

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

3 FUJITSU NETWORK COMMUNICATIONS, INC.,
4 Petitioner

5 V.

6 CAPELLA PHOTONICS, INC.

7 Patent Owner

8 CASE NO. IPR2015-00726

9 CASE NO. IPR2015-00727

10 - - - - -
11 Thursday, October 29, 2015
12 1:33 p.m.
13 - - - - -

14 TELECONFERENCE IN THE ABOVE MATTER

15 BEFORE: JAMES A. TARTAL
16 JOSIAH C. COCKS
17 KALYAN K. DESHPANDE
18 Administrative Patent Judges

19 REPORTED BY:

20 SUSAN D. GUNELSON, Certified Court Reporter
21 (License No. 30XI00076300), Registered Professional
22 Reporter, Certified Realtime Reporter, Certified
23 LiveNote Reporter and Notary Public of New Jersey,
24 Pennsylvania and Delaware.

25 VERITEXT NATIONAL COURT REPORTING COMPANY

MID-ATLANTIC REGION

1250 Eye Street, NW, Suite 1201

Washington, DC 20005

Page 2

1
2 APPEARANCES
3
4 MILBANK, TWEED, HADLEY & McCLOY, LLP
BY: NATHANIEL BROWAND, ESQUIRE
5 nbrowand@milbank.com
and
6 CHRISTOPHER CHALSEN, ESQUIRE
cchalsen@milbank.com, ESQUIRE
7 One Chase Manhattan Plaza
47th Floor
8 New York, New York 10005-1413
COUNSEL FOR PETITIONER FUJITSU NETWORK
9 COMMUNICATIONS, INC.
10
11 STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX, P.L.L.C.
12 BY: ROBERT GREENE STERNE, ESQUIRE
rsterne@skgf.com
and
13 NICHOLAS J. NOWAK, ESQUIRE
nnowak@skgf.com
and
14 JASON EISENBERG, ESQUIRE
jasone-ptab@skgf.com
and
15 JONATHAN TUMINARO, ESQUIRE
jtminaro-ptab@skgf.com
and
16 TYLER DUTTON, ESQUIRE
tdutton-ptab@skgf.com
17 1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600
18 COUNSEL FOR THE PATENT OWNER
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Page 3

1 (The following was taken out of the
2 telephonic presence of Mr. Broward, Mr.
3 Chalsen, Judges Tartal, Cocks and
4 Deshpande:)
5 MR. STERNE: So I'm Rob Sterne, and
6 I'll be speaking for the Patent Owner. We also
7 have Jason Eisenberg, Nicholas Nowak, Jonathan
8 Tuminaro, and finally but not last but least,
9 Tyler Dutton. So that's our team for Patent
10 Owner.
11 And we'll have others on the call
12 shortly, and we'll get you the judges' names.
13 We're going to want this transcript
14 ASAP, please.
15 (Brief pause.)
16 (The following was taken in the
17 telephonic presence of Mr. Broward, Mr.
18 Chalsen but out of the telephonic presence
19 of Judges Tartal, Cocks and Deshpande:)
20 THE COURT REPORTER: Mr. Broward,
21 do you want a copy of today's transcript?
22 MR. BROWAND: Yes, please, yeah.
23 MR. CHALSEN: Also, this is Chris
24 Chalsen, Mr. Browand's colleague, and I may speak
25 also. Nate will primarily be handling Fujitsu's

Page 4

1 side of this discussion.
2 THE COURT REPORTER: Okay. Thank
3 you.
4 (Brief pause.)
5 (The following was taken in the
6 telephonic presence of Judges Tartal,
7 Cocks and Deshpande:)
8 JUDGE TARTAL: Good afternoon.
9 This call is in regards to Fujitsu
10 Network Communications, Incorporated versus
11 Capella Photonics, Incorporated, IPR2015-00726 and
12 00727. With me on the call today are Judges Cocks
13 and Deshpande.
14 And can we begin with counsel for
15 Petitioner, identify who will be on the call?
16 MR. STERNE: Thank you, Your Honor.
17 It's Nathaniel Browand. With me is Christopher
18 Chalsen, on behalf of Petitioner Fujitsu Network
19 Communications.
20 JUDGE TARTAL: Thank you, and
21 welcome.
22 And can we have counsel for Patent
23 Owner identify who will be speaking on the call
24 today?
25 MR. STERNE: Good afternoon, Your

