

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

EIZO CORPORATION
Petitioner

v.

TOM KIMPE and PAUL MATTHIJS
Patent Owners

Case IPR2014-00778
Patent RE43,707E

Mailed: June 11, 2014

Before PATRICK E. BAKER, *Trial Paralegal*

NOTICE OF FILING DATE ACCORDED TO PETITION
AND
TIME FOR FILING PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

The petition for *inter partes* review in the above proceeding has been accorded the filing date of May 20, 2014.

Administrative Patent Judge James B. Arpin has been designated to manage the proceeding. 37 C.F.R. § 42.5.

A review of the petition identified the following defects:

- Failure to provide power of attorney for back-up counsel. 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(b).
- Failure to affix exhibit labels to the lower right corner of the first page of the exhibit. 37 C.F.R. § 42.63(d)(1), (2)(ii).
- Failure to sequentially number each page of the exhibits. 37 C.F.R. § 42.63(d)(2)(i).
- Incorrect spacing in petition. Footnotes should be double-spaced. 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(a)(2)(iii).
- Improper usages of claim charts: The rules require that a petition identify how the challenged claims are to be construed and how the claims are unpatentable under the statutory grounds raised. This information is to be provided pursuant to the page limit requirements, which require double spacing. Additionally, the rules require that the petition specify where each element of a challenged claim is to be found in the prior art. The element by element showing may be provided in a claim chart, which is permitted to be written with single spacing. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(a)(2)(iii). Placing one's argument and claim construction in a claim chart to circumvent the double spacing requirement is not permitted.

Petitioner must correct the defects within FIVE BUSINESS DAYS from this notice. Failure to correct the defects may result in an order to show cause as to why the Board should institute the trial. No substantive changes (e.g., new grounds) may be made to the petition.

Patent Owners may file a preliminary response to the petition no later than three months from the date of this notice. The preliminary response is

Case IPR2014-00778
Patent RE43,707E

limited to setting forth the reasons why the requested review should not be instituted. Patent Owners may also file an election to waive the preliminary response to expedite the proceeding. For more information, please consult the Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48756 (Aug. 14, 2012), which is available on the Board Web site at <http://www.uspto.gov/PTAB>.

Patent Owners are advised of the requirement to submit mandatory notice information under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(a)(2) within 21 days of service of the petition.

The parties are encouraged to use the heading on the first page of this Notice for all future filings in the proceeding.

The parties are advised that under 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c), recognition of counsel *pro hac vice* requires a showing of good cause. The parties are authorized to file motions for *pro hac vice* admission under 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c). Such motions shall be filed in accordance with the “Order -- Authorizing Motion for *Pro Hac Vice* Admission” in Case IPR2013-00639, Paper 7, a copy of which is available on the Board Web site under “Representative Orders, Decisions, and Notices.”

The parties are reminded that unless otherwise permitted by 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(b)(2), all filings in this proceeding must be made electronically in the Patent Review Processing System (PRPS), accessible from the Board Web site at <http://www.uspto.gov/PTAB>.

If there are any questions pertaining to this notice, please contact Patrick E. Baker at 571-272-6192 or the Patent Trial and Appeal Board at 571-272-7822.

Case IPR2014-00778
Patent RE43,707E

PETITIONER:

Marc K. Weinstein
Joseph Milowic
QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN LLP
marcweinstein@quinnemanuel.com
josephmilowic@quinnemanuel.com

PATENT OWNERS:

Kerry T. Hartman
HARTMAN PATENTS PLLC
3399 Flint Hill Pl.
Woodbridge, VA 22192