RECORD OF ORAL HEARING

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SIPNET EU S.R.O. Petitioner

vs.

STRAIGHT PATH IP GROUP, INC. Patent Owner

- - - - - -

Case IPR 2013-00246 Patent 6,108,704

- - - - - -

Oral Hearing Held: July 11, 2014

Before: KALYAN K. DESHPANDE, THOMAS L. GIANNETTI, and TRENTON A. WARD, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

The above-entitled matter came on for hearing on Friday, July 11, 2014 at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, 600 Dulany Street, Alexandria, Virginia at 1:00 p.m., in Hearing Room B.

1



Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at <u>docketalarm.com</u>.

2	ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONERS:
3 4 5 6 7	SANJAY PRASAD, ESQ. Prasad IP 1768 Miramonte Avenue, #4845 Mountain View, CA 94040
8	
10	PAVEL POGODIN, ESQ.
11 12 13 14	TransPacific Law Group 7140 Crest Hill Drive Reno, Nevada 78506
15	ON BEHALF OF THE PATENT OWNER:
16 17 18 19 20 21	ALAN M. FISCH, ESQ. ALICIA MEROS CARNEY, ESQ. Fisch Sigler LLP 5335 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W., Eighth Floor Washington, D.C. 20015
22	
23	
24	
25	

2

DOCKET A L A R M Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at <u>docketalarm.com</u>.

1	P R O C E E D I N G S
2	(1:00 p.m.)
3	JUDGE GIANNETTI: You may be seated, please.
4	Good afternoon. We are here for the final hearing
5	in Sipnet EU versus Straight Path IP Group, which is case
6	IPR2013-00246 involving patent 6,108,704.
7	Counsel for the Petitioner, may I have your
8	appearances, please.
9	MR. POGODIN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. This is
10	Pavel Pogodin on behalf of the Petitioner from TransPacific
11	Law Group.
12	MR. PRASAD: Sanjay Prasad on behalf of Petitioner
13	Sipnet also.
14	JUDGE GIANNETTI: Okay, welcome. And who is
15	appearing on behalf of Patent Owner?
16	MR. FISCH: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Alan
17	Fisch and my colleague, Alicia Meros Carney.
18	JUDGE GIANNETTI: Okay. Thank you very much.
19	MR. FISCH: Thank you, sir.
20	JUDGE GIANNETTI: And welcome.
21	Okay. So each side will have an hour to present
22	their argument. Petitioner will start. And we have
23	Petitioner may we don't have a motion to amend, so
24	Petitioner may reserve time for rebuttal. You can do that
25	either now or at the end of your presentation. But there
	3

DOCKET ALARM Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at <u>docketalarm.com</u>.

1 will be no rebuttal from the Patent Owner. All right. Who is presenting the argument for the 2 3 Petitioner? 4 MR. PRASAD: That will be me, Your Honor. 5 JUDGE GIANNETTI: Okay. I will use the timer here, so the red light should go on when your time is up. I 6 will try to give you a warning about five minutes before the 7 8 end of your time. 9 MR. PRASAD: Okay. I would like to reserve 15 10 minutes for rebuttal. 11 JUDGE GIANNETTI: All right. So, Mr. Prasad, you 12 may proceed when you are ready. 13 MR. POGODIN: Excuse me, Your Honor. We have a printed copy of the presentation. May I approach to provide 14 15 it? JUDGE GIANNETTI: That's fine. You can hand those 16 17 up. MR. POGODIN: Thank you. 18 JUDGE GIANNETTI: Thank you very much. 19 20 All right, Mr. Prasad, you may proceed. 21 MR. PRASAD: Thank you, Your Honor. 22 May it please the Board, my name is Sanjay Prasad, 23 and I represent the Petitioner, Sipnet. 24 The Board instituted this proceeding on the basis 25 of Petitioner's arguments and evidence showing anticipation

4

IPR2013-00246 Patent 6,108,704

1 of claims 1 to 7 and 32 to 42 in view of WINS and NetBIOS and

2 obviousness of claims 33 to 37 in view of WINS and NetBIOS.

Patent Owner filed a motion for rehearing, which
was denied. And Patent Owner did not seek to amend the
claims or establish an earlier invention date. Consequently,

6 this trial is proceeding on the Board's

7 original grounds for institution.

8 I would like to spend my time allocated on the 9 arguments that have been raised by Patent Owner, and 10 specifically in the context of the evidence that has been 11 adduced during this proceeding.

12 The issues in this trial will be reduced down to 13 the following four points raised by the Patent Owner. The first is a query or determination as to the on-line status of 14 15 a process as required by the challenged claims. Second is 16 dynamic address allocation. And then the third and fourth 17 points, third is the status of WINS as prior art, and number 18 4 is the status of a third-party Stalker Software as a real 19 party in interest.

Before turning to details of WINS and NetBIOS, let me briefly review the disclosure of the '704 patent. I have it on the screen, slide 2. And the thing to note about the '704 patent is that it is not particularly detailed. The entirety of the disclosure relevant to this proceeding is shown in figures 1, 7, and 8 and in the accompanying

5

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.