Page 5

1 Honor. This is Robert Sterne from Sterne Kessler
2 representing Patent Owner Capella, and on the call
3 with me today are counsel Jason Eisenberg, Nik --
4 Nicholas Nowak, Jonathan Tuminaro and Tyler
5 Dutton.
6 And we have a court reporter on the
7 line, Your Honor, that Patent Owner engaged, and
8 we will be providing the Board and the Petitioner
9 with a transcript of this Board call, if you so
10 request.
11 JUDGE TARTAL: Yes, please include
12 as an exhibit the filing for a copy of the
13 transcript of the call. That would be
14 appreciated.
15 MR. STERNE: Not a problem, Your
16 Honor.
17 JUDGE TARTAL: Okay. Petitioner
18 requested the call and so we will turn it over to
19 Petitioner to address the issues that they have.
20 MR. BROWAND: Thank you, Your
21 Honor.
22 I wish we were here under different
23 circumstances. But at this time we would seek the
24 Board's relief and request to, in the first
25 instance, forego cross examination under the

Page 6

1 circumstances of Petitioner's declarant's sudden
2 and untimely death. We've made the offer to
3 Patent Owner as a mutual labor of cross
4 examination of each side's expert in connection
5 with the case. That's our initial request, Your
6 Honor.

7 As a secondary request, we believe
8 that it's appropriate under the circumstances, and
9 I'd like to explain sort of the factual background
10 leading up to this, but we would believe it
11 appropriate for Petitioner to submit substitute
12 declarations and if necessary, substitute petition
13 to reference the -- the new declaration.

14 We would propose to submit them in
15 accordance with the authority in Corning Gilbert V
16 PPC Broadband, which is IPR2013-347 paper number
17 20. There's a procedure that's outlined there for
18 substitute petitions when the declarant becomes
19 unavailable. So if it's all right with Your Honor
20 I'd like to sort of explain the circumstances
21 under which our declarant became unavailable.

22 I'd like to make clear that
23 throughout the entire time Petitioner advised
24 Patent Owner about the -- what we knew of
25 Dr. Drabik's condition. As soon as we learned new

Page 7

1 information, we passed that along. And the
2 sequence of relevant events is as follows:
3 On the FNC's IPRs were instituted
4 on August 24th, 2015.

5 On September 11th, Patent Owner
6 requested a deposition of Dr. Drabik for the last
7 week of October. We -- although Dr. Drabik would
8 have been available for a deposition in September,
9 Patent Owner could have requested that, but Patent
10 Owner chose to wait until the end of October.

11 On September 16th, Your Honor,
12 Petitioner informed Patent Owner that a deposition
13 of Dr. Drabik the last week of October should
14 work, and at that time Petitioner had no
15 information about Dr. Drabik's condition and we
16 fully expected that he would be available for
17 deposition as requested.

18 On September 24th, Dr. Drabik
19 signed a declaration in two other IPRs. It was
20 IPR2015-01958 and IPR2015-01961, and I mention
21 that simply to show that Dr. Drabik was available
22 to perform work at that time.

23 On September 28th we learned --
24 Petitioner learned that Dr. Drabik was sick. We
25 informed the Patent Owner that same day that the

Page 8

1 deposition would have to be rescheduled. At that
2 time on September 28th Petitioner fully expected
3 that Dr. Drabik would recover in a timely manner
4 and that he would be able to sit for a deposition.

5 Petitioner and Patent Owner
6 discussed the possibility of extending due date
7 one at that time to allow for Dr. Drabik to
8 recover so Petitioner could take his deposition
9 before submitting responses to the petition. The
10 Patent Owner requested that we provide updates to
11 them regarding Dr. Drabik's conditions every week
12 or two and Petitioner did exactly that.

13 On October 8th Petitioner informed
14 Patent Owner that Dr. Drabik had been admitted to
15 the hospital. At that time, based on the
16 information we had received from a contact of
17 Dr. Drabik, Petitioner fully expected that
18 Dr. Drabik would still recover.

19 On October 15th, Petitioner called
20 counsel for Patent Owner and informed them that we
21 did not expect Dr. Drabik would be available for
22 deposition. We asked whether -- at that time on
23 the call we asked whether Patent Owner would agree
24 to forego cross examination and as an alternative,
25 Petitioner proposed obtaining permission from the

Page 9

1 Board to submit substitute declarations signed by
2 another expert if Patent Owner demanded having --
3 taking cross examination. Counsel for Patent
4 Owner at the time told us that they would consider
5 these issues and provide us with responses.

6 We waited, and while we were
7 waiting for a response from Patent Owner,
8 Petitioner learned that unfortunately and suddenly
9 Dr. Drabik passed away.

