

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

INTEL CORPORATION,  
Petitioner,

v.

DSS TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT, INC.,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2016-00287  
Patent 6,784,552 B2

Before BRYAN F. MOORE, BRIAN J. McNAMARA, and  
MINN CHUNG, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

CHUNG, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

SCHEDULING ORDER

## A. INITIAL CONFERENCE CALL

No initial conference call is scheduled for this case. The parties are encouraged to contact the Board to request a call if any issues arise during trial. The parties' attention is directed to the following matters.

### 1. Motion to Amend

Patent Owner is reminded that it must confer with the Board before filing a Motion to Amend. 37 C.F.R. § 42.121(a). Patent Owner should contact the Board to request a conference in sufficient time to ensure that the conference is conducted at least one week before DUE DATE 1.

Patent Owner and Petitioner are directed to the revised rules governing Motions to Amend. 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.24(a)(1), 42.24(c), 42.121(b).

### 2. Confidential Information

The parties must file confidential information using the appropriate availability indicator in PRPS (e.g., "Board and Parties Only"), regardless of whose confidential information it is. It is the responsibility of the party whose confidential information is at issue, not necessarily the proffering party, to file the motion to seal.

A protective order does not exist in a case until one is filed in the case and is approved by the Board. If a motion to seal is filed by either party, the proposed protective order should be presented as an exhibit to the motion. The parties are urged to operate under the Board's default protective order, should that become necessary. *See* Default Protective Order, Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48,756, App. B (Aug. 14, 2012).

If the parties choose to propose a protective order deviating from the default protective order, they should submit the proposed protective order jointly. A marked-up comparison of the proposed and default protective orders should be presented as an additional exhibit to the motion to seal, so that differences are highlighted. The parties should contact the Board if they cannot agree on the terms of the proposed protective order.

*a. Redactions*

Redactions should be limited strictly to isolated passages consisting of confidential information. The thrust of the underlying argument or evidence must be discernable from the redacted version.

*b. Confidential Information in Final Written Decisions*

Information subject to a protective order will become public if identified in a final written decision in this proceeding. A motion to expunge the information will not necessarily prevail over the public interest in maintaining a complete and understandable file history. *See* Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. at 48,761.

## B. DUE DATES

This order sets due dates for the parties to take action after institution of the proceeding. The parties may stipulate to different dates for DUE DATES 1 through 5 (earlier or later, but no later than DUE DATE 6). A notice of the stipulation, specifically identifying the changed due dates, must be promptly filed. The parties may not stipulate to an extension of DUE DATES 6 and 7.

Regardless of whether the parties stipulate to a change of DUE DATE 4, requests for oral argument must be filed no later than the date set forth in this order for DUE DATE 4, for Board planning purposes.

In stipulating to different times, the parties should consider the effect of the stipulation on times to object to evidence (37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(1)), to supplement evidence (37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(2)), to conduct cross-examination (37 C.F.R. § 42.53(d)(2)), and to draft papers depending on the evidence and cross-examination testimony (*see* section C, below).

The parties are reminded that the Testimony Guidelines appended to the Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. at 48,772 (Appendix D), apply to this proceeding. The Board may impose an appropriate sanction for failure to adhere to the Testimony Guidelines. 37 C.F.R. § 42.12. For example, reasonable expenses and attorneys' fees incurred by any party may be levied on a person who impedes, delays, or frustrates the fair examination of a witness.

#### 1. DUE DATE 1

The patent owner may file—

- a. A response to the petition (37 C.F.R. § 42.120), and
- b. A motion to amend the patent (37 C.F.R. § 42.121).

The patent owner must file any such response or motion to amend by DUE DATE 1. In addition to the revised rules concerning Motions to Amend mentioned above, the patent owner is directed to the revised rules governing Patent Owner Responses. 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.24(b), (d). If the patent owner elects not to file anything, the patent owner must arrange a conference call with the parties and the Board. The patent owner is cautioned that any

arguments for patentability not raised in the response will be deemed waived.

## 2. DUE DATE 2

The petitioner must file any reply to the patent owner's response and opposition to the motion to amend by DUE DATE 2. In addition to the revised rules concerning Motions to Amend mentioned above, the petitioner is directed to the revised rules governing Replies. 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.24(c), (d).

## 3. DUE DATE 3

The patent owner must file any reply to the petitioner's opposition to patent owner's motion to amend by DUE DATE 3.

## 4. DUE DATE 4

a. Each party must file any motion for an observation on the cross-examination testimony of a reply witness (*see* section D, below) by DUE DATE 4.

b. Each party must file any motion to exclude evidence (37 C.F.R. § 42.64(c)) and any request for oral argument (37 C.F.R. § 42.70(a)) by DUE DATE 4.

## 5. DUE DATE 5

a. Each party must file any response to an observation on cross-examination testimony by DUE DATE 5.

b. Each party must file any opposition to a motion to exclude evidence by DUE DATE 5.

# 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.