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

CISCO SYSTEMS, INC., DISH

NETWORK, LLC, COMCAST CABLE

COMMUNICATIONS, LLC, COX

COMMUNICATIONS, INC., TIME

WARNER CABLE ENTERPRISES,

LLC, VERIZON SERVICES CORP.,

and ARRIS GROUP, INC.,

Petitioner, IPR 2016-01006, 2016-01007,

-v- 2016-01008, 2016-01009,

TQ DELTA, LLC, 2016-01020, 2016-01021

Patent Owner.

TRANSCIPT OF PROCEEDINGS had of the telephonic conference call of the above-entitled matter on the 21st day of June 2017, at 3:00 p.m. EST.

BEFORE: HONORABLE KALYAN DESHPANDE
HONORABLE TREVOR JEFFERSON
HONORABLE SALLY MEDLEY

Thompson Court Reporters, Inc thompsonreporters.com



1 APPEARANCES: 2 HAYNES & BOONE, LLP 3 2323 Victory Avenue, Suite 700 4 Dallas, Texas 75219 5 (214)651-5533, by: 6 MR. DAVID L. McCOMBS 6 david, mccombs, ipr@haynesboone.com, and 8 MR. THEODORE M. FOSTER 9 ipr.theo.foster@haynesboone.com 10 MR. GREGORY P. HUH 11 gregory.hub.ipr@haynesboone.com 11 and Theo Foster 12 Appearing on Behalf of Petitioner Cisco 13 Systems, Inc. 14 14 15 COOLEY, LLP 15 COOLEY, LLP 16 1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Suite 700 17 Washington, DC 20004 18 (703)456-8130, by: 19 MR. STEPHEN McBRIDE 20 smcbride@cooley.com 21 Appearing on Behalf of Petitioner 22 Dish Network, LLC 23 McANDREWS HELD & MALLOY, LTD. 3 McANDREWS HELD & MALLOY, LTD. 4 500 West Madison Street, 34th Floor 5 Chicago, Illinois 60661 6 (312)775-8000, by: 8 pmcandrews@mcandrews-ip.com, and 10 MR. ANDREW KARP 11 MR. NONEW KARP 12 ARD PETER J. McANDREWS 8 pmcandrews@mcandrews-ip.com, and 11 MR. ANDREW KARP 12 ARD PETER J. McANDREWS 12 ANDREWS HELD 13 MR. SCOTT McBRIDE 14 MR. ANDREW KARP 15 Cooler McR. DECOMBREA J. Submitted pute a bit of new evidence. It's evidence that patent owner could not have anticipated and has not had an opportunity to address or submit countervidence of a conclusory statement in their petition, we point out that it's conclusory and unsupported by the evidence, and a responding to that argument is made specific or supported by the evidence, wistered and new evidence. 12 westerifically the basis for the requested relief. 13 MR. SCOTT McBRIDE 14 MR. ANDREW KARP 15 MAR PETER J. McANDREWS 16 MR. PETER J. McANDREWS 17 MR. ANDREW KARP 18 MR. ANDREW KARP 19 MR. ANDREW KARP 10 Cooler McBRIDE 11 MR. ANDREW KARP 11 MR. ANDREW KARP 12 ARB PETER J. McANDREWS 12 MR. McCMBS: Yes, Your Honor. This is Judge Medley. Union of the surplease and place and has not had an opportunity to address or submit countervidence and rather than responding to that argument is made specific or supported by the evidence, wistered with in the record the argument is made specific or supported by the evidence, wistered and new evidence.		Page 2		Page 4
HAYNES & BOONE, LLP 3	1		1	
3 2323 Victory Avenue, Suite 700 4 Dallas, Texas 75219 5 (214)651-5533, by: 6 MR. DAVID L. McCOMBS 6 MR. DAVID L. McCOMBS 7 david.mccombs.ipr@haynesboone.com, and 8 MR. THEODORE M. FOSTER 9 ipr.theo.foster@haynesboone.com, and 10 MR. GREGORY P. HUH 11 gregory.huh.ipr@haynesboone.com 12 Appearing on Behalf of Petitioner Cisco 13 Systems, Inc. 14 Peter McAndrews, and I have with me scott McBride 15 COOLEY, LLP 16 1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Suite 700 17 Washington, DC 20004 18 (703)456-8130, by: 19 MR. STEPHEN McBRIDE 20 smcbride@cooley.com 21 Appearing on Behalf of Petitioner 22 Dish Network, LLC 23 McANDREWS HELD & MALLOY, LTD. 24 APPEARANCES, CONTINUED: 25 McANDREWS HELD & MALLOY, LTD. 26 (312)775-8000, by: 27 MR. PETER J. McANDREWS 28 pmcandrews@mcandrews-ip.com, and 3 MR. SCOTT McBRIDE 30 MR. ANDREW KARP 11 MR. ANDREW KARP 12 akarp@mcandrews-ip.com, and 3 Judge Medley. On the call with me are Judges 10 Deshpande and Jefferson. This is a conference call respanding IPR 2016-10007, -10008, -01007, -1008, -01009, -1020, and -0121, Cisco Systems vs. TQ Delta. 18 McCOMBS: Judge Medley, this is David McCombs for Cisco Systems vs. TQ Delta. 19 MR. McCOMBS: Judge Medley, this is David McCombs for Cisco Systems vs. TQ Delta. 19 MR. McCOMBS: Judge Medley, this is David McCombs for Cisco Systems vs. TQ Delta. 19 MR. McCOMBS: Judge Medley, this is David McCombs for Cisco Systems vs. TQ Delta. 10 MR. McCoMBS: Judge Medley, this is David McCombs for Cisco Systems vs. TQ Delta. 11 JUDGE MEDLEY: Thank you. 12 And for Patent Owner? 12 MR. McANDREWS: Yes, Your Honor, this is Peter McAndrews and have with me scott McBride 12 Appearing on Behalf of Petitioner 13 MR. McANDREWS: Yes, Your Honor, this is a conference and the Amoretion of the original and the Peter McAndrews and have with me scott McBride 16 Cisco Systems vs. TQ Delta. 17 Vice McDLEY: Thank you. 18 And froe Patent Owner? 19 MR. STEPHEN McBRIDE 20 String McLey St				
4 Dallas, Texas 75219 5 (214)651-5533, by: 6 MR. DAVID L. McCOMBS 7 david.mccombs.jpr@haynesboone.com, and 8 MR. THEODORE M. FOSTER 9 ipr.theo.foster@haynesboone.com, and 10 MR. GREGORY P. HUH 11 gregory.huh.jpr@haynesboone.com 12 Appearing on Behalf of Petitioner Cisco 13 Systems, Inc. 14 15 COOLEY, LLP 16 1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Suite 700 17 Washington, DC 20004 18 (703)456-8130, by: 19 MR. STEPHEN McBRIDE 20 smcbride@cooley.com 21 Appearing on Behalf of Petitioner 22 Dish Network, LLC 23 McANDREWS HELD & MALLOY, LTD. 24 APPEARANCES, CONTINUED: 25 McANDREWS HELD & MALLOY, LTD. 26 G (312)775-8000, by: 27 MR. APPETR J. McANDREWS 8 pmcandrews@mcandrews-ip.com, and 4 MR. ANDREW KARP 10 Callage. A point of the six proceedings of the six proceedings of the requested relict. 26 MR. PETER J. McANDREWS 27 MR. PETER J. McANDREWS 28 pmcandrews@mcandrews-ip.com, and 48 MR. COMBS: Judge Medley, this is David McCombs for Cisco Systems along with Gregory Hul and Theo Foster. 49 MR. Davide McCombs for Cisco Systems along with Gregory Hul and Theo Foster. 40 McCombs for Cisco Systems along with Gregory Hul and Theo Foster. 41 MR. McANDREWS: Yes, Your Honor, this is a conference call regarding IPR 2016-01006, -01007, -10108, -01009, -1020, and 10121, Cisco Systems vs. TQ Deta. 41 MR. ANDREWS HELD & Mallory LTD. 42 McANDREWS HELD & MALLOY, LTD. 43 MR. APPETR J. McANDREWS 44 McANDREWS HELD & MALLOY, LTD. 45 SOO West Madison Street, 34th Floor 46 G (312)775-8000, by: 47 MR. PETER J. McANDREWS 48 pmcandrews@mcandrews-ip.com, and 49 MR. CHRISTOPHER SCHARFF 40 cscharff@mcandrews-ip.com, and 40 MR. ANDREW KARP 41 akarp@mcandrews-ip.com, and 41 MR. SCOTT McBRIDE 42 supported by the evidence, they instead submit in the record the argument is nade specific or usupported, and rather than responding to that argument by pointing out whit in the record the argument and new evidence. 41 The Destriction of 12 the motions to strike the replies in the interior pointing out whit in the record the argument is made specific or usupported, an				
5 (214)651-5533, by: 6 MR. DAVID L. McCOMBS 7 david.mccombs.ipr@haynesboone.com, and 8 MR. THEODORE M. FOSTER 9 ipr.theo.foster@haynesboone.com, and 10 MR. GREGORY P. HUH 11 gregory.huh.ipr@haynesboone.com 12 Appearing on Behalf of Petitioner Cisco 13 Systems, Inc. 14 15 COOLEY, LLP 16 1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Suite 700 17 Washington, DC 20004 18 (703)456-8130, by: 19 MR. STEPHEN McBRIDE 20 smcbride@cooley.com 21 Appearing on Behalf of Petitioner 22 Dish Network, LLC 23 McANDREWS HELD & MALLOY, LTD. 24 APPEARANCES, CONTINUED: 25 APPEARANCES, CONTINUED: 26 APPEARANCES, CONTINUED: 27 APPEARANCES, CONTINUED: 28 APPEARANCES, CONTINUED: 29 APPEARANCES, CONTINUED: 20 Chicago, Illinois 60661 20 (312)775-8000, by: 30 MR. CHRISTOPHER SCHARFF 40 Calchard MR. ANDREWS KARP 41 MR. ANDREWS KARP 42 ANDREWS KARP 43 MR. ANDREWS KARP 44 MR. ANDREWS KARP 45 MR. CHRISTOPHER SCHARFF 45 Cocharff@mcandrews-ip.com, and 46 MR. ANDREWS KARP 47 MR. ANDREWS KARP 48 ANDREWS MARIDE 49 MR. CHRISTOPHER SCHARFF 50 cscharff@mcandrews-ip.com, and 51 MR. SCOTT McBRIDE 51 ANDREW ARP 51 MR. ANDREWS HELD 52 ANDREM KARP 53 MR. ANDREWS KARP 54 MR. ANDREWS ARP 55 MR. ANDREWS KARP 55 MR. CHRISTOPHER SCHARFF 56 Cocharff@mcandrews-ip.com, and 57 MR. ANDREW KARP 58 pmcandrews-groun, and 59 MR. CHRISTOPHER SCHARFF 50 cscharff@mcandrews-ip.com, and 50 MR. ANDREW KARP 51 MR. ANDREWS KAPR 51 MR. ANDREWS ANDREWS 51 MR. ANDREWS ANDREWS 51 MR. ANDREW KARP 51 MR. MCANDREWS 51 MR. MCANDREWS 52 MR. MCANDREWS 53 MR. MCANDREWS 54 MR. MCANDREWS 55 MR. MCANDREWS 56 MR. MCANDREWS 57 MR. MCANDREWS 58 MR. MCANDREWS 59 MR. MCANDREWS 59 MR. MCANDREWS 50 MR. MCANDREWS 51 MR. M		·		
