behalf of Patent
9 Owner ROY-G-BIV. I have with me backup counsel Richard Meyer and
10 backup counsel Doug Wilson and also (indiscernible) Dave Brown.

11 JUDGE GIANNETTI: Welcome. All right. So the ground
12 rules are here that each side has one hour to present argument. You may
13 divide argument as you wish. The Petitioner may -- will go first and may
14 reserve rebuttal time. Let me know at the beginning of the argument how
15 much time you are reserving.

16 Okay. Any questions before we begin?

17 (No response.)

18 JUDGE GIANNETTI: Okay. Mr. McLeod, you may proceed
19 when you're ready.

20 MR. MCLEOD: Thank you, Your Honor. I'd like to reserve
21 25 minutes for rebuttal if I may?

22 JUDGE GIANNETTI: Okay. So that's 1:35. You have until
23 1:35. And I'll try to give you five minutes notice towards the end.

24 MR. MCLEOD: Thank you. I have (indiscernible) slides for
25 the panel, if they would like them.

1 JUDGE GIANNETTI: Please.

2 MR. MCLEOD: Judge Plenzler, I apologize. I haven't quite
3 technologically figured out how to deliver those to Detroit yet.

4 JUDGE GIANNETTI: We've got your demonstratives in
5 advance, so I believe Judge Plenzler has access to them.

6 MR. MCLEOD: May it please the Board, the claims of the
7 '236 and '557 Patents are unpatentable for the reasons that have been given
8 in our petition. If you'll turn to page 2 of our slides, we've summarized the
9 grounds for trial for which the Board has instituted this proceeding.

10 One thing is clear, the Gertz thesis, the Stewart thesis and the
11 Morrow paper are the central basis for each of the grounds of rejection.
12 Some additional references address a few items of independent claims from
13 the merged '282 and '286 Patents.

14 Slide 3, we summarize what we believe to be RGB's central
15 arguments in their response. As to specific claim terms, component
16 functions, component code, driver functions, they tend to argue that
17 functions must mean executable code, although executable code does not
18 appear in any claim construction.

19 They asserted that primitive operations are not taught by Gertz,
20 however we note that they didn't challenge that Morrow taught trajectory
21 primitives, which the Board found in its order instituting trial, that the
22 combination of the trajectory primitives and Morrow with the teachings of
23 Gertz would disclose primitive operation.

24 They had some arguments in their response regarding the
25 function pointer table, which we took directly from their infringement

1 contentions and pointed how that was contained in a prior reference. And
2 then there is a brief argument about the -- not being able to write control
3 commands to a file in the UNIX system and they have this argument that
4 Gertz and Morrow are not prior art, which we explain that's just not true.
5 And then there are some arguments that it's somehow impossible to combine
6 the prior art.

7 Looking at page four, the disputed claim terms that are
8 generally listed in their responses are listed. The first place I would like to
9 start with this is claim construction, Slide 5.

10 Now as we know, this is an IPR. We use the broadest
11 reasonable interpretation standard. In our petition, or actually in the order
12 instituting trial, the Board adopted our proposed constructions with the
13 exception of two. And RGB's response, they argue that, well, there's a --
14 these should be construed more narrowly. They should be construed more
15 narrowly because in the joint claim construction statement submitted in
16 district court, ABB supposedly agreed to certain narrower constructions.
17 And that is not a canon of claim construction, certainly not for the broadest
18 reasonable interpretation.

19 They didn't cite any legal authority for this narrowing. They
20 didn't cite any intrinsic evidence, and Dr. Stewart, in fact, didn't give any
21 basis for taking a narrow interpretation. In fact, his declaration often says,
22 "I've read the definition in the patent or I adopted the definition from the
23 joint claim construction statement." When asked if he was a patent law
24 expert, he said no. He simply adopted what was selected for him.

25 Turning to page 6, we look at primitive operations. In the

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.