10 On October 26th, Petitioner
11 informed Patent Owner that Dr. Drabik had passed
12 away, and we reiterated our request to forego
13 cross examination or obtain permission to submit
14 substitute declarations by another expert in
15 accordance with the authority in the Corning IPR.

16 On October 27th Petitioner and
17 Patent Owner had a meet and confer to discuss
18 these issues and to seek the Board's guidance.

19 We again offered Petitioner to
20 forego cross examination and we extended the
21 offering that Petitioner would agree to forego
22 cross examination if Patent Owner would agree to
23 forego cross examination.

24 We also reiterated our request to
25 obtain permission to submit substitute

Page 10

1 declaration. And on the call, Patent Owner did
2 not agree to those offers.
3 So at this time we have identified
4 a substitute expert who we would believe would be
5 able to come up to speed quickly on the matter and
6 we would request the Board's permission to, if in
7 fact, Patent Owner does not agree to forego cross
8 examination, we would in fact seek the Board's
9 permission to file substitute declarations that
10 would be identical to those on -- already on file
11 by Dr. Drabik, in accordance with the procedure
12 outlined in the Corning IPR, and we would propose
13 to do that within two weeks. I guess
14 November 12th would be the date.
15 And after that filing, we would
16 make the substitute expert available for
17 deposition at a mutually convenient time and we
18 would be willing to agree to a reasonable
19 extension of due date one to accommodate the
20 Patent Owner.
21 So I'm happy to address any
22 questions, or if you want to turn it over to the
23 Patent Owner.
24 JUDGE TARTAL: Thank you, Counsel.
25 I think it would be helpful to hear

Page 11

1 from counsel for Patent Owner at this point. So
2 let's hear their views at this point.
3 MR. STERNE: Thank you, Your Honor.
4 This is Robert Sterne.
5 This is an unfortunate
6 circumstance, obviously, and we do not want to
7 take any advantage of this. But I think it's
8 important for the Board to realize that we have
9 been attacked in multiple IPRs. Our Patent Owner
10 is a small company from the Silicon Valley, and we
11 have been attacked by the some of the largest
12 companies in electronics in the world. And we're
13 trying to defend our patent rights, we're trying
14 to adequately deal with the charges that have been
15 made on the record, and we submit to Your Honor,
16 and I will explain this in more detail in a
17 moment, that the Corning case that has been
18 referred to repeatedly by my opponent is not
19 controlling here in -- either in the facts or in
20 terms of the result obtained.
21 In that case, the deponent was
22 sick. They tried to get an 18-month trial date.
23 That was turned down by Judge Jameson Lee in paper
24 number 18, and then they moved on to a possible
25 substitution. They ended up having to take the

Page 12

1 deposition of the original declarant in a modified
2 schedule.
3 Here we cannot do that. So saying
4 that this case is controlled, as I believe my
5 opponent has said several times, by that Board
6 panel decision is not accurate.
7 As you are aware, Dr. Drabik did
8 pass away on October 26th. Unfortunately, his
9 passing came after he signed and submitted
10 declarations on behalf of Petitioner but before we
11 had, as Patent Owner, an opportunity to dispose --
12 to depose him.
13 Regardless of the tragic nature of
14 these circumstances, we submit that the current
15 situation could have been entirely avoided but for
16 the actions of Petitioner. And let me explain,
17 'cause I realize that's quite a charge.
18 We have reason to believe that
19 Petitioner was aware at least as in early
20 September that Dr. Drabik would most likely never
21 be in a position to be deposed and that despite
22 knowing this, Petitioner failed to make us aware
23 and do anything to make sure that we had an
24 opportunity to depose him before he passed on
25 October 26th, less than a month before Capella's

Page 13

1 Patent Owner responses are due on November 24.
2 We believe that this really
3 constitutes negligence, not Dr. Drabik's untimely
4 passing but that steps could have been taken to
5 allow us to take his deposition earlier. And --
6 JUDGE TARTAL: Let me just
7 interrupt you, and in terms of, I understand that
8 there are circumstances surrounding, you know,
9 what exactly transpired in the past, but at this
10 point in the proceeding, we need to determine how
11 to go forward.
12 And in order to do that, it would
13 be particularly helpful to know what Patent
14 Owner's position is on the two proposals that
15 Petitioner has set forward, the first being a
16 waiver of cross examination, and the second being
17 a request for a substitute declaration, and
18 obviously if Patent Owner has an alternative
19 proposal, you're welcome to -- welcome to address
20 that as well.
21 MR. STERNE: Yeah, Your Honor. I
22 would very much like to address that. And I'd
23 also like to address the issue of expungement of
24 the dec.
25 So let's start, if we may, with the