6 MR. DAVID L. McCOMBS 7 david.mccombs.jpr@haynesboone.com, and 8 MR. THEODORE M. FOSTER 9 ipr.theo.foster@haynesboone.com, and 10 MR. GREGORY P. HUH 11 gregory.huh.jpr@haynesboone.com 12 Appearing on Behalf of Petitioner Cisco 13 Systems, Inc. 14 15 COOLEY, LLP 16 1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Suite 700 17 Washington, DC 20004 18 (703)456-8130, by: 19 MR. STEPHEN McBRIDE 20 smcbride@cooley.com 21 Appearing on Behalf of Petitioner 22 Dish Network, LLC 23 24 24 25 APPEARANCES, CONTINUED: 26 APPEARANCES, CONTINUED: 27 APPEARANCES, CONTINUED: 28 MCANDREWS HELD & MALLOY, LTD. 29 Garding and Screet, 34th Floor 20 Chicago, Illinois 60661 21 Gilly Type Character and the submitted quite a bit of new evidence. It's evidence that patent owner could not have anticipated and has not had an opportunity to address or submit counterevidence to. 29 Examples of what has been submitted her are, for example, Petitioner makes a conclusory procandrews@mcandrews-ip.com, and MR. ANDREWS incom, and 30 MR. ARNDREWS SCHARFF 31 CSCHART® READ ARALPE ARAP@mcandrews-ip.com, and MR. SCOTT McBRIDE 31 MR. ANDREWS SCHARFF 32 ARP@mcandrews-ip.com, and MR. SCOTT McBRIDE 33 MR. ANDREWS HELD & CHARFF 34 MR. ARAP@mcandrews-ip.com, and MR. SCOTT McBRIDE 44 MR. ANDREWS in com. 45 APPEARANCES, CONTINUEUS 46 Cooley and on the call for Petitioner? 47 MR. PETER J. McANDREWS 48 pmcandrews@mcandrews-ip.com, and MR. SCOTT McBRIDE 40 ARAPOREWS in com. 40 APPEARANCES CONTINUED: 41 Traised a large number of new arguments and has submitted quite a bit of new evidence. It's evidence that patent owner could not have anticipated and has not had an opportunity to address or submit counterevidence to. 41 Examples of what has been submitted her are, for example, Petitioner makes a conclusory and unsupported, and rather than responding to that argument by pointing out which in the record the argument is made specific argument and new evidence.		*		•
david.mccombs.ipr@haynesboone.com, and MR. THEODORE M. FOSTER pipr.theo.foster@haynesboone.com, and MR. GREGORY P. HUH gregory.huh.ipr@haynesboone.com Appearing on Behalf of Petitioner Cisco Systems, Inc. Appearing on Behalf of Petitioner Cisco Systems, Inc. COOLEY, LLP 15 COOLEY, LLP 16 1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Suite 700 17 Washington, DC 20004 18 (703)456-8130, by: MR. STEPHEN McBRIDE Smcbride@cooley.com Appearing on Behalf of Petitioner Dish Network, LLC Page 3 APPEARANCES, CONTINUED: Page 3 APPEARANCES, CONTINUED: Page 3 APPEARANCES, CONTINUED: APPEARANCES, CONTINUED: APPEAR MALLOY, LTD. SOOWESH Madison Street, 34th Floor Chicago, Illinois 60661 G (312)775-8000, by: MR. ACHRISTOPHER SCHARFF Cscharff@mcandrews-ip.com, and MR. ANDREW KARP ARP MCANDREWS is meandrews-ip.com, and MR. ANDREW KARP ARPE MCARIBE ARPEGRANCES, CONTIMEED ARR. MCANDREWS is not he call for Petitioner? MR. McCombs: McCombs for Cisco Systems along with Gregory Hul Ad MR. ANDREW KARP Add Theo Foster. MR. McCombs: Judge Medley, this is David and Theo Foster. MR. McCombs for Cisco Systems along with Gregory Hul and Theo Foster. MR. McCombs: Judge McCombs for Cisco Systems along with Gregory Hul and Theo Foster. MR. McCombs: Judge McCombs for Cisco Systems along with Gregory Hul and Theo Foster. MR. McCombs: Judge McCombs for Cisco Systems along with Gregory Hul and Theo Foster. MR. McAndrews: Judge McCombs for Cisco Systems along with Gregory Hul and Theo Foster. JUDGE MEDLEY: Okay. We understand tha Feter McAndrews Karp. JUDGE MeDLEY: Okay. We understand tha Feter McAndrews Karp. JUDGE MeDLEY: Okay. We understand tha Feter McAndrews All have with me Scott McBride JUDGE MeDLEY: Okay. We understand tha Feter McAndrew Karp. JUDGE MeDLEY: Okay. We understand tha Feter McAndrew Karp. JUDGE MeDLEY: Okay. We understand tha Feter McAndrew Karp. JUDGE MeDLEY: Okay. We understand tha Feter McAndrew Karp. JUDGE MeDLEY: Okay. We understand tha Feter McAndrew Karp. JUDGE MeDLEY: Okay. We understand tha Feter McAndre		The state of the s		
MR. THEODORE M. FOSTER ipr.theo.foster@haynesboone.com, and MR. GREGORY P. HUH Theoretic forms of behalf of Petitioner Cisco Appearing on Behalf of Petitioner Cisco Appearing on Behalf of Petitioner Cisco Systems, Inc. Appearing on Behalf of Petitioner Cisco Systems, Inc. COOLEY, LLP COOLEY, LLP MR. McANDREWS: Yes, Your Honor, this is Peter McAndrews, and I have with me Scott McBride Chris Scharff and Andrew Karp. JUDGE MEDLEY: Okay. We understand that Patent Owner requests authorization to file motions to strike the replies in the six proceedings or authorization to file surreplies in each of the six proceedings or Appearing on Behalf of Petitioner Appearing on Behalf of Petitioner Dish Network, LLC Appearing on Behalf of Petitioner Appearing on Behalf of				•
9 ipr.theo.foster@haynesboone.com, and 10 MR. GREGORY P. HUH 11 gregory.huh.ipr@haynesboone.com 12 Appearing on Behalf of Petitioner Cisco 13 Systems, Inc. 14 15 COOLEY, LLP 15 COOLEY, LLP 16 1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Suite 700 17 Washington, DC 20004 18 (703)456-8130, by: 19 MR. STEPHEN McBRIDE 20 smcbride@cooley.com 21 Appearing on Behalf of Petitioner 22 Dish Network, LLC 23 McANDREWS, LLC 24 APPEARANCES, CONTINUED: 25 APPEARANCES, CONTINUED: 26 APPEARANCES, CONTINUED: 27 APPEARANCES, CONTINUED: 28 McANDREWS HELD & MALLOY, LTD. 38 McANDREWS HELD & MALLOY, LTD. 49 MR. PETER J. McANDREWS 40 MR. PETER J. McANDREWS 50 West Madison Street, 34th Floor 51 Chicago, Illinois 60661 52 Chicago, Illinois 60661 53 Chicago, Illinois 60661 54 MR. CHRISTOPHER SCHARFF 55 Chicago, Illinois 60661 55 Chicago, Illinois 60661 66 (312)775-8000, by: 66 MR. CHRISTOPHER SCHARFF 67 MR. CHRISTOPHER SCHARFF 68 MR. CHRISTOPHER SCHARFF 79 MR. CHRISTOPHER SCHARFF 70 cscharff@mcandrews-ip.com, and 70 MR. ANDREW KARP 70 ARAP@mcandrews-ip.com, and 71 MR. SCOTT McBRIDE 71 MR. SCOTT McBRIDE 72 ARAP@mcandrews-ip.com, and 73 MR. SCOTT McBRIDE 74 MR. SCOTT McBRIDE 75 MR. Petitioner in their petition, we point out that it's conclusory and unsupported, and rather than responding to that argument is made specific or supported by the evidence, they instead submit a new specific argument and new evidence.		- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
10 MR. GREGORY P. HUH 11 gregory.huh.ipr@haynesboone.com 12 Appearing on Behalf of Petitioner Cisco 13 Systems, Inc. 14 Peter McAndrews, and I have with me Scott McBride 15 COOLEY, LLP 16 1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Suite 700 17 Washington, DC 20004 18 (703)456-8130, by: 19 MR. STEPHEN McBRIDE 20 smcbride@cooley.com 21 Appearing on Behalf of Petitioner 22 Dish Network, LLC 23 Appearing on Behalf of Petitioner 24 APPEARANCES, CONTINUED: 25 APPEARANCES, CONTINUED: 26 Gi312)775-8000, by: 27 MR. PETER J. McANDREWS 28 pmcandrews@mcandrews-ip.com, and 29 MR. CHRISTOPHER SCHARFF 10 cscharff@mcandrews-ip.com, and 10 MR. SCOTT McBRIDE 11 Appeared and tha specific or supported flow are point out that it's conclusory and unsupported, and rather than responding to that argument ts made specific or supported by the vidence, they instead submit a new evidence. It's new specific gragument and new evidence. It's new specific gragument and new evidence. It's new specific gragument and new evidence. It's new specific and that it's conclusory and unsupported, and rather than responding to that argument ts made specific or supported by the vidence, they instead submit a new specific argument and new evidence.				
11 gregory.huh.ipr@haynesboone.com 12 Appearing on Behalf of Petitioner Cisco 13 Systems, Inc. 14 Peter McAndrews, and I have with me Scott McBride 15 COOLEY, LLP 16 1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Suite 700 17 Washington, DC 20004 18 (703)456-8130, by: 19 MR. STEPHEN McBRIDE 20 smcbride@cooley.com 21 Appearing on Behalf of Petitioner 22 Dish Network, LLC 23 APPEARANCES, CONTINUED: 24 Page 3 25 Page 3 26 Page 3 27 Page 3 28 Page 3 29 Page 3 29 Patent Owner requests authorization to file motions to strike the replies in the six proceedings or authorization to file surreplies in each of the six proceedings. And so well begin with Patent Owner's explanation stating specifically the basis for the requested relief. 29 MR. McANDREWS: Yes, Your Honor. 21 Appearing on Behalf of Petitioner 22 Dish Network, LLC 23 MR. McANDREWS: Yes, Your Honor. 24 The Petitioner in their replies have 25 Page 3 26 Page 3 27 Page 3 28 Page 3 29 Page 3 29 Page 3 20 Page 3 20 Page 3 20 Page 3 21 Countries death of the six proceedings or and submitted quite a bit of new evidence. It's evidence that patent owner could not have anticipated and has not had an opportunity to address or submit countrevidence to. 30 McANDREWS HELD & MALLOY, LTD. South West Madison Street, 34th Floor Chicago, Illinois 60661 Chicago, Illinois 60661 South Appearance of the six proceedings of				
