```
Page 1
 1
 2
     Case IPR2014-00746
     U.S. Patent No. 5,563,883
 3
     UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
 4
 5
     BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD
 6
     ARRIS GROUP, INC.
 7
     Petitioner7
 8
     V.
 9
     C-CATION TECHNOLOGIES, LLC
10
     Patent Owner
11
12
     CASE IPR2014-00746
     Patent 5,563,883
13
14
15
16
                      CONFERENCE CALL
                  Thursday, June 26, 2014
17
18
                         3:00 p.m.
19
20
21
22
23
     Reported by:
24
     ROBIN NUNEZ
25
     JOB NO. 81630
```



```
Page 2
 1
 2
     APPEARANCES:
 3
          KENYON & KENYON
          Attorneys for Patent Owner
 4
 5
                One Broadway
                New York, New York 10004
 6
 7
          BY:
                LEWIS POPOVSKI, ESQ
 8
                JEFFREY GINSBERG, ESQ
 9
                DAVID KAPLAN, ESQ
10
11
          WINSTON & STRAWN
          Attorneys for Petitioner
12
13
                1700 K Street, N.W.
14
                Washington, D.C. 20006
15
          BY:
                ANDREW SOMMER, ESQ
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```



- 1 CONFERENCE CALL
- 2 THE COURT: So I think I heard from
- 3 the point in which you were citing the
- 4 trial practice guide.
- 5 MR. POPOVSKI: Yes, ma'am, so we've
- 6 identified some evidence here that would,
- 7 we believe, show that one can reasonably
- 8 believe that Arris had at the very least
- 9 the opportunity and the contractual
- 10 obligation to control the portion of that
- 11 previous litigation that relates to the use
- of Arris's products by Comcast. Two pieces,
- 13 first, Arris has stated terms and
- 14 conditions of sale that it publishes on its
- 15 website. Those terms and conditions show
- 16 that Arris, at the time of the filing of
- 17 the complaint and through the entire
- 18 damages period, is contractually obligated
- 19 to indemnify customers only where, and this
- 20 is a critical portion of this, "customer
- 21 gives Arris reasonable assistance and sole
- 22 control and defense of all negotiations
- 23 towards settlement or compromise."
- We believe that type of document is
- 25 very critical, and again, according to the



- 1 CONFERENCE CALL
- 2 guide, is common, as evidentiary support
- 3 for a claim of privity.
- 4 Second, from Arris's SEC
- 5 disclosures, we know that Comcast was in
- 6 fact indemnified by Arris, as those
- 7 disclosures state. Arris agreed to pay
- 8 Comcast a settlement indemnification claim
- 9 related to that lawsuit, related to the
- 10 claims being asserted on Comcast's use of
- 11 Arris's products.
- 12 THE COURT: I'm sorry, counsel. Can
- 13 you repeat that? They agreed to pay what?
- MR. POPOVSKI: The SEC disclosure
- 15 states that Arris agreed to pay Comcast to
- 16 settle indemnification claims related to
- 17 the Comcast use of Arris products in the
- 18 Texas litigation. The quote is "Arris
- 19 agreed to pay Comcast settled
- 20 indemnification claims."
- 21 THE COURT: And you said your
- 22 standard terms and conditions found in the
- 23 website offers the terms that Arris would
- 24 indemnify?
- MR. POPOVSKI: Under paragraph 22 of

```
1 CONFERENCE CALL
```

- 2 the document that's published on the
- 3 website, it says Arris will indemnify and
- 4 hold customer harmless against damages,
- 5 liabilities, cost, and then it goes on.
- 6 And then as a condition of that, it says
- 7 that it requires that, quote, "customer
- 8 give Arris reasonable assistance in and
- 9 sole control of the defense and all
- 10 negotiations for its settlement or
- 11 compromise."
- 12 That's a precondition to
- 13 indemnification.
- 14 THE COURT: Okay.
- MR. POPOVSKI: So we wanted to
- 16 confirm our understanding of the exact
- 17 nature of the relationship between Comcast
- 18 and Arris at the time, so we did. We served
- 19 upon them a very, very narrow document
- 20 request, a single document request that
- 21 requests one thing, and one thing only, we
- 22 are seeking the agreements between Arris
- 23 and Comcast, that include provisions to
- 24 asserting Arris's ability to control the
- 25 defense of claims asserted against it,



DOCKET

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.

