

1 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
2 BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD  
3

4 APPLE, INC AND TWITTER

5 Petitioners,

6 v.

7 SUMMIT 6

8 Patent Owner.

9 -----  
10 Case IPR2015

11 Patent 00685, 686, 687 and 688.  
12  
13

14 Before HOWARD B. BLANKENSHIP, KERRY BEGLEY and  
15 GEORGIANNA W. BRADEN, Administrative Patent Judges  
16  
17  
18

19 Job No. 2031172

20 Pages 1 - 10

21 Reporter: Donna M. Lewis, RPR, CSR  
22

A P P E A R A N C E S

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX PLLC

BY: JASON D. EISENBERG, ESQUIRE

ON BEHALF OF PATENT OWNER:

LEE & HAYES, PLLC

BY: PETER J. AYERS, ESQUIRE

REID JOHNSON, ESQUIRE

BRIAN MANGUM, ESQUIRE

Veritext Legal Solutions

Mid-Atlantic Region

1250 Eye Street NW - Suite 1201

Washington, D.C. 20005

1 P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S.

2 JUDGE BLANKENSHIP: This is Judge  
3 Blankenship from the P tab (phonetic). Also on  
4 are Judges Begley and Braden. This call concerns  
5 cases of IPR2015-000685, 686, 687 and 688. Is  
6 counsel for patent owner on the line?

7 MR. AYERS: Yes, he is, Your Honor.  
8 Peter Ayers for Patent owner 76.

9 JUDGE BLANKENSHIP: All right. Counsel  
10 for Petitioner.

11 MR. EISENBERG: Yes, Your Honor. This  
12 is Jason Eisenberg for Petitioner.

13 JUDGE BLANKENSHIP: All right. Is there  
14 a court reporter on the line?

15 THE COURT REPORTER: Yes. Donna Lewis  
16 the court reporter.

17 JUDGE BLANKENSHIP: Who is providing the  
18 court reporter?

19 MR. EISENBERG: The Petitioner, Your  
20 Honor.

21 JUDGE BLANKENSHIP: All right. Can you  
22 see that a copy of the transcript is filed in

1     these cases when it is available?

2                 MR. EISENBERG:   Yes sir.

3                 JUDGE BLANKENSHIP:   All right.   We  
4     understand the Patent owner seeks authorization to  
5     file a motion to stay in ex parte reexamination  
6     90012987.   Patent owner, can you tell us why a  
7     motion to stay is appropriate?

8                 MR. AYERS:   Yes, Your Honor.   It is  
9     appropriate in this case because that  
10    reexamination involves some of the same patents --  
11    the same -- one of the same patents that is at  
12    issue in nine -- or several of these IPRs  
13    challenging the same claims based on the same  
14    identical prior art as presented in these IPRs.  
15    And we just think given that the patent owner is  
16    now -- it is not just these four IPRs, there have  
17    actually been a total of ten IPRs file against  
18    three related patents.   In nine of those involve  
19    the two prime -- the two sole prior art references  
20    that are being asserted in the reexam.   We just  
21    think that it would be much more efficient for  
22    that matter to be stayed to allow us to -- the

1 record to be developed in the IPRs because the  
2 same issues will be presented, namely the scope of  
3 the patent, the 482 patent in particular, some  
4 claim construction issues are presented in the  
5 scope of what the prior art teaches in the Mattus  
6 (phonetic) and Gregler (phonetic) references that  
7 are being -- that form the basis for their  
8 reexamination are also the basis for or at issue  
9 in nine of the ten IPRs. And we just requested  
10 this call in connection with four of those that  
11 specifically challenged the 4A2. But the Kramer  
12 and Mathis patents or references are also being  
13 asserted as the basis for invalidity in the 681,  
14 683, 806 and 807 IPRs which involve either the  
15 same 4A2 patent or two related patents. So we are  
16 going to be having to vet these same issues in  
17 nine of the ten IPRs. And we just think that that  
18 is inefficient if nothing else but -- so we would  
19 request that that reexam be stayed and that these  
20 issues be vetted in the inter parties review where  
21 the full record can be developed and we can  
22 conserve our resources in defending against all of

# 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.