Appearing on Behalf of Petitioner Cisco Systems, Inc. Appearing on Behalf of Petitioner Cisco Systems, Inc. MR. McANDREWS: Yes, Your Honor, this is Peter McAndrews, and I have with me Scott McBride Chris Scharff and Andrew Karp. COOLEY, LLP Standard Avenue, NW, Suite 700 Substitution of 1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Suite 700 Substitution of 1699 Substit				
13 Systems, Inc. 14 Peter McAndrews, and I have with me Scott McBride 15 COOLEY, LLP 16 1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Suite 700 17 Washington, DC 20004 18 (703)456-8130, by: 19 MR. STEPHEN McBRIDE 20 smcbride@cooley.com 21 Appearing on Behalf of Petitioner 22 Dish Network, LLC 23 Page 3 1 APPEARANCES, CONTINUED: 24 Page 3 1 APPEARANCES, CONTINUED: 25 McANDREWS HELD & MALLOY, LTD. 26 Gi (312)775-8000, by: 27 MR. PETER J. McANDREWS 28 pmcandrews@mcandrews-ip.com, and 29 MR. CHRISTOPHER SCHARFF 10 cschartf@mcandrews-ip.com, and 10 MR. ANDREW KARP 11 MR. SCOTT McBRIDE 13 MR. McANDREWS: Yes, Your Honor, this is 14 Peter McAndrews, and I have with me Scott McBride 15 Chris Schartf and Andrew sip.com, and 16 Peter McAndrews, and I have with me Scott McBride 16 Chris Schartf and Andrew Karp 17 McBRIDE 18 Page 17 APPEARANCES, CONTINUED: 19 authorization to file surreplies in each of the six proceedings or authorization to file surreplies in each of the six proceedings or authorization to file surreplies in each of the six proceedings. And so we'll begin with Patent 20 Owner's explanation stating specifically the basis for the requested relief. 22 MR. McANDREWS: Yes, Your Honor. 24 The Petitioner in their replies have Page 25 Page 26 Page 27 Page 28 Page 29 Patent Owner requests authorization to file motions to strike the replies in the six proceedings or authorization to file surreplies in each of the six proceedings or authorization to file surreplies for the requeste relief. MR. McANDREWS: Yes, Your Honor. 29 Trained a large number of new arguments and has submitted quite a bit of new evidence. It's evidence that patent owner could not have anticipated and has not had an opportunity to address or submit counterevidence to. Salva Page 3 Page 4 Page 4 Page 6 Page 7				•
14 Peter McAndrews, and I have with me Scott McBride 15 COOLEY, LLP 16 1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Suite 700 16 1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Suite 700 17 Washington, DC 20004 18 (703)456-8130, by: 19 MR. STEPHEN McBRIDE 20 smcbride@cooley.com 21 Appearing on Behalf of Petitioner 22 Dish Network, LLC 23 Dish Network, LLC 24 The Petitioner in their replies in each of the six proceedings. And so we'll begin with Patent 25 Owner's explanation stating specifically the basis for the requested relief. 26 MR. McANDREWS: Yes, Your Honor. 27 The Petitioner in their replies have Page 28 Page 29 Page 29 Page 20 Owner's explanation stating specifically the basis for the requested relief. 29 MR. McANDREWS: Yes, Your Honor. 20 The Petitioner in their replies have Page 20 Submitted quite a bit of new arguments and have anticipated and has not had an opportunity to address or submit counterevidence to. 29 Examples of what has been submitted her are, for example, Petitioner makes a conclusory statement in their petition, we point out that its conclusory and unsupported, and rather than responding to that argument by pointing out which in the record the argument by pointing out which in the record the argument by pointing out which in the record the argument is made specific or supported by the evidence, they instead submit a new specific argument and new evidence.				
15 COOLEY, LLP 16 1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Suite 700 16 1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Suite 700 17 Washington, DC 20004 18 (703)456-8130, by: 19 MR. STEPHEN McBRIDE 20 smcbride@cooley.com 21 Appearing on Behalf of Petitioner 22 Dish Network, LLC 23 Dish Network, LLC 24 The Petitioner in their replies have Page 3 APPEARANCES, CONTINUED: 25 McANDREWS HELD & MALLOY, LTD. 26 SOO West Madison Street, 34th Floor 27 Chicago, Illinois 60661 28 Gillinois 60661 29 MR. PETER J. McANDREWS 20 mg. ACANDREWS 21 APPEAR MCES, CONTINUED: 22 To be submitted quite a bit of new evidence. It's evidence that patent owner could not have anticipated and has not had an opportunity to address or submit counterevidence to. 29 Chicago, Illinois 60661 30 MR. PETER J. McANDREWS 30 MR. PETER J. McANDREWS 40 MR. PETER J. McANDREWS 41 MR. ANDREW SARP 42 ARAPE MR. ANDREW SARP 43 MR. ANDREW KARP 44 ARAPE MR. ANDREW KARP 45 MR. CHRISTOPHER SCHARFF 46 Conclusory and unsupported, and rather than responding to that argument is made specific or supported by the evidence, they instead submit a new specific argument and new evidence.		Systems, Inc.		
16 1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Suite 700 17 Washington, DC 20004 18 (703)456-8130, by: 19 MR. STEPHEN McBRIDE 20 smcbride@cooley.com 21 Appearing on Behalf of Petitioner 22 Dish Network, LLC 23 MR. McANDREWS: Yes, Your Honor. 24 Page 3 Page 25 APPEARANCES, CONTINUED: 26 MCANDREWS HELD & MALLOY, LTD. 27 Soo West Madison Street, 34th Floor 28 Chicago, Illinois 60661 29 Gallen Schaff@mcandrews-ip.com, and 30 MR. PETER J. McANDREWS 31 MR. PETER J. McANDREWS 42 pmcandrews@mcandrews-ip.com, and 43 MR. ANDREW KARP 44 MR. ANDREW KARP 55 Age Mallen Schaff Companded S		COOLEY LID		
17 Washington, DC 20004 18 (703)456-8130, by: 19 MR. STEPHEN McBRIDE 20 smcbride@cooley.com 21 Appearing on Behalf of Petitioner 22 Dish Network, LLC 23 BAPEARANCES, CONTINUED: 24 APPEARANCES, CONTINUED: 25 McANDREWS HELD & MALLOY, LTD. 26 G(312)775-8000, by: 27 MR. PETER J. McANDREWS 28 pmcandrews@mcandrews-ip.com, and 29 MR. CHRISTOPHER SCHARFF 20 smcbride@mcandrews-ip.com, and 30 MR. ANDREW KARP 31 MR. ANDREW KARP 32 MR. SCOTT McBRIDE 33 MR. ANDREWS HELD & MALLOY ITD. 34 Statement in their petition, we point out that it's conclusory and unsupported, and rather than responding to that argument is made specific or supported by the evidence, they instead submit a new specific argument and new evidence.		•		
18 (703)456-8130, by: 19 MR. STEPHEN McBRIDE 20 smcbride@cooley.com 21 Appearing on Behalf of Petitioner 21 Appearing on Behalf of Petitioner 22 Dish Network, LLC 23 BAPPEARANCES, CONTINUED: 24 Page 3 25 APPEARANCES, CONTINUED: 26 APPEARANCES, CONTINUED: 27 Taised a large number of new arguments and has submitted quite a bit of new evidence. It's evidence that patent owner could not have anticipated and has not had an opportunity to address or submit counterevidence to. 26 (312)775-8000, by: 27 MR. PETER J. McANDREWS 28 pmcandrews-ip.com, and MR. CHRISTOPHER SCHARFF or submitted many proceedings or authorization to file surreplies in the six proceedings or authorization to file surreplies in each of the six proceedings. And so we'll begin with Patent Owner's explanation stating specifically the basis for the requested relief. 29 MR. McANDREWS: Yes, Your Honor. 20 The Petitioner in their replies have Page 3 Page 4 20 Dish Network, LLC 21 Owner's explanation stating specifically the basis for the requested relief. 22 MR. McANDREWS: Yes, Your Honor. 23 The Petitioner in their replies have Page 4 24 Evidence that patent owner could not have anticipated and has not had an opportunity to address or submit counterevidence to. 25 Examples of what has been submitted her are, for example, Petitioner makes a conclusory statement in their petition, we point out that it's conclusory and unsupported, and rather than responding to that argument by pointing out whin the record the argument is made specific or supported by the evidence, they instead submit a new specific argument and new evidence.		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
