

Paper No. \_\_\_\_  
Filed: June 5, 2015

Filed on behalf of: Askeladden LLC

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

Askeladden LLC  
Petitioner

v.

Sean McGhie and Brian Buchheit  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2015-00124  
U.S. Patent No. 8,540,152

---

**PETITIONER'S OPPOSITION  
TO  
PATENT OWNERS' MOTION FOR DISCOVERY AUTHORIZATION**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**I. Introduction.....1**

**II. Patent Owners’ Request for Employment Lists Should Be Denied .....2**

**III. Patent Owners’ Request for Funding Information Should Be Denied .....5**

**IV. Patent Owners’ Request for a Timeline Should Be Denied.....6**

**V. Conclusion .....7**

## I. Introduction

Pursuant to the Board’s May 27, 2015 Order (Paper 38), Petitioner Askeladden LLC (“Askeladden”) hereby opposes Patent Owners’ Motion for Discovery Authorization (Paper 40) (“Motion”). The rules permit additional discovery only in rare instances where the moving party establishes that the discovery is necessary and would be in the interest of justice. 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.20(c), 42.51(b)(2)(i); *Garmin Int’l, Inc. v. Cuozzo Speed Techs. LLC*, IPR2012-00001, Paper 26 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 5, 2013) (“*Garmin*”). The discovery sought by Patent Owners here is improper under these standards.

The proposed discovery is almost entirely unrelated to real party-in-interest (“RPI”) issues, is premised at best on speculative assumptions regarding the information that might be obtained, and is unnecessary in light of information already disclosed or that is available to the Patent Owners. Moreover, the proposed discovery will impose undue burden on Petitioner to inquire with respect to parties that are not within its control—*e.g.*, each of the twenty-six member banks of The Clearing House Payments Company L.L.C. (“PayCo”)—concerning matters that are not remotely related to Askeladden’s IPR efforts. Patent Owners’ failure to enunciate a concise justification for their proposed discovery illustrates its improper nature and that it is not in the interest of justice.

## II. Patent Owners' Request for Employment Lists Should Be Denied

The Motion requests the name and role “of each individual employee/committee member/officer/director of the Acknowledged RPI who is an employee/committee member/officer/director of the Alleged RPI” (“1<sup>st</sup> Request”).<sup>1</sup> Motion at 1. Patent Owners thus seek the names and roles of any person employed by or affiliated with PayCo and Askeladden who is also affiliated with an Alleged RPI—*i.e.*, not only with the Association, but with each of the twenty-six banks that is a member of PayCo. Patent Owners seek this information regardless of whether a person has any relationship to Askeladden or the present IPR. The interests of justice weigh against granting this request.

Under the first *Garmin* factor, the information sought lacks “substantive value to a contention of the party moving for discovery,” and therefore will not be useful. *Garmin* at 6-7. The Motion fails to explain otherwise. For example, if an employee of a PayCo member bank participates in a PayCo committee concerning banking regulatory matters, the identity of that person is called for by the Motion even though such information is entirely irrelevant to Askeladden’s IPR activities

---

<sup>1</sup> The Motion defines (i) Askeladden and PayCo, collectively, as “Acknowledged RPI,” and (ii) “owning banks” of PayCo and The Clearing House Association (the “Association”) as “Alleged RPI.” Motion at 1.

and would be prohibitively burdensome to identify. At best, therefore, Patent Owners can only speculate that their overly broad 1<sup>st</sup> Request might reveal something relevant to RPI issues. But the first *Garmin* factor does not countenance such speculation, and the fifth *Garmin* factor does not permit discovery such as this that is not “sensible and responsibly tailored according to a genuine need.” *Id.* at 7.

Moreover, Patent Owners already have evidence of this sort sufficient to the RPI question. Regarding control over this proceeding, Patent Owners already have been provided full information about the membership of Askeladden and PayCo, their governing boards, and the lack of *any* involvement of PayCo’s member banks in Askeladden’s IPR activities. The Reilly Declaration (Ex. 1531) and Askeladden LLC Agreement (Ex. 1533) each establish that [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] is solely responsible for selecting patents to challenge using IPR proceedings, and for independently determining all other aspects of Askeladden’s IPR activities. Ex. 1531 ¶ 11; Ex. 1533 at 2, 8, 12. As the Patent Owners also know, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]. Ex. 1531 ¶ 15; Ex. 1533 at 2, 10. Petitioner further represents that

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

# 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.