Page 14

1 Federal Rules of Evidence, which as we all know
2 apply to post-grant proceedings as to PTAB as
3 indicated by 37 CFR section 42.62 Alpha, 62A.
4 The Board had indicated that
5 parties should treat evidentiary issues in
6 post-grant proceedings, quote, Just as they would
7 in a case pending before a U.S. District Court,
8 keeping in mind the applicability of the USPTO
9 duty of candor in 37 CFR 4211, and this comes from
10 IPR 213-2 -- excuse me, 213-00285 paper 15,
11 page 2.
12 Here, without an opportunity to
13 cross-examine Dr. Drabik, his declaration
14 constitutes hearsay pursuant to Federal Rule 802.
15 The only hearsay exception that is arguably
16 relevant here is exception 804(b)(1), the
17 exception regarding former testimony, and that
18 question does not apply.
19 Rule 804(b)(1) indicates that if
20 the opportunity to cross-examine is lacking, as it
21 is here, the prior testimony must be excluded if
22 the opposing party has not been given a meaningful
23 opportunity to cross-examine if it wishes to do
24 so.
25 The opportunity to cross-examine

Page 15

1 requirement is generally satisfied when the
2 defense is given a full and fair opportunity to
3 probe and expose the infirmities of testimony
4 through cross examination, thereby calling to the
5 attention of the fact finder the reason for giving
6 significant weight to the witness testimony. And
7 I can provide case law on this point, if you so
8 request.
9 Now, we -- we assert, Your Honors,
10 that there is a due process violation here.
11 Regardless of the hearsay rule as a matter of due
12 process, Capella has a fundamental right as Patent
13 Owner to defend their patent in -- and should be
14 allowed to cross-examine witnesses who give
15 adverse testimony in these proceedings.
16 In the Supreme Court case of
17 Goldberg -- Goldberg versus Kelly, a 1970 Supreme
18 Court case, the Supreme Court says, quote, In
19 almost every setting where important decisions
20 turn on questions of fact, due process requires an
21 opportunity to confront and cross-examine adverse
22 witnesses. And this is found at 397 US 254 at
23 page 269.
24 We submit the Board's ultimate
25 legal conclusions in this case will turn on

Page 16

1 critical questions of fact and opinion set forth
2 by Dr. Drabik in his declaration. So as a matter
3 of due process, Capella needs to be -- to have an
4 opportunity to cross-examine Dr. Drabik.
5 Now, we were never provided,
6 obviously, with an opportunity to cross-examine
7 him, despite the fact that he signed his
8 declaration nearly eight and a half months prior
9 to his death. In addition, institution occurred
10 on August 24th, eight weeks prior to his death.
11 There is no reason under the circumstances that
12 Petitioner could not have proactively offered
13 Dr. Drabik for deposition at any point during that
14 time. Nor is there any reason that Petitioner
15 could not have offered Dr. Drabik for deposition
16 as soon as it learned he was ill and might not be
17 able to testify.
18 It was Capella instead who, without
19 any knowledge of Dr. Drabik's condition, had to
20 press Petitioner for information as to his
21 availability. And it is Petitioner who simply
22 dragged the issue out until Dr. Drabik's passing.
23 In short, Petitioner can point to nothing that
24 shows it made any effort to avoid the situation
25 that the parties now find themselves in. As a

Page 17

1 result, Capella asserts that Dr. Drabik's
2 declaration should be expunged as hearsay as well
3 as to avoid a violation of Capella's due process
4 rights.
5 So that's our position first, Your
6 Honor, about the declaration itself.
7 Now, even if Dr. Drabik's
8 declarations are expunged, there is no prejudice
9 to Fujitsu. In addition to the two IPRs at issue
10 here, Fujitsu is Petitioner in four other
11 proceedings, four other proceedings against the
12 '368 and '678 patents.
13 On September 4, 2015, Fujitsu was
14 joined as a Petitioner in IPRs initiated by Cisco
15 and on September 25, 2015 Fujitsu and others filed
16 additional IPR petitions against the '368 patent
17 and the '678 patents.
18 Now, we need, if there is a
19 substitute expert, Your Honor, we must have the
20 opportunity to depose that expert. And this
21 raises all kinds of complicated questions because,
22 first of all, we don't know if there's -- if the
23 substitute declaration is going to be the same as
24 the original declaration. It gives the Petitioner
25 the opportunity to now make changes to their

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.