19 MR. STEPHEN McBRIDE 20 smcbride@cooley.com 21 Appearing on Behalf of Petitioner 22 Dish Network, LLC 23 Dish Network, LLC 24 Dish Network, LLC 25 Dish Network, LLC 26 Dish Network, LLC 27 Dish Network, LLC 28 Dish Network, LLC 29 For the requested relief. 20 MR. McANDREWS: Yes, Your Honor. 20 The Petitioner in their replies have Page 20 Page 21 APPEARANCES, CONTINUED: 21 Traised a large number of new arguments and had a submitted quite a bit of new evidence. It's evidence that patent owner could not have anticipated and has not had an opportunity to address or submit counterevidence to. 21 Chicago, Illinois 60661 22 Submitted quite a bit of new evidence. It's evidence that patent owner could not have anticipated and has not had an opportunity to address or submit counterevidence to. 23 McANDREWS HELD & MALLOY, LTD. 3 Examples of what has been submitted her are, for example, Petitioner makes a conclusory pmcandrews@mcandrews-ip.com, and MR. CHRISTOPHER SCHARFF pmcandrews-ip.com, and MR. ANDREW KARP 20 MR. CHRISTOPHER SCHARFF pmcandrews-ip.com, and MR. SCOTT McBRIDE pmcandrews-ip.com, and material pmcandrews-ip.com, and material pmcandrews-ip.com, and mr. seponding to that argument is made specific or supported by the evidence, they instead submit a new specific argument and new evidence.		——————————————————————————————————————		-
20 smcbride@cooley.com 21 Appearing on Behalf of Petitioner 22 Dish Network, LLC 23 MR. McANDREWS: Yes, Your Honor. 24 The Petitioner in their replies have Page 3 APPEARANCES, CONTINUED: 2 submitted quite a bit of new arguments and have sevidence. It's evidence that patent owner could not have anticipated and has not had an opportunity to address or submit counterevidence to. 3 McANDREWS HELD & MALLOY, LTD. 4 500 West Madison Street, 34th Floor 5 Chicago, Illinois 60661 6 (312)775-8000, by: 6 Examples of what has been submitted her are, for example, Petitioner makes a conclusory pmcandrews@mcandrews-ip.com, and MR. CHRISTOPHER SCHARFF 10 cscharff@mcandrews-ip.com, and 11 MR. ANDREW KARP 12 akarp@mcandrews-ip.com, and 13 MR. SCOTT McBRIDE 14 smcbride@mcandrews.ip.com, and 15 MR. SCOTT McBRIDE 16 mrs. And so we'll begin with Patent 20 Owner's explanation stating specifically the basis for the requested relief. 22 mR. McANDREWS: Yes, Your Honor. 24 The Petitioner in their replies have Page 1 raised a large number of new arguments and have evidence. It's evidence that patent owner could not have anticipated and has not had an opportunity to address or submit counterevidence to. Examples of what has been submitted her are, for example, Petitioner makes a conclusory statement in their petition, we point out that it's conclusory and unsupported, and rather than responding to that argument by pointing out whing the properties of the argument is made specific or supported by the evidence, they instead submit a new specific argument and new evidence.		· / ·		
21 Appearing on Behalf of Petitioner 22 Dish Network, LLC 23 MR. McANDREWS: Yes, Your Honor. 24 The Petitioner in their replies have Page 3 APPEARANCES, CONTINUED: 1 raised a large number of new arguments and had submitted quite a bit of new evidence. It's evidence that patent owner could not have anticipated and has not had an opportunity to address or submit counterevidence to. 25 Chicago, Illinois 60661 26 (312)775-8000, by: 27 MR. PETER J. McANDREWS 28 pmcandrews@mcandrews-ip.com, and pmcandrews@mcandrews-ip.com, and to cscharff@mcandrews-ip.com, and to cscharff@mcandrews-ip.com, and to cscharff@mcandrews-ip.com, and to adarps to that argument is made specific or supported by the evidence, they instead submit a new specific argument and new evidence.				
Dish Network, LLC Dish Network Properations Am. M. ANDREWS Held & MR. MALLOY, LTD. District Page District Properation in their replies have District Properation in their replies have Page District Properation in their replies have District Properation in their petition, we point out that it's District Properation in their petition, we point out that it's District Properation in their petition, we point out that it's District Properation in their petition, we point out that it's District Properation in their petition, we point out that it's District Properation in their petition, we point out that it's District Properation in their petition, we point out that it's District Properation in their petition, we point out that it's District Propera	_	· ·		
23 MR. McANDREWS: Yes, Your Honor. 24 The Petitioner in their replies have Page 3 APPEARANCES, CONTINUED: 1 raised a large number of new arguments and had submitted quite a bit of new evidence. It's 2 submitted quite a bit of new evidence. It's 3 McANDREWS HELD & MALLOY, LTD. 4 500 West Madison Street, 34th Floor 5 Chicago, Illinois 60661 5 address or submit counterevidence to. 6 (312)775-8000, by: 7 MR. PETER J. McANDREWS 8 pmcandrews@mcandrews-ip.com, and 9 MR. CHRISTOPHER SCHARFF 10 cscharff@mcandrews-ip.com, and 11 MR. ANDREW KARP 12 akarp@mcandrews-ip.com, and 13 MR. SCOTT McBRIDE 14 smebride@mcandrews-ip.com 15 mR. SCOTT McBRIDE 16 mR. MR. McANDREWS 17 mr. petitioner in their replies have 18 evidence that patent owner could not have 19 anticipated and has not had an opportunity to 20 address or submit counterevidence to. 21 Examples of what has been submitted her 22 are, for example, Petitioner makes a conclusory 23 statement in their petition, we point out that it's 24 conclusory and unsupported, and rather than 25 responding to that argument by pointing out who in the record the argument is made specific or 26 supported by the evidence, they instead submit a new specific argument and new evidence.				
Page 3 Page 3 Page 3 Page 1 APPEARANCES, CONTINUED: 1 raised a large number of new arguments and had submitted quite a bit of new evidence. It's evidence that patent owner could not have anticipated and has not had an opportunity to address or submit counterevidence to. (312)775-8000, by: 6 Examples of what has been submitted her are, for example, Petitioner makes a conclusory mcandrews@mcandrews-ip.com, and 9 MR. CHRISTOPHER SCHARFF 9 conclusory and unsupported, and rather than responding to that argument by pointing out who in the record the argument is made specific or supported by the evidence, they instead submit a new specific argument and new evidence.		Dish Network, LLC		
Page 3 APPEARANCES, CONTINUED: 1 raised a large number of new arguments and had submitted quite a bit of new evidence. It's submitted quite a bit of new evidence. It's evidence that patent owner could not have anticipated and has not had an opportunity to chicago, Illinois 60661 5 Chicago, Illinois 60661 6 (312)775-8000, by: 7 MR. PETER J. McANDREWS 8 pmcandrews@mcandrews-ip.com, and 9 MR. CHRISTOPHER SCHARFF 10 cscharff@mcandrews-ip.com, and 11 MR. ANDREW KARP 12 akarp@mcandrews-ip.com, and 13 MR. SCOTT McBRIDE 14 smcbride@mcandrews-ip.com 15 raised a large number of new arguments and had submitted a bit of new evidence. It's evidence that patent owner could not have anticipated and has not had an opportunity to address or submit counterevidence to. 16 Examples of what has been submitted her are, for example, Petitioner makes a conclusory statement in their petition, we point out that it's conclusory and unsupported, and rather than responding to that argument by pointing out when in the record the argument is made specific or supported by the evidence, they instead submit a new specific argument and new evidence.				
1 APPEARANCES, CONTINUED: 2 submitted quite a bit of new evidence. It's 3 McANDREWS HELD & MALLOY, LTD. 4 500 West Madison Street, 34th Floor 5 Chicago, Illinois 60661 6 (312)775-8000, by: 7 MR. PETER J. McANDREWS 8 pmcandrews@mcandrews-ip.com, and 9 MR. CHRISTOPHER SCHARFF 10 cscharff@mcandrews-ip.com, and 11 MR. ANDREW KARP 12 akarp@mcandrews-ip.com, and 13 MR. SCOTT McBRIDE 14 raised a large number of new arguments and had submit a new specific argument is made specific or submitted quite a bit of new evidence. It's 2 submitted quite a bit of new evidence. It's 2 submitted quite a bit of new evidence. It's 2 submitted quite a bit of new evidence. It's 2 submitted quite a bit of new evidence. It's 2 submitted quite a bit of new evidence. It's 3 evidence that patent owner could not have 4 anticipated and has not had an opportunity to address or submit counterevidence to. 5 Examples of what has been submitted her 4 are, for example, Petitioner makes a conclusory 5 statement in their petition, we point out that it's 6 conclusory and unsupported, and rather than 7 responding to that argument by pointing out who in the record the argument is made specific or 8 supported by the evidence, they instead submit a new specific argument and new evidence.	24		24	The Petitioner in their replies have
