

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA - WESTERN DIVISION
HONORABLE MARIANA R. PFAELZER, U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY,)
Plaintiff/Counter-Defendant,)
vs.) Case No.
) CV 13-7245 MRP (JEMx)
HUGHES COMMUNICATIONS, INC.; HUGHES)
NETWORK SYSTEMS, LLC; DISH NETWORK)
CORPORATION; DISH NETWORK, LLC; and)
DISHNET SATELLITE BROADBAND, LLC,)
Defendants/Counter-Plaintiffs.)

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF
CLAIMS CONSTRUCTION AND MOTION HEARING
WEDNESDAY, JULY 9, 2014
1:05 P.M.
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

MYRA L. PONCE, CSR NO. 11544, RMR, CRR
FEDERAL OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER
312 NORTH SPRING STREET, ROOM 430
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012
(213) 894-2305

APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:**FOR THE PLAINTIFF/CROSS-DEFENDANT:**

QUINN, EMANUEL, URQUHART & SULLIVAN
BY: JAMES R. ASPERGER
Attorney at Law
865 South Figueroa Street, 10th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90017
(213) 443-3000

QUINN, EMANUEL, URQUHART & SULLIVAN
BY: KEVIN P.B. JOHNSON
BY: MARK TUNG, Ph.D.
Attorneys at Law
555 Twin Dolphin Drive, Fifth Floor
Redwood Shores, California 94065
(650) 801-5000

QUINN, EMANUEL, URQUHART & SULLIVAN
BY: EDWARD J. DeFRANCO
BY: ERIC HUANG
Attorneys at Law
51 Madison Avenue, 22nd Floor
New York, New York 10010
(212) 849-7000

FOR THE DEFENDANTS/CROSS-PLAINTIFFS:

WILMER, CUTLER, PICKERING, HALE & DORR
BY: JAMES M. DOWD
BY: AARON S. THOMPSON
Attorneys at Law
350 South Grand Avenue, Suite 2100
Los Angeles, California 90071
(213) 443-5309

WILMER, CUTLER, PICKERING, HALE & DORR
BY: WILLIAM F. LEE
BY: RICHARD GOLDENBERG
Attorneys at Law
60 State Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02109
(617) 526-6556

1 WEDNESDAY, JULY 9, 2014; 1:05 P.M.

2 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

3 -oOo-

4 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Calling Item No. 1,
5 CV 13-7245 MRP, The California Institute of Technology versus
6 Hughes Communications, Inc., et al.

7 Counsel, please state your appearances.

8 MR. ASPERGER: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Jim
9 Asperger appearing on behalf of CalTech. With us from CalTech
10 are Jennifer Lum, Chantal D'Apuzzo, Hannah Dvorak-Carbone, and
11 Jennifer Shockro.

12 THE COURT: Fine. I say welcome to them all.

13 MR. JOHNSON: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Kevin
14 Johnson on behalf of CalTech.

15 MR. DeFRANCO: And, Your Honor, Ed DeFranco also on
16 behalf of CalTech.

17 MR. TUNG: Mark Tung on behalf of CalTech.

18 MR. HUANG: Eric Huang on behalf of CalTech.

19 THE COURT: All right.

20 MR. LEE: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Bill Lee from
21 Wilmer Hale with Aaron Thompson and Richard Goldenberg and Jim
22 Dowd for Hughes. And with us are Dean Manson and Kim Jessett
23 from Hughes.

24 THE COURT: All right. Please.

25 That was -- that was very helpful yesterday.

1 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you, Your Honor. Again, Kevin
2 Johnson. And we plan on starting, as we discussed yesterday,
3 with -- by going back and forth and starting with the "repeat"
4 term. And I'm going to begin by addressing Your Honor's
5 question. And just so -- so we're all on the same page, of
6 course there are -- and we've handed out slides, Your Honor,
7 to -- to Your Honor as well as to the clerk and to the court
8 reporter.

9 THE COURT: All right.

10 MR. JOHNSON: So there are four CalTech patents
11 involved in this lawsuit. And I'm at Slide 2. And there are
12 six terms that are the subject of discussion for today. And
13 I'm going to start with the "repeating" term. And I'm going to
14 answer Your Honor's question first, and then I'll discuss the
15 competing constructions and the intrinsic evidence with respect
16 to the "repeating" term.

17 And, Your Honor, from the CalTech's side, the idea is that
18 I will deal with the "repeat" term, the "transmission" term,
19 and the "codeword" terms. And then my partner Mr. DeFranco
20 will deal with the balance of the terms.

21 THE COURT: The indefiniteness.

22 MR. JOHNSON: That's right. The Tanner graph, the
23 equation, and "combined."

24 THE COURT: That's fine.

25 MR. JOHNSON: So, Your Honor, the Court posed the

1 following question at Slide 5. "If the term 'repeat' were
2 construed to require duplication of bits, would this
3 construction necessarily exclude from the scope of the claims
4 the LDGM embodiment described in column 3, lines 51 to 59, of
5 U.S. Patent No. 7,116,710?"

6 THE COURT: I raised this, frankly, yesterday.

7 MR. JOHNSON: Right. Right. And the answer is that
8 assuming that "duplication" means "re-use," the LDGM embodiment
9 is not excluded. It would be covered by the definition of
10 "repeating."

11 THE COURT: I know that.

12 MR. JOHNSON: However, if -- if Hughes contends that
13 "duplication" means something other than "re-use," if it means
14 copying bits, it's still going to be a disputed issue as to
15 whether the LDGM is covered or not. And let me explain why.

16 THE COURT: I said to you yesterday, you want to
17 include in the meaning of the term that alternate embodiment.

18 MR. JOHNSON: That's correct, Your Honor.

19 THE COURT: Yes.

20 MR. JOHNSON: And that's because a person skilled in
21 the art reading the patent and the specification and the claims
22 would understand that the term "repeat" has to cover everything
23 that -- all of the embodiments that's disclosed in the patent.

24 THE COURT: Quite so.

25 MR. JOHNSON: And so it has to disclose and has to

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.