

RECORD OF ORAL HEARING  
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

-----  
BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

-----  
UNIVERSAL REMOTE CONTROL, INC.,

Petitioner,

v.

UNIVERSAL ELECTRONICS, INC.,

Patent Owner.  
-----

Case IPR2014-01102 (Patent 5,228,077)  
Case IPR2014-01103 (Patent 5,552,917)  
Case IPR2014-01104 (Patent 5,414,761)  
Case IPR2014-01106 (Patent 5,255,313)  
-----

Oral Hearing Held on: Wednesday, August 19, 2015  
-----

Before: HOWARD B. BLANKENSHIP, SALLY C. MEDLEY, and  
LYNNE E. PETTIGREW, Administrative Patent Judges.

The above-entitled matter came on for hearing on Wednesday, August 19, 2015, at 9:00 a.m., in Hearing Room A, taken at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, 600 Dulany Street, Alexandria, Virginia.

IPR2014-01102 (Patent 5,228,077)  
IPR2014-01103 (Patent 5,552,917)  
IPR2014-01104 (Patent 5,414,761)  
IPR2014-01106 (Patent 5,255,313)

APPEARANCES:

ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER:

PETER H. KANG, ESQ.  
FERENC PAZMANDI, ESQ.  
Sidley Austin LLP  
1001 Page Mill Road  
Building 1  
Palo Alto, California 94304  
650-565-7000

KEITH BARKAUS, ESQ.  
Ostrolenk Faber, LLP  
1180 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10036  
212-596-0500

ON BEHALF OF THE PATENT OWNER:

ERIC J. MAIERS, ESQ.  
JAMES J. LUKAS, JR., ESQ.  
Greenberg Traurig, LLP  
77 West Wacker Drive  
Suite 2500  
Chicago, Illinois 60601  
312-456-840



IPR2014-01102 (Patent 5,228,077)  
IPR2014-01103 (Patent 5,552,917)  
IPR2014-01104 (Patent 5,414,761)  
IPR2014-01106 (Patent 5,255,313)

1           MR. MAIERS: Good morning, Your Honors. On  
2 behalf of Patent Owner, Eric Maiers from the law firm of  
3 Greenberg Traurig, representing Universal Electronics.

4           MR. LUKAS: Good morning, Your Honors. James  
5 Lukas from Greenberg Traurig representing Universal  
6 Electronics.

7           JUDGE MEDLEY: Okay. Thank you. Before we  
8 get started, we were made aware of the late filing made by the  
9 Patent Owner with its demonstratives. Yesterday you had  
10 uploaded some demonstratives.

11           One was a redacted version, Exhibit 2071, and that  
12 was submitted prior to our order that went out yesterday. And  
13 then subsequently you filed an updated redacted version,  
14 Exhibit 2072. That was submitted late last night after our  
15 order went out. And neither of these filings were timely.

16           So we would like Patent Owner counsel, Mr.  
17 Maiers, to please explain why you filed the first redacted and  
18 the second redacted versions late and, if we excuse these late  
19 filings, which demonstratives should stay of record.

20           MR. MAIERS: So Patent Owner timely filed, as  
21 you are aware, a demonstrative that we requested to be filed  
22 under seal on Monday of this week.

23           And pursuant to agreement with counsel for  
24 Petitioner, we were going to file a redacted version of that  
25 same demonstrative, where we redacted the confidential

IPR2014-01102 (Patent 5,228,077)  
IPR2014-01103 (Patent 5,552,917)  
IPR2014-01104 (Patent 5,414,761)  
IPR2014-01106 (Patent 5,255,313)

1 information from that slide presentation, Tuesday morning,  
2 which we did. And then Your Honors issued your order  
3 expunging the under seal version of that document.

4 In response to that we conferred with our client  
5 and identified some information that we decided to waive  
6 confidentiality on, and so we submitted an updated redacted  
7 version of those slides such that more of that information that  
8 we previously considered confidential would be part of the  
9 public record.

10 We did not change or add any material to the slide.  
11 It was merely just revealing more of the information that was  
12 previously redacted. And, as a result, there would be no  
13 prejudice to Petitioner as they had the full version of the deck  
14 of slides as of Monday, and, frankly, as of last Wednesday  
15 when they were originally served.

16 JUDGE MEDLEY: So if he made what was  
17 previously redacted available to the public, does that affect  
18 your motion to seal? In other words, if you are agreeing that  
19 not everything needs to be sealed -- we don't want to seal  
20 anything.

21 MR. MAIERS: Certainly.

22 JUDGE MEDLEY: So if we can hone in on what  
23 needs to be sealed, that would help us in our ruling.

24 MR. MAIERS: Absolutely. And that involves a  
25 discussion actually Mr. Lukas and Mr. Kang were just having.

# 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.