2 submitted quite a bit of new evidence. It's 3 McANDREWS HELD & MALLOY, LTD. 4 500 West Madison Street, 34th Floor 5 Chicago, Illinois 60661 6 (312)775-8000, by: 6 Examples of what has been submitted her 7 MR. PETER J. McANDREWS 8 pmcandrews@mcandrews-ip.com, and 9 MR. CHRISTOPHER SCHARFF 10 cscharff@mcandrews-ip.com, and 11 MR. ANDREW KARP 12 akarp@mcandrews-ip.com, and 13 MR. SCOTT McBRIDE 14 smcbride@mcandrews.ip.com 15 submitted quite a bit of new evidence. It's 2 evidence that patent owner could not have 4 anticipated and has not had an opportunity to 5 address or submit counterevidence to. 6 Examples of what has been submitted her 6 are, for example, Petitioner makes a conclusory 8 statement in their petition, we point out that it's 9 conclusory and unsupported, and rather than 10 responding to that argument by pointing out whim in the record the argument is made specific or 12 supported by the evidence, they instead submit a new specific argument and new evidence.		Page 3		Page 5
2 submitted quite a bit of new evidence. It's 3 McANDREWS HELD & MALLOY, LTD. 4 500 West Madison Street, 34th Floor 5 Chicago, Illinois 60661 6 (312)775-8000, by: 7 MR. PETER J. McANDREWS 8 pmcandrews@mcandrews-ip.com, and 9 MR. CHRISTOPHER SCHARFF 10 cscharff@mcandrews-ip.com, and 11 MR. ANDREW KARP 12 akarp@mcandrews-ip.com, and 13 MR. SCOTT McBRIDE 14 smcbride@mcandrews.ip.com 15 submitted quite a bit of new evidence. It's 2 evidence that patent owner could not have 4 anticipated and has not had an opportunity to 5 address or submit counterevidence to. 6 Examples of what has been submitted her 6 are, for example, Petitioner makes a conclusory 8 statement in their petition, we point out that it's 9 conclusory and unsupported, and rather than 10 responding to that argument by pointing out whin the record the argument is made specific or 12 supported by the evidence, they instead submit a new specific argument and new evidence.	1	APPEARANCES, CONTINUED:	1	raised a large number of new arguments and had
4 500 West Madison Street, 34th Floor 5 Chicago, Illinois 60661 6 (312)775-8000, by: 7 MR. PETER J. McANDREWS 8 pmcandrews@mcandrews-ip.com, and 9 MR. CHRISTOPHER SCHARFF 10 cscharff@mcandrews-ip.com, and 11 MR. ANDREW KARP 12 akarp@mcandrews-ip.com, and 13 MR. SCOTT McBRIDE 14 smcbride@mcandrews.ip.com 15 address or submit counterevidence to. 6 Examples of what has been submitted her 7 are, for example, Petitioner makes a conclusory 8 statement in their petition, we point out that it's 9 conclusory and unsupported, and rather than 10 responding to that argument by pointing out who 11 in the record the argument is made specific or 12 supported by the evidence, they instead submit a 13 new specific argument and new evidence.	2		2	submitted quite a bit of new evidence. It's
5 Chicago, Illinois 60661 5 address or submit counterevidence to. 6 (312)775-8000, by: 7 MR. PETER J. McANDREWS 8 pmcandrews@mcandrews-ip.com, and 9 MR. CHRISTOPHER SCHARFF 10 cscharff@mcandrews-ip.com, and 11 MR. ANDREW KARP 12 akarp@mcandrews-ip.com, and 13 MR. SCOTT McBRIDE 14 smcbride@mcandrews.ip.com 15 address or submit counterevidence to. 16 Examples of what has been submitted her 27 are, for example, Petitioner makes a conclusory 28 statement in their petition, we point out that it's 29 conclusory and unsupported, and rather than 20 responding to that argument by pointing out whim in the record the argument is made specific or supported by the evidence, they instead submit a new specific argument and new evidence.	3	McANDREWS HELD & MALLOY, LTD.	3	evidence that patent owner could not have
6 (312)775-8000, by: 7 MR. PETER J. McANDREWS 8 pmcandrews@mcandrews-ip.com, and 9 MR. CHRISTOPHER SCHARFF 10 cscharff@mcandrews-ip.com, and 11 MR. ANDREW KARP 12 akarp@mcandrews-ip.com, and 13 MR. SCOTT McBRIDE 14 smcbride@mcandrews.ip.com 15 Examples of what has been submitted her 26 are, for example, Petitioner makes a conclusory 27 statement in their petition, we point out that it's 28 conclusory and unsupported, and rather than 29 responding to that argument by pointing out which in the record the argument is made specific or supported by the evidence, they instead submit a new specific argument and new evidence.	4	500 West Madison Street, 34th Floor	4	anticipated and has not had an opportunity to
7 MR. PETER J. McANDREWS 8 pmcandrews@mcandrews-ip.com, and 9 MR. CHRISTOPHER SCHARFF 10 cscharff@mcandrews-ip.com, and 11 MR. ANDREW KARP 12 akarp@mcandrews-ip.com, and 13 MR. SCOTT McBRIDE 14 smcbride@mcandrews.ip.com 15 MR. ANDREW Karp 16 are, for example, Petitioner makes a conclusory statement in their petition, we point out that it's conclusory and unsupported, and rather than responding to that argument by pointing out who in the record the argument is made specific or supported by the evidence, they instead submit a new specific argument and new evidence.	5	Chicago, Illinois 60661	5	address or submit counterevidence to.
pmcandrews@mcandrews-ip.com, and MR. CHRISTOPHER SCHARFF cscharff@mcandrews-ip.com, and MR. ANDREW KARP akarp@mcandrews-ip.com, and MR. SCOTT McBRIDE MR. SCOTT McBRIDE metalty of champe, retables in their petition, we point out that it's conclusory and unsupported, and rather than responding to that argument by pointing out whe in the record the argument is made specific or supported by the evidence, they instead submit a new specific argument and new evidence.			6	Examples of what has been submitted here
9 MR. CHRISTOPHER SCHARFF 10 cscharff@mcandrews-ip.com, and 11 MR. ANDREW KARP 12 akarp@mcandrews-ip.com, and 13 MR. SCOTT McBRIDE 14 smcbride@mcandrews.ip.com 15 statistic in the petiton, we point out that its conclusory and unsupported, and rather than responding to that argument by pointing out who in the record the argument is made specific or supported by the evidence, they instead submit a new specific argument and new evidence.			7	are, for example, Petitioner makes a conclusory
cscharff@mcandrews-ip.com, and MR. ANDREW KARP akarp@mcandrews-ip.com, and MR. SCOTT McBRIDE MR. SCOTT McBRIDE smcbride@mcandrews.ip.com akarp@mcandrews.ip.com supported by the evidence, they instead submit a new specific argument and new evidence.		* *	8	statement in their petition, we point out that it's
11 MR. ANDREW KARP 12 akarp@mcandrews-ip.com, and 13 MR. SCOTT McBRIDE 14 smcbride@mcandrews.ip.com 15 responding to that argument by pointing out with responding to that argument is made specific or supported by the evidence, they instead submit a new specific argument and new evidence.			9	conclusory and unsupported, and rather than
12 akarp@mcandrews-ip.com, and 13 MR. SCOTT McBRIDE 14 smcbride@mcandrews.ip.com 15 In the record the argument is made specific or 16 supported by the evidence, they instead submit a new specific argument and new evidence.			10	responding to that argument by pointing out where
13 MR. SCOTT McBRIDE supported by the evidence, they instead submit a new specific argument and new evidence.			11	in the record the argument is made specific or
14 smcbride@mcandrews.in.com			12	supported by the evidence, they instead submit a
1 4 Another example would be where we have			13	new specific argument and new evidence.
15 Anomer example would be where we have		sinconde@incandrews-ip.com,	14	Another example would be where we have
Appearing on Behalf of Patent Owner 15 pointed out that the argument that they present i	1.0	Appearing on Rehalf of Patent Owner	15	pointed out that the argument that they present is
16 incorrect, and rather than coming back and	16	Appearing on Bendin of Latent Owner		
17 explaining why their argument was correct, they			17	explaining why their argument was correct, they've
18 instead changed their argument. They changed			18	instead changed their argument. They changed it
19 into something completely different that could n				into something completely different that could not
			20	have been addressed by the Patent Owner in the
21 first instance.				first instance.
22 Additionally, there are instances where				
	23	REPORTED BY: SUZANNE DUDA		we have pointed out that they had no evidence for
24 CSR-3199, RPR, CRR 24 an assertion, and rather than coming back and	24	CSR-3199, RPR, CRR	24	an assertion, and rather than coming back and

