

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Cases: IPR2016-00034, IPR2016-00036,  
IPR2016-00038, IPR2016-00039,  
IPR2016-00040, IPR2016-00041d

-----X  
COSTCO WHOLESALE CORPORATION,  
Petitioner,  
VS.  
ROBERT BOSCH LLC,  
Patent Owner.  
-----X

\*\*\*TELEPHONIC HEARING\*\*\*

December 9, 2016

11:00 a.m.

BEFORE:

JUDGE WILLIAM SAINDON  
JUDGE BARRY GROSSMAN  
JUDGE PHIL KAUFFMAN

Reported by:

AYLETTE GONZALEZ, RPR, CLR, CCR

JOB NO. 116818

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

A P P E A R A N C E S :

HUGHES HUBBARD & REED

Counsel for Petitioner

COSTCO WHOLESALE CORPORATION

One Battery Park Plaza

New York, New York 10004

BY: JAMES DABNEY, ESQ.

BY: RICHARD KOEHL, ESQ.

BY: JAMES KLAIBER, ESQ.

BY: STEFANIE LOPATKIN, ESQ.

SHEARMAN & STERLING

Counsel for Patent Owner

ROBERT BOSCH, LLC

599 Lexington Avenue

New York, New York 10022

BY: MARK HANNEMANN, ESQ.

BY: PATRICK COLSHER, ESQ.

## 1 PROCEEDINGS

2 JUDGE SAINDON: This conference  
3 call is at the request of Patent  
4 Owner. We received an e-mail and they  
5 have requested a Motion to Strike or  
6 some other relief regarding  
7 Petitioners reply. So what we  
8 instructed the parties to do was  
9 essentially to provide or for Patent  
10 Owner to provide a list of examples  
11 for us to go through today to decide  
12 whether or not we need further  
13 briefing on this issue.

14 Before we get into the particular  
15 items that were provided, I just  
16 wanted to do a quick background on our  
17 view of what's proper in a reply and  
18 what we're looking for and to try to  
19 hope that the arguments that we see  
20 can be a little more useful to us.

21 So we see this issue come up a lot  
22 especially recently given the federal  
23 circuit cases regarding new arguments  
24 in the reply. What we're looking for  
25 is -- it's often the case that in a

## 1 PROCEEDINGS

2 Patent Owner response will have an  
3 argument and then in the reply,  
4 Petitioner responds to that and they  
5 introduce new evidence to respond to  
6 that and in our view, that is within  
7 the rules, that's what the reply is  
8 for, even if that is something that  
9 could theoretically have been raised  
10 in the petition.

11 The issue for us is whether the  
12 response is a change in the theory of  
13 unpatentability and so that's really  
14 what we're looking for here, not  
15 really is it something that could have  
16 been raised in the petition but is a  
17 change, because it's obviously  
18 something not in the petition, it's in  
19 the reply.

20 So to the extent we can focus less  
21 on that this is new and more on this  
22 either -- I mean it does happen that  
23 something in the reply is not  
24 responsive to something in the Patent  
25 Owner response, that is rare though.

## 1 PROCEEDINGS

2 So if that's true the issue, then  
3 let's talk about it, but if it's  
4 really that the issue is that this is  
5 a new thrust of theory for  
6 unpatentability, then let's focus on  
7 that issue and just go right to it,  
8 because that's the one we're really  
9 interested in and if that's the case,  
10 then what we're looking for is either  
11 to disregard that argument, that new  
12 argument or that new factor, whatever  
13 it may be or to have Patent Owner have  
14 the opportunity to respond to it in  
15 some fashion. And so again, those are  
16 the two avenues that we're looking at  
17 here, if we find ourselves with  
18 something new.

19 So again, with the arguments that  
20 we're going to discuss today, I'd just  
21 like that to be in the back of the  
22 mind of the parties because that's  
23 what we're looking for.

24 So with that, Patent Owner, I see  
25 the first item on your list, if you

# 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.