

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

UNIFIED PATENTS INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

BLITZSAFE TEXAS, LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2016-00118
Patent 8,155,342 B2

LEE, *Administrative Patent Judge.*

Conference Call
Conduct of Proceedings
37 C.F.R. § 42.05

On April 22, 2016, a telephone conference was held. The participants were respective counsel for the parties and Judges Lee and Bui. Counsel for Patent Owner explained that Patent Owner inadvertently omitted the word “not” in five instances in the Patent Owner Response such that a literal reading of those sentences conveys the opposite of what was intended, and that when the representations are read, in context, readers would readily recognize the inadvertent omission. Counsel for Patent Owner asked the Board what it should do.

We suggested and authorized Patent Owner to prepare and file a document that specifically identifies the five instances where it desires the text to be read as though the word “not” is present, indicate that the Patent Owner response should be read as though the word “not” is present in those five instances, and indicate whether Petitioner agrees with that proposal,

IPR2016-00118
Patent 8,155,342 B2

Petitioner:

Paul Haughey
Scott Kolassa
phaughey@kilpatricktownsend.com
skolassa@kilpatricktownsend.com

Jonathan Stroud
jonathan@unifiedpatents.com

Patent Owner:

Peter Lambaianakos
planbrianakos@brownrudnick.com