2 (Pages 2 to 5)





	Page 6		Page 8
1	explaining where that evidence is in the record for	1	know, we but the listing might help us in such a
2	the assertion, they had submitted new evidence, new	2	situation as this.
3	evidence that we have not had an adequate	3	So we'll hear from Petitioner at this
4	opportunity to respond to or to, for example,	4	time.
5	submit our own expert's interpretation of that	5	MR. McANDREWS: Your Honor, I apologize.
6	evidence.	6	This is Peter McAndrews. If I might add one
7	I can provide some specific instances of	7	additional thing about the listing?
8	where this has occurred; however, just in	8	The listing that we have seen and,
9	summary and we've put this in an email to	9	granted, I haven't, you know, done thorough enough
10	Petitioner's counsel we listed for the 1006	10	research to know that I've seen all of them but
11	and 1009 proceedings we've listed four new	11	if a listing is allowed, what I've seen is that
12	arguments, four instances of new argument or new	12	there's a listing by Patent Owner of the arguments
13	evidence, for the 1007, 1008, and then also for the	13	that are allegedly new, and then the responsive
14	1009, because it has some additional arguments,	14	listing for whatever reason which required to show
15	we've listed eight new instances of new evidence or	15	where why the reply is responsive to something
16	new argument, and then for the 1021 and 1020	16	in the Patent Owner response. But that's really
17	proceedings we've listed six separate instances of	17	not the issue, the issue is whether the reply
18	new argument or evidence.	18	includes new evidence that should have been
19	I could go through those or I could give	19	presented in the petition.
20	you a couple anecdotal versions of those, but I	20	I just wanted to point that out, Your
21	believe that the more efficient way to get a proper	21	Honor, just in the event that you had a particular
22	record before the panel would be to allow	22	type of listing in response to the listing in mind.
23	Petitioner to submit these in writing in summary	23	JUDGE MEDLEY: Right. And I think it's
24	format as a precursor to determining whether we	24	listings that are generally that I'm aware of is
	Page 7		Page 9
1	Page 7 would be allowed to file a motion to strike or the	1	Page 9 because the Petitioner's response to the
1 2	_	1 2	
	would be allowed to file a motion to strike or the		because the Petitioner's response to the
2	would be allowed to file a motion to strike or the surreply if the panel believed that's necessary as	2	because the Petitioner's response to the allegation, if you will, is that, well, our you
2	would be allowed to file a motion to strike or the surreply if the panel believed that's necessary as a threshold to allowing us to file a motion to	2 3	because the Petitioner's response to the allegation, if you will, is that, well, our you know, it was necessitated. We had to you know,
2 3 4	would be allowed to file a motion to strike or the surreply if the panel believed that's necessary as a threshold to allowing us to file a motion to strike or in the alternative to reply in the first	2 3 4	because the Petitioner's response to the allegation, if you will, is that, well, our you know, it was necessitated. We had to you know, we couldn't have anticipated a type of argument.
2 3 4 5	would be allowed to file a motion to strike or the surreply if the panel believed that's necessary as a threshold to allowing us to file a motion to strike or in the alternative to reply in the first place.	2 3 4 5	because the Petitioner's response to the allegation, if you will, is that, well, our you know, it was necessitated. We had to you know, we couldn't have anticipated a type of argument. So but I understand what you're saying.
2 3 4 5 6	would be allowed to file a motion to strike or the surreply if the panel believed that's necessary as a threshold to allowing us to file a motion to strike or in the alternative to reply in the first place. JUDGE MEDLEY: Okay, I understand.	2 3 4 5 6	because the Petitioner's response to the allegation, if you will, is that, well, our you know, it was necessitated. We had to you know, we couldn't have anticipated a type of argument. So but I understand what you're saying. Okay, so we'll hear from Petitioner.
2 3 4 5 6 7	would be allowed to file a motion to strike or the surreply if the panel believed that's necessary as a threshold to allowing us to file a motion to strike or in the alternative to reply in the first place. JUDGE MEDLEY: Okay, I understand. I think — so you've probably — before	2 3 4 5 6 7	because the Petitioner's response to the allegation, if you will, is that, well, our you know, it was necessitated. We had to you know, we couldn't have anticipated a type of argument. So but I understand what you're saying. Okay, so we'll hear from Petitioner. MR. McCOMBS: Yes, Your Honor.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	would be allowed to file a motion to strike or the surreply if the panel believed that's necessary as a threshold to allowing us to file a motion to strike or in the alternative to reply in the first place. JUDGE MEDLEY: Okay, I understand. I think so you've probably before we heard from Petitioner, you probably both are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	because the Petitioner's response to the allegation, if you will, is that, well, our you know, it was necessitated. We had to you know, we couldn't have anticipated a type of argument. So but I understand what you're saying. Okay, so we'll hear from Petitioner. MR. McCOMBS: Yes, Your Honor. Judge Medley, first of all I'd just point
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	would be allowed to file a motion to strike or the surreply if the panel believed that's necessary as a threshold to allowing us to file a motion to strike or in the alternative to reply in the first place. JUDGE MEDLEY: Okay, I understand. I think — so you've probably — before we heard from Petitioner, you probably both are familiar with both procedures sometimes when this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	because the Petitioner's response to the allegation, if you will, is that, well, our you know, it was necessitated. We had to you know, we couldn't have anticipated a type of argument. So but I understand what you're saying. Okay, so we'll hear from Petitioner. MR. McCOMBS: Yes, Your Honor. Judge Medley, first of all I'd just point out that our position is that our petition replies
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	would be allowed to file a motion to strike or the surreply if the panel believed that's necessary as a threshold to allowing us to file a motion to strike or in the alternative to reply in the first place. JUDGE MEDLEY: Okay, I understand. I think — so you've probably — before we heard from Petitioner, you probably both are familiar with both procedures sometimes when this issue — this type of thing comes up that the Board	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	because the Petitioner's response to the allegation, if you will, is that, well, our you know, it was necessitated. We had to you know, we couldn't have anticipated a type of argument. So but I understand what you're saying. Okay, so we'll hear from Petitioner. MR. McCOMBS: Yes, Your Honor. Judge Medley, first of all I'd just point out that our position is that our petition replies are fully compliant with Rule 42.23(b) and that we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	would be allowed to file a motion to strike or the surreply if the panel believed that's necessary as a threshold to allowing us to file a motion to strike or in the alternative to reply in the first place. JUDGE MEDLEY: Okay, I understand. I think — so you've probably — before we heard from Petitioner, you probably both are familiar with both procedures sometimes when this issue — this type of thing comes up that the Board sometimes will allow the parties to file a listing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	because the Petitioner's response to the allegation, if you will, is that, well, our you know, it was necessitated. We had to you know, we couldn't have anticipated a type of argument. So but I understand what you're saying. Okay, so we'll hear from Petitioner. MR. McCOMBS: Yes, Your Honor. Judge Medley, first of all I'd just point out that our position is that our petition replies are fully compliant with Rule 42.23(b) and that we understand that the arguments that we raise are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	would be allowed to file a motion to strike or the surreply if the panel believed that's necessary as a threshold to allowing us to file a motion to strike or in the alternative to reply in the first place. JUDGE MEDLEY: Okay, I understand. I think — so you've probably — before we heard from Petitioner, you probably both are familiar with both procedures sometimes when this issue — this type of thing comes up that the Board sometimes will allow the parties to file a listing like you are proposing, Patent Owner?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	because the Petitioner's response to the allegation, if you will, is that, well, our you know, it was necessitated. We had to you know, we couldn't have anticipated a type of argument. So but I understand what you're saying. Okay, so we'll hear from Petitioner. MR. McCOMBS: Yes, Your Honor. Judge Medley, first of all I'd just point out that our position is that our petition replies are fully compliant with Rule 42.23(b) and that we understand that the arguments that we raise are supposed to be responding to the arguments raised
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	would be allowed to file a motion to strike or the surreply if the panel believed that's necessary as a threshold to allowing us to file a motion to strike or in the alternative to reply in the first place. JUDGE MEDLEY: Okay, I understand. I think — so you've probably — before we heard from Petitioner, you probably both are familiar with both procedures sometimes when this issue — this type of thing comes up that the Board sometimes will allow the parties to file a listing like you are proposing, Patent Owner? MR. McANDREWS: Yes, Your Honor, we've	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	because the Petitioner's response to the allegation, if you will, is that, well, our you know, it was necessitated. We had to you know, we couldn't have anticipated a type of argument. So but I understand what you're saying. Okay, so we'll hear from Petitioner. MR. McCOMBS: Yes, Your Honor. Judge Medley, first of all I'd just point out that our position is that our petition replies are fully compliant with Rule 42.23(b) and that we understand that the arguments that we raise are supposed to be responding to the arguments raised in the Patent Owner response, and that is what we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	would be allowed to file a motion to strike or the surreply if the panel believed that's necessary as a threshold to allowing us to file a motion to strike or in the alternative to reply in the first place. JUDGE MEDLEY: Okay, I understand. I think — so you've probably — before we heard from Petitioner, you probably both are familiar with both procedures sometimes when this issue — this type of thing comes up that the Board sometimes will allow the parties to file a listing like you are proposing, Patent Owner? MR. McANDREWS: Yes, Your Honor, we've seen that listing in other cases, and that is what	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	because the Petitioner's response to the allegation, if you will, is that, well, our you know, it was necessitated. We had to you know, we couldn't have anticipated a type of argument. So but I understand what you're saying. Okay, so we'll hear from Petitioner. MR. McCOMBS: Yes, Your Honor. Judge Medley, first of all I'd just point out that our position is that our petition replies are fully compliant with Rule 42.23(b) and that we understand that the arguments that we raise are supposed to be responding to the arguments raised in the Patent Owner response, and that is what we have done. We believe that the Board is fully
