Trials@uspto.gov Tel: 571-272-7822 Paper 15 Entered: October 31, 2014

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

FORD MOTOR COMPANY, Petitioner,

v.

PAICE LLC & THE ABELL FOUNDATION, INC., Patent Owner.

Cases¹

IPR2014-00570 (Patent 8,214,097 B2) IPR2014-00571 (Patent 7,104,347 B2) IPR2014-00579 (Patent 7,104,347 B2)

Before SALLY C. MEDLEY, KALYAN K. DESHPANDE, and CARL M. DEFRANCO, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

DESHPANDE, Administrative Patent Judge.

DOCKE

RM

CONFERENCE SUMMARY Conduct of the Proceeding 37 C.F.R. § 42.5

¹ This Order applies to each of the above-listed cases. Although we issue one order to be docketed in each case, the parties are not authorized to use this caption for any subsequent papers.

IPR2014-00570 (Patent 8,214,097 B2) IPR2014-00571 (Patent 7,104,347 B2) IPR2014-00579 (Patent 7,104,347 B2)

On October 30, 2014, the initial conference call was held between counsel for the respective parties and Judges Medley, Deshpande, and DeFranco.

Motions

Neither party seeks authorization to file a motion at this time. As discussed, if Patent Owner determines that it will file a motion to amend, Patent Owner must arrange for a conference call, preferably two weeks prior to filing the motion to amend, with us and opposing counsel to discuss the proposed motion to amend. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.121(a). Additional guidance on motions to amend claims is provided in the Board's Trial Practice Guide (*see Office Patent Trial Practice Guide*, 77 Fed. Reg. 48,756, 48,764, 48,766 (Aug. 14, 2012)) and in relevant Board decisions, including *Nichia Corp. v. Emcore Corp.*, IPR2012-00005, Paper 27 (PTAB Jun. 3, 2013), and *Idle Free Systems, Inc. v. Bergstrom, Inc.*, IPR2012-00027, Paper 26 (PTAB Jun. 11, 2013).

We remind the parties that, if they seek authorization to file a motion not contemplated per the Scheduling Order, the party requesting such authorization must arrange for a conference call with us and opposing counsel.

Schedule

Patent Owner indicated it has proposed to Petitioner modifications for Due Dates 1 and 2 set forth in the Scheduling Order. Petitioner indicated it is considering Patent Owner's proposal. To the extent issues arise with Due Dates 1IPR2014-00570 (Patent 8,214,097 B2) IPR2014-00571 (Patent 7,104,347 B2) IPR2014-00579 (Patent 7,104,347 B2)

DOCKET

RM

Δ

5 identified in the Scheduling Order, we remind the parties that, without obtaining prior authorization from us, they may stipulate to different dates for Due Dates 1-5, but no later than Due Date 6, as provided in the Scheduling Order, by filing an appropriate notice with the Board. The parties may not stipulate to any other changes to the Scheduling Order.

IPR2014-00570 (Patent 8,214,097 B2) IPR2014-00571 (Patent 7,104,347 B2) IPR2014-00579 (Patent 7,104,347 B2)

For PETITIONER:

Sangeeta G. Shah Frank A. Angileri Michael D. Cushion Andrew B. Turner John Nemazi John Rondini BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C. FPGP0110IPR1@brookskushman.com FPGP0101IPR2@brookskushman.com FPGP0101IPR3@brookskushman.com

Lissi Mojica Kevin Greenleaf DENTONS US LLP <u>lissi.mojica@dentons.com</u> kevin.greenleaf@dentons.com

For PATENT OWNER:

DOCKET

Timothy W. Riffe Kevin E. Greene FISH & RICHARDSON P.C. <u>Riffe@fr.com</u> <u>Greene@fr.com</u> <u>IPR36351-0013P1@fr.com</u>

