

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MAKO SURGICAL CORP.,
Petitioner,

v.

BLUE BELT TECHNOLOGIES, INC.¹,
Exclusive Licensee and Patent Owner.

Case IPR2015-00629 (Patent 6,757,582 B2)
Case IPR2015-00630 (Patent 6,205,411 B1)

Before SALLY C. MEDLEY, KEVIN F. TURNER, and
WILLIAM M. FINK, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

TURNER, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

ORDER
Requests for Oral Argument
37 C.F.R. § 42.70

¹ As discussed in Paper 13 of IPR2015-00630, BLUE BELT TECHNOLOGIES, INC. is the exclusive licensee of the 6,205,411 B1 Patent, and CARNEGIE MELLON UNIVERSITY is the Patent Owner of the same patent.

IPR2015-00629 (Patent 6,757,582 B2)

IPR2015-00630 (Patent 6,205,411 B1)

The Scheduling Orders (Papers 7) for these proceedings provided that an oral hearing would be conducted if the hearing is requested by the parties and granted by the Board. Patent Owner/Exclusive Licensee (hereinafter “Patent Owner”) and Petitioner requested oral hearing pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.70. Papers 15, 16 (IPR2015-00629); papers 31, 32 (IPR2015-00630). The requests are *granted*.

The oral arguments for both *inter partes* reviews will be merged and conducted at the same time, i.e., not in *seriatim*. Each party will have sixty (60) minutes of total oral argument time for both proceedings. Petitioner bears the ultimate burden of proof that Patent Owner’s claims at issue in this review are unpatentable. Therefore, Petitioner will open the hearing by presenting its case regarding the challenged claims for which the Board instituted trial. Petitioner may allocate its time as it wishes between the patents involved.

Patent Owner has filed a contingent motion to amend the claims in IPR2015-00630 and bears the burden of proof with respect to that motion. After Petitioner’s presentation, therefore, Patent Owner will respond to Petitioner’s argument and also argue in support of its motion to amend.

Each side may reserve time to respond to arguments presented by the other side with some limitations. More specifically, to the extent that Petitioner reserves rebuttal time, it may respond to Patent Owner’s presentation on all matters. To the extent that Patent Owner reserves rebuttal time, however, it may respond only to Petitioner’s arguments opposing the motion to amend.

The hearing will commence at 1:00 PM on April 7, 2016, on the ninth floor of Madison Building East, 600 Dulany Street, Alexandria, Virginia. The Board will provide a court reporter for the hearing and the reporter’s transcript will constitute the official record of the hearing. The hearing will be open to the public

IPR2015-00629 (Patent 6,757,582 B2)

IPR2015-00630 (Patent 6,205,411 B1)

for in-person attendance that will be accommodated on a first-come, first-served basis. At least one member of the panel will be attending the oral argument remotely by use of two-way audiovisual communication equipment and will not be able to view the projection screen in the hearing room.

The parties are reminded that under 37 C.F.R. § 42.53(f)(7), a proponent of deposition testimony must file such testimony as an exhibit. The Board will not consider any deposition testimony that has not been so filed. If the parties have any concern about disclosing confidential information, they are to contact the Board at least 10 days in advance of the hearing to discuss the matter.

Furthermore, under 37 C.F.R. § 42.70(b), demonstrative exhibits must be served at least five business days before the hearing date. The parties also shall provide a courtesy copy of any demonstrative exhibits to the Board at least five business days prior to the hearing by emailing them to Trials@uspto.gov. The parties shall *not* file any demonstrative exhibits in this proceeding without prior authorization from the Board.

The parties must file any objections to the demonstratives with the Board at least two business days before the hearing. Any objection to demonstrative exhibits that is not timely presented will be considered waived. The objections should identify with particularity which demonstratives are subject to objection and include a short (one sentence or less) statement of the reason for each objection. No argument or further explanation is permitted. The Board will consider the objections and schedule a conference if deemed necessary. Otherwise, the Board will reserve ruling on the objections until after the oral argument. The parties are directed to *St. Jude Medical, Cardiology Division, Inc. v. The Board of Regents of the University of Michigan*, IPR2013-00041 (PTAB January 27, 2014) (Paper 65), for guidance regarding the appropriate content of

IPR2015-00629 (Patent 6,757,582 B2)

IPR2015-00630 (Patent 6,205,411 B1)

demonstrative exhibits. No live testimony from any witness will be taken at the oral argument.

The Board expects lead counsel for each party to be present in person at the oral hearing. However, any counsel of record may present the party's argument. If either party expects that its lead counsel will not be attending the oral argument, the parties should initiate a joint telephone conference with the Board no later than two business days prior to the oral hearing to discuss the matter.

Any special requests for audiovisual equipment should be directed to Trials@uspto.gov. Requests for special equipment will not be honored unless presented in a separate communication not less than five days before the hearing, directed to the above email address.

IPR2015-00629 (Patent 6,757,582 B2)

IPR2015-00630 (Patent 6,205,411 B1)

PETITIONER:

Matthew I. Kreeger

Walter Wu

Wesley E. Overson

MORRISON & FOESTER LLP

mkreeger@mofo.com

wwu@mofo.com

PATENT OWNER / EXCLUSIVE LICENSEE:

Brian Buroker

Stuart Rosenberg

GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP

bburoker@gibsondunn.com

srosenberg@gibsondunn.com

Gregory Stark

SCHWEGMAN LUNDBERG WOESSNER P.A.

gstark@slwip.com

Patrick McElhinny

Mark Knedeisen

K&L GATES LLP

patrick.mcelhinny@klgates.com

mark.knedeisen@klgates.com