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	would be allowed to file a motion to strike or the surreply if the panel believed that's necessary as a threshold to allowing us to file a motion to strike or in the alternative to reply in the first place. JUDGE MEDLEY: Okay, I understand. I think — so you've probably — before we heard from Petitioner, you probably both are familiar with both procedures sometimes when this issue — this type of thing comes up that the Board sometimes will allow the parties to file a listing like you are proposing, Patent Owner? MR. McANDREWS: Yes, Your Honor, we've seen that listing in other cases, and that is what I'm referring to. JUDGE MEDLEY: So that kind of is a precursor to help us to figure out how to proceed.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	because the Petitioner's response to the allegation, if you will, is that, well, our you know, it was necessitated. We had to you know, we couldn't have anticipated a type of argument. So but I understand what you're saying. Okay, so we'll hear from Petitioner. MR. McCOMBS: Yes, Your Honor. Judge Medley, first of all I'd just point out that our position is that our petition replies are fully compliant with Rule 42.23(b) and that we understand that the arguments that we raise are supposed to be responding to the arguments raised in the Patent Owner response, and that is what we have done. We believe that the Board is fully capable of evaluating that in reviewing the replies. JUDGE MEDLEY: Okay. That's all you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	would be allowed to file a motion to strike or the surreply if the panel believed that's necessary as a threshold to allowing us to file a motion to strike or in the alternative to reply in the first place. JUDGE MEDLEY: Okay, I understand. I think — so you've probably — before we heard from Petitioner, you probably both are familiar with both procedures sometimes when this issue — this type of thing comes up that the Board sometimes will allow the parties to file a listing like you are proposing, Patent Owner? MR. McANDREWS: Yes, Your Honor, we've seen that listing in other cases, and that is what I'm referring to. JUDGE MEDLEY: So that kind of is a precursor to help us to figure out how to proceed. And just — as both parties know, I mean,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	because the Petitioner's response to the allegation, if you will, is that, well, our you know, it was necessitated. We had to you know, we couldn't have anticipated a type of argument. So but I understand what you're saying. Okay, so we'll hear from Petitioner. MR. McCOMBS: Yes, Your Honor. Judge Medley, first of all I'd just point out that our position is that our petition replies are fully compliant with Rule 42.23(b) and that we understand that the arguments that we raise are supposed to be responding to the arguments raised in the Patent Owner response, and that is what we have done. We believe that the Board is fully capable of evaluating that in reviewing the replies.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	would be allowed to file a motion to strike or the surreply if the panel believed that's necessary as a threshold to allowing us to file a motion to strike or in the alternative to reply in the first place. JUDGE MEDLEY: Okay, I understand. I think — so you've probably — before we heard from Petitioner, you probably both are familiar with both procedures sometimes when this issue — this type of thing comes up that the Board sometimes will allow the parties to file a listing like you are proposing, Patent Owner? MR. McANDREWS: Yes, Your Honor, we've seen that listing in other cases, and that is what I'm referring to. JUDGE MEDLEY: So that kind of is a precursor to help us to figure out how to proceed. And just — as both parties know, I mean, we appreciate the help, but we understand that —	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	because the Petitioner's response to the allegation, if you will, is that, well, our you know, it was necessitated. We had to you know, we couldn't have anticipated a type of argument. So but I understand what you're saying. Okay, so we'll hear from Petitioner. MR. McCOMBS: Yes, Your Honor. Judge Medley, first of all I'd just point out that our position is that our petition replies are fully compliant with Rule 42.23(b) and that we understand that the arguments that we raise are supposed to be responding to the arguments raised in the Patent Owner response, and that is what we have done. We believe that the Board is fully capable of evaluating that in reviewing the replies. JUDGE MEDLEY: Okay. That's all you have? So if we authorize them to file a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	would be allowed to file a motion to strike or the surreply if the panel believed that's necessary as a threshold to allowing us to file a motion to strike or in the alternative to reply in the first place. JUDGE MEDLEY: Okay, I understand. I think — so you've probably — before we heard from Petitioner, you probably both are familiar with both procedures sometimes when this issue — this type of thing comes up that the Board sometimes will allow the parties to file a listing like you are proposing, Patent Owner? MR. McANDREWS: Yes, Your Honor, we've seen that listing in other cases, and that is what I'm referring to. JUDGE MEDLEY: So that kind of is a precursor to help us to figure out how to proceed. And just — as both parties know, I mean, we appreciate the help, but we understand that — you know, our own rules which, you know, are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	because the Petitioner's response to the allegation, if you will, is that, well, our you know, it was necessitated. We had to you know, we couldn't have anticipated a type of argument. So but I understand what you're saying. Okay, so we'll hear from Petitioner. MR. McCOMBS: Yes, Your Honor. Judge Medley, first of all I'd just point out that our position is that our petition replies are fully compliant with Rule 42.23(b) and that we understand that the arguments that we raise are supposed to be responding to the arguments raised in the Patent Owner response, and that is what we have done. We believe that the Board is fully capable of evaluating that in reviewing the replies. JUDGE MEDLEY: Okay. That's all you have? So if we authorize them to file a listing, would you want to file a responsive
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	would be allowed to file a motion to strike or the surreply if the panel believed that's necessary as a threshold to allowing us to file a motion to strike or in the alternative to reply in the first place. JUDGE MEDLEY: Okay, I understand. I think — so you've probably — before we heard from Petitioner, you probably both are familiar with both procedures sometimes when this issue — this type of thing comes up that the Board sometimes will allow the parties to file a listing like you are proposing, Patent Owner? MR. McANDREWS: Yes, Your Honor, we've seen that listing in other cases, and that is what I'm referring to. JUDGE MEDLEY: So that kind of is a precursor to help us to figure out how to proceed. And just — as both parties know, I mean, we appreciate the help, but we understand that — you know, our own rules which, you know, are replies only able to respond to arguments raised in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	because the Petitioner's response to the allegation, if you will, is that, well, our you know, it was necessitated. We had to you know, we couldn't have anticipated a type of argument. So but I understand what you're saying. Okay, so we'll hear from Petitioner. MR. McCOMBS: Yes, Your Honor. Judge Medley, first of all I'd just point out that our position is that our petition replies are fully compliant with Rule 42.23(b) and that we understand that the arguments that we raise are supposed to be responding to the arguments raised in the Patent Owner response, and that is what we have done. We believe that the Board is fully capable of evaluating that in reviewing the replies. JUDGE MEDLEY: Okay. That's all you have? So if we authorize them to file a listing, would you want to file a responsive listing?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	would be allowed to file a motion to strike or the surreply if the panel believed that's necessary as a threshold to allowing us to file a motion to strike or in the alternative to reply in the first place. JUDGE MEDLEY: Okay, I understand. I think — so you've probably — before we heard from Petitioner, you probably both are familiar with both procedures sometimes when this issue — this type of thing comes up that the Board sometimes will allow the parties to file a listing like you are proposing, Patent Owner? MR. McANDREWS: Yes, Your Honor, we've seen that listing in other cases, and that is what I'm referring to. JUDGE MEDLEY: So that kind of is a precursor to help us to figure out how to proceed. And just — as both parties know, I mean, we appreciate the help, but we understand that — you know, our own rules which, you know, are replies only able to respond to arguments raised in a corresponding opposition or a Patent Owner	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	because the Petitioner's response to the allegation, if you will, is that, well, our you know, it was necessitated. We had to you know, we couldn't have anticipated a type of argument. So but I understand what you're saying. Okay, so we'll hear from Petitioner. MR. McCOMBS: Yes, Your Honor. Judge Medley, first of all I'd just point out that our position is that our petition replies are fully compliant with Rule 42.23(b) and that we understand that the arguments that we raise are supposed to be responding to the arguments raised in the Patent Owner response, and that is what we have done. We believe that the Board is fully capable of evaluating that in reviewing the replies. JUDGE MEDLEY: Okay. That's all you have? So if we authorize them to file a listing, would you want to file a responsive listing? MR. McCOMBS: Yes, Your Honor. I don't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	would be allowed to file a motion to strike or the surreply if the panel believed that's necessary as a threshold to allowing us to file a motion to strike or in the alternative to reply in the first place. JUDGE MEDLEY: Okay, I understand. I think — so you've probably — before we heard from Petitioner, you probably both are familiar with both procedures sometimes when this issue — this type of thing comes up that the Board sometimes will allow the parties to file a listing like you are proposing, Patent Owner? MR. McANDREWS: Yes, Your Honor, we've seen that listing in other cases, and that is what I'm referring to. JUDGE MEDLEY: So that kind of is a precursor to help us to figure out how to proceed. And just — as both parties know, I mean, we appreciate the help, but we understand that — you know, our own rules which, you know, are replies only able to respond to arguments raised in a corresponding opposition or a Patent Owner response, and it's not supposed to make, you know,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	because the Petitioner's response to the allegation, if you will, is that, well, our you know, it was necessitated. We had to you know, we couldn't have anticipated a type of argument. So but I understand what you're saying. Okay, so we'll hear from Petitioner. MR. McCOMBS: Yes, Your Honor. Judge Medley, first of all I'd just point out that our position is that our petition replies are fully compliant with Rule 42.23(b) and that we understand that the arguments that we raise are supposed to be responding to the arguments raised in the Patent Owner response, and that is what we have done. We believe that the Board is fully capable of evaluating that in reviewing the replies. JUDGE MEDLEY: Okay. That's all you have? So if we authorize them to file a listing, would you want to file a responsive listing? MR. McCOMBS: Yes, Your Honor. I don't think we have an objection to the list format,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	would be allowed to file a motion to strike or the surreply if the panel believed that's necessary as a threshold to allowing us to file a motion to strike or in the alternative to reply in the first place. JUDGE MEDLEY: Okay, I understand. I think — so you've probably — before we heard from Petitioner, you probably both are familiar with both procedures sometimes when this issue — this type of thing comes up that the Board sometimes will allow the parties to file a listing like you are proposing, Patent Owner? MR. McANDREWS: Yes, Your Honor, we've seen that listing in other cases, and that is what I'm referring to. JUDGE MEDLEY: So that kind of is a precursor to help us to figure out how to proceed. And just — as both parties know, I mean, we appreciate the help, but we understand that — you know, our own rules which, you know, are replies only able to respond to arguments raised in a corresponding opposition or a Patent Owner	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	because the Petitioner's response to the allegation, if you will, is that, well, our you know, it was necessitated. We had to you know, we couldn't have anticipated a type of argument. So but I understand what you're saying. Okay, so we'll hear from Petitioner. MR. McCOMBS: Yes, Your Honor. Judge Medley, first of all I'd just point out that our position is that our petition replies are fully compliant with Rule 42.23(b) and that we understand that the arguments that we raise are supposed to be responding to the arguments raised in the Patent Owner response, and that is what we have done. We believe that the Board is fully capable of evaluating that in reviewing the replies. JUDGE MEDLEY: Okay. That's all you have? So if we authorize them to file a listing, would you want to file a responsive listing? MR. McCOMBS: Yes, Your Honor. I don't

