RECORD OF ORAL HEARING

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

- - - - - -

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

- - - - - -

GOOGLE INC., MOTOROLA MOBILITY LLC and

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.,

Petitioners,

v.

ARENDI S.A.R.L.,

Patent Owner.

- - - - - - -

Case No. IPR2014-00452 (Patent 6,323,853)
Technology Center 2100

Oral Hearing Held on Tuesday, April 21, 2015

Before: MICHAEL R. ZECHER, NEIL T. POWELL, and KEVIN
W. CHERRY, Administrative Patent Judges.

The above-entitled matter came on for hearing on Tuesday, April 21,
2015, at 2:08 p.m., in Hearing Room A, taken at the U.S. Patent and
Trademark Office, 600 Dulany Street, Alexandria, Virginia.

APPEARANCES:

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONERS GOOGLE INC.

and MOTOROLA MOBILITY LLC:

MATTHEW A. SMITH, ESQ.
ROBERT J. KENT, ESQ.
Turner Boyd LLP
702 Marshall Street, Suite 640
Redwood City, California 94063
650-521-5930

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER SAMSUNG

ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.:

ANDREA G. REISTER, ESQ.
Covington & Burling LLP
One CityCenter
850 Tenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001-4956
202-662-5141

BRUCE D. SUNSTEIN, ESQ.
ROBERT M. ASHER, ESQ.
DOROTHY WU CHIANG, ESQ.
Sunstein Kann Murphy & Timbers LLP
125 Summer Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02110-1618
617-443-9292

Atle Hedloy
Arendi S.A.R.L. Representative

1	P R O C E E D I N G S
2	(2:08 p.m.)
3	JUDGE POWELL: Okay. Is everybody ready?

4 With that then we will begin the hearing for IPR2014-00452,

5 and we will start as last time with Petitioner.

6 MR. SMITH: Thank you, Your Honor. Matthew

7 Smith, Turner Boyd, for the Petitioners Google and Motorola

8 Mobility. I think I would like to reserve about 10 minutes of

9 time for rebuttal, if that's okay.

10 May it please the Board, let me get right to what I

11 view as the central issue here. Arendi has two approaches to

12 claim construction that it uses, I think, to make a single

13 critique of the Goodhand reference.

14 The first approach to claim construction deals with

15 the analyzing limitation, which in the original reads analyzing

16 the document to determine if first information is contained

17 therein. So it is a test for the presence of first information,

18 which is not further qualified as claim language as being

19 information of any particular type.

20 Arendi would like to construe that to mean

21 analyzing the document to determine or to distinguish first

22 information from other information, other text in the

23 document, and at times in the Patent Owner response Arendi

24 seems to argue that that limitation should be construed to

25 mean analyzing the document to determine or to distinguish

1   contact information from other types of contact information or

2   other text in the document.

3   And, of course, the second approach to claim

4   construction is the argument that there should be a negative

5   limitation in the claims that effectively excludes what Arendi

6   calls user selection prior to the analyzing step in any system

7   that might be asserted as prior art.

8   And these two constructions are intertwined in the

9   sense that I think Arendi is saying if a prior art system or if

10   an accused infringing system is analyzing the text according

11   to the analyzing step, that it is likely not using user selection,

12   and vice versa, if it is using user selection then it is likely not

13   analyzing the text.

14   The central critique that Arendi makes of the

15   Goodhand reference as I see it is the following: In the

16   Goodhand reference the user is typing things into an address

17   field in an e-mail form, so a "to" field, a cc field, a bcc field,

18   something like that.

19   And the Goodhand system takes what is in the

20   address field -- and also I think with the understanding, to be

21   fair, that what is in the address field is intended to in some

22   way be connected to a recipient of the e-mail, so I think

23   Arendi's argument is that the Goodhand system is taking the

24   information that it gets from the text, being the address field,

25   and from the intent of the user of the Goodhand system and

DOCKET ALARM

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.

WHAT WILL YOU BUILD? | sales@docketalarm.com | 1-866-77-FASTCASE

fastcase
Smarter legal research.