

1 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
2 BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

3

4 HUGHES NETWORK SYSTEMS, LLC and  
5 HUGHES COMMUNICATIONS, INC.,  
6 Petitioner,

7 v.

8 CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY,  
9 Patent Owner.

10

11 Case IPR2015-00081

12 Patent 8,284,833

13

14 PTAB BOARD MEETING

15

16 TAKEN ON

17 WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

18 10:01 A.M.

19

20 701 FIFTH AVENUE, SUITE 5100

21 SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98104

22

23

24

25 Job # 90815

1 APPEARANCES

2

3 Appearing on behalf of the Petitioner,

4 Hughes Network Systems, LLC and Hughes Communications, Inc.:

5 ELIOT WILLIAMS, ESQ.

6 Baker Botts

7 1001 Page Mill Road

8 Palo Alto, California 94304

9

10

11

12 Appearing on behalf of the Patent Owner,

13 California Institute of Technology:

14 MICHAEL ROSATO, ESQ.

15 ANDY BROWN, ESQ.

16 Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati

17 701 Fifth Avenue

18 Seattle, Washington 98104

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1	PTAB BOARD MEETING	09:31
2	PTAB BOARD MEETING	09:31
3	WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015	12:35
4	10:01 A.M.	10:01
5	MR. WILLIAMS: Hallied Gaugojak who's assisting us	10:01
6	in this matter.	10:01
7	JUDGE PERRY: Thank you very much. And who do we	10:01
8	have representing the patent owner?	10:01
9	MR. ROSATO: Yeah. Good morning, Your Honor. On	10:01
10	the west coast this is Mike Rosato on behalf of the Patent	10:01
11	Owner. And I have with me cocounsel Matthew Argenti and an	10:01
12	associate Andy Brown here. And I wanted to let the parties	10:01
13	know we have a court reporter on the line.	10:01
14	JUDGE PERRY: Excellent. Since you have arranged	10:01
15	for a court reporter please file a transcript of this call	10:01
16	as an exhibit in the -- among the record papers.	10:01
17	MR. ROSATO: We will do so, Your Honor. Thank	10:01
18	you.	10:01
19	JUDGE PERRY: Are there any others on the line not	10:01
20	yet identified? Okay.	10:01
21	Thank you all for participating in this	10:01
22	panel-initiated call. The reason we initiated the call is	10:01
23	simply to explore the facts related to Patent Owner's	10:01
24	allegation in the preliminary responses that there are	10:01
25	unnamed inter -- unnamed real parties in interest that	

## PTAB BOARD MEETING

10:01

1 should have been set forth in the petitions. Let me assure 10:01  
2 everyone that we're not going to make any dispositive 10:01  
3 decisions on this call. We just want to explore the facts 10:01  
4 and that will help us determine next steps procedurally. 10:01  
5

6 So Patent Owner, let's begin with you. Would you 10:01  
7 mind just taking a minute or two to summarize for us your 10:02  
8 position with regard to these unnamed real parties in 10:02  
9 interest? 10:02

10 MR. ROSATO: Certainly, Your Honor. 10:02

11 So, you know, as we set forth in our preliminary 10:02  
12 responses and the panel has correctly noted, we believe that 10:02  
13 there are real parties in interest which exist but are not 10:02  
14 named in any of the petitions, any of the six petitions 10:02  
15 involved here. 10:02

16 First there's EchoStar, which is the parent of the 10:02  
17 Hughes entities. It is not specifically named as a real 10:02  
18 party in interest in the petitions but they should be. 10:02  
19 There are various Dish entities that are not named as real 10:02  
20 parties in interest in the petitions but they should be. 10:02  
21 The only parties specifically named are several Hughes 10:02  
22 entities. And as we set forth in our preliminary responses 10:03  
23 for various reasons these parties identified should -- that 10:03  
24 we have identified, EchoStar and the Dish entities, should 10:03  
25 have been named. You know, the boundary lines are so

## PTAB BOARD MEETING

10:03

1 blurred between the Hughes, EchoStar and Dish entities that 10:03  
2 each of them either exercised control or could have 10:03  
3 exercised control in these IPR proceedings. 10:03

4 Briefly EchoStar is the parent company of Hughes 10:03  
5 and public documents expressly state that EchoStar's legal 10:03  
6 team and general counsel control the legal affairs of the 10:03  
7 Hughes subsidiaries. The Dish entities are specifically 10:03  
8 named together with Hughes in the District Court litigation, 10:03  
9 though Dish entities are not named in the IPR petitions. 10:04

10 But those entities are represented by common counsel at 10:04  
11 District Court. And counsel has even stood up in District 10:04  
12 Court and told the judge that Dish and Hughes would be 10:04  
13 pursuing IPRs at the patent office, which is exactly what we 10:04  
14 see here. And for various other reasons we think the 10:04  
15 evidence that we've submitted demonstrates that Dish also 10:04  
16 has either exercised control or clearly could have done so 10:04  
17 in these proceedings. 10:04

18 Now, we feel we've made a prima facie showing on 10:04  
19 this issue. And that showing is supported by evidence 10:04  
20 including public documents and SEC filings. At this point, 10:04  
21 you know, the Petitioner certainly would be in possession of 10:04  
22 further evidence or have access to evidence relevant to this 10:04  
23 issue. We feel we made an initial showing and at this point 10:05  
24 the ultimate burden of proof on this issue now lies with the

# 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.