

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

WHATSAPP INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

TRIPLAY, INC.,  
Patent Owner.

---

Cases IPR2016-00717 and IPR2016-00718  
Patent 8,874,677 B2

---

Record of Oral Hearing  
Held: March 5, 2019

---

Before JOSIAH C. COCKS, BRIAN J. MCNAMARA, and  
FRANCES L. IPPOLITO, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

IPR2016-00717 and IPR2016-00718  
Patent 8,874,677 B2

APPEARANCES:

ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER:

YUAN LIANG, ESQUIRE  
HEIDI KEEFE, ESQUIRE  
Cooley LLP  
3175 Hanover Street  
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1130

ON BEHALF OF THE PATENT OWNER:

DOUGLAS WEIDER, ESQUIRE  
Greenberg Traurig LLP  
500 Campus Drive  
Suite 400  
Florham Park NJ 07932

The above-entitled matter came on for hearing on Tuesday, March 5, 2019, commencing at 1:00 p.m., at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, 600 Dulany Street, Alexandria, Virginia.

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 - - - - -

3 JUDGE COCKS: Please be seated. All right good afternoon. Judge  
4 Ippolito is going to be starting us off today so please direct your attention to  
5 her. I think she will be showing up there. Judge Ippolito, can you hear us  
6 today?

7 JUDGE IPPOLITO: I can hear you. I don't see myself -- oh, there it  
8 is. Okay. Good afternoon. This is a supplemental consolidated oral hearing  
9 in the cases of IPR 2016-00717 and IPR 2016-00718. These proceedings  
10 both involve U.S. patent number 8,874,677.

11 The final written decisions in both of these proceedings were entered  
12 on August 27, 2017 after oral argument was held on June 12, 2017. On  
13 October -- November 14, 2018 the Federal Circuit issued its decision  
14 vacating and remanding these proceedings to the Board. This is a post-  
15 remand hearing to address remaining issues in both matters.

16 I'm Judge Ippolito and with us today are Judges Cocks and  
17 McNamara. Some of us are participating remotely today so please  
18 remember to speak from the podium so that all of us can hear you and  
19 remember to identify by slide number any demonstratives you're referring  
20 to.

21 And per our order, each side will have 30 minutes of total presentation  
22 time. Petitioner will begin today and present its case regarding the  
23 remaining issues in these cases and patent owner will have an opportunity to  
24 respond. Petitioner may reserve rebuttal time as well.

25 Could I have beginning with petitioner the parties introduce  
26 themselves?

1 MS. KEEFE: Thank you. Good afternoon, Your Honor. Heidi Keefe  
2 on behalf of petitioner WhatsApp. With me in the courtroom is my co-  
3 counsel Yuan Liang and in the audience is our client, Nikki Vo. Thank you.

4 JUDGE IPPOLITO: Thank you. Patent owner?

5 MR. WEIDER: Doug Weider, Greenberg Traurig on behalf of  
6 Triplay and with me at counsel table is Steve Pedersen counsel at Triplay.

7 JUDGE IPPOLITO: Thank you. Are we ready to begin? Petitioner?

8 MS. KEEFE: Yes, Your Honor.

9 JUDGE IPPOLITO: Proceed.

10 MS. KEEFE: Thank you, Your Honor.

11 JUDGE COCKS: Counsel, before you start, are you going to reserve  
12 any rebuttal time?

13 MS. KEEFE: Thank you for reminding me, Your Honor. Yes, I  
14 would like to reserve 15 minutes.

15 JUDGE COCKS: I only ask so I can put something into my device.

16 MS. KEEFE: I appreciate it, Your Honor. Obviously what is most  
17 important is answering your questions so if I go over there, I have no  
18 problem because I want to make sure that I'm answering what matters to  
19 you.

20 So we stand before you today after the Federal Circuit's decision on a  
21 single simple issue which is whether or not there was a motivation to  
22 combine Coulombe, Bellordre and Friedman in order to find the clickable  
23 icon element of the claims at issue in this case.

24 And I have on Slide 2 in front of Your Honors right now just Claim 1  
25 showing the language clickable icon which appears in the limitation sub A.

26 The same as in Claim 6 as well and that's on Slide 3.

1           On Slide 4, I wanted to start with observations made by the Federal  
2 Circuit. The Federal Circuit held that quote there is no dispute that  
3 Coulombe discloses a majority of the claim limitations with the exception of  
4 two limitations. Adaptation of video objects, a limitation petitioners find in  
5 Bellordre and clickable icons, a limitation petitioners find in Friedman.

6           The Federal Circuit went on to note that together, Coulombe,  
7 Bellordre and Friedman disclose all of the limitations of the 677 patent. A  
8 fact, which was conceded by Triplay at the first oral hearing before this  
9 Board. And that's in the transcript of the hearing at page 65 column, sorry,  
10 page 65 lines 17 through page 66 line 8. And this is on Slide 4.

11           And I raise that to make sure that we reemphasize the only thing that  
12 we are addressing here is whether or not there is a motivation to combine the  
13 three references because there is no dispute that the combination of all three  
14 references includes all of the elements of the claims at issue.

15           And as explained by the Federal Circuit, they vacated the Board's  
16 non-obviousness decision and remanded for further consideration of the  
17 motivation to combine the clickable icons of Freidman with Coulombe and  
18 Bellordre, citing to the Federal Circuit opinion.

19           As explained by the Board, the Federal Circuit remanded for further  
20 consideration the motivation to combine the clickable icons of Freidman  
21 with Coulombe and Bellordre.

22           And I know I have said it about three times now, but it bears repeating  
23 that it is a combination of all three references because I anticipate that Patent  
24 Owner will argue that there is a problem with the combination of simply  
25 Coulombe with Friedman and arguing that there is not a logical link between  
26 Coulombe and Friedman. But that's the incorrect question. Because the

# 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.