3 (Pages 6 to 9)



	Page 10		Page 12
1	to make clear on the record that this should not be	1	heard anything that would compel us to authorize a
2	a substitute for additional briefing and that a	2	motion to strike and/or a motion for surreplies.
3	list is a list.	3	So it might be that we just receive the
4	JUDGE MEDLEY: Right.	4	list and that we use that as kind of a placeholder
5	MR. McCOMBS: And if that is what the	5	so that when we decide the cases, we can reference
6	Board has in mind, we're fully capable of providing	6	those lists and then determine whether, you know,
7	a response to such a list.	7	on our own whether the arguments and the reply go
8	JUDGE MEDLEY: Okay. All right. Let me	8	beyond the scope of what should be in a reply.
9	put you on hold and the panel will confer.	9	So we'll allow both parties to file a
10	Do either of the parties have anything	10	list in serial succession. So, Patent Owner, you
11	else to add?	11	will file your list followed by Petitioner's list.
12	MR. McANDREWS: Your Honor, yes. This is	12	And we'll send out an order probably by tomorrow.
13	Peter McAndrews for Patent Owner.	13	Are there any questions?
14	One concern that we had with merely	14	MR. McANDREWS: Yes, Your Honor. For
15	providing a listing at this time is that there's	15	Patent Owner it sounds like based on the timing of
16	going to be some time delay here, and,	16	this that this will preclude Patent Owner from
17	unfortunately, we find ourselves in the situation	17	submitting a surreply. In the event that the Board
18	where we are less than six weeks to the trial date,	18	were to determine that this is not new argument at
19	to the oral hearing date, and we have to cover a	19	a later date, it would have eliminated our ability
20	number of things between now and then, including,	20	to then file a surreply.
21	you know, we're cross-examining witnesses and, you	21	JUDGE MEDLEY: Yeah, we're capable of
22	know, we have authorizations that will become due.	22	asking for briefing at any time. I mean, even if
23	And so if the turn-around on this listing	23	we get to oral argument and we determine that we
24	and then Your Honor's decision on whether we can	24	want more briefing we can ask for more briefing.
	Page 11		Page 13
1	Page 11 even file a motion to strike in the first instance	1	
1 2		1 2	Page 13 So I don't think that's a concern right now, I think we just need a starting point to see what
	even file a motion to strike in the first instance		So I don't think that's a concern right now, I
2	even file a motion to strike in the first instance causes significant delay, this is going to be	2	So I don't think that's a concern right now, I think we just need a starting point to see what
2	even file a motion to strike in the first instance causes significant delay, this is going to be difficult for us to pull off in the limited amount	2 3	So I don't think that's a concern right now, I think we just need a starting point to see what you're talking about and then we can go from there.
2 3 4	even file a motion to strike in the first instance causes significant delay, this is going to be difficult for us to pull off in the limited amount of time.	2 3 4	So I don't think that's a concern right now, I think we just need a starting point to see what you're talking about and then we can go from there. Any other questions?
2 3 4 5	even file a motion to strike in the first instance causes significant delay, this is going to be difficult for us to pull off in the limited amount of time. And so I'd just like to make a request	2 3 4 5	So I don't think that's a concern right now, I think we just need a starting point to see what you're talking about and then we can go from there. Any other questions? MR. McCOMBS: Not from Petitioner. Thank
2 3 4 5 6	even file a motion to strike in the first instance causes significant delay, this is going to be difficult for us to pull off in the limited amount of time. And so I'd just like to make a request that Patent Owner would prefer to be allowed to go	2 3 4 5 6	So I don't think that's a concern right now, I think we just need a starting point to see what you're talking about and then we can go from there. Any other questions? MR. McCOMBS: Not from Petitioner. Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7	even file a motion to strike in the first instance causes significant delay, this is going to be difficult for us to pull off in the limited amount of time. And so I'd just like to make a request that Patent Owner would prefer to be allowed to go right to the motion to strike where, of course, we	2 3 4 5 6 7	So I don't think that's a concern right now, I think we just need a starting point to see what you're talking about and then we can go from there. Any other questions? MR. McCOMBS: Not from Petitioner. Thank you. JUDGE MEDLEY: Okay, thank you. We are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	even file a motion to strike in the first instance causes significant delay, this is going to be difficult for us to pull off in the limited amount of time. And so I'd just like to make a request that Patent Owner would prefer to be allowed to go right to the motion to strike where, of course, we would provide a summary listing up front of the issues, but then it would immediately provide, you know, the reasons why we believe each of these	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	So I don't think that's a concern right now, I think we just need a starting point to see what you're talking about and then we can go from there. Any other questions? MR. McCOMBS: Not from Petitioner. Thank you. JUDGE MEDLEY: Okay, thank you. We are adjourned. MR. McANDREWS: Your Honor, I apologize. Peter McAndrews. The timing of this?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	even file a motion to strike in the first instance causes significant delay, this is going to be difficult for us to pull off in the limited amount of time. And so I'd just like to make a request that Patent Owner would prefer to be allowed to go right to the motion to strike where, of course, we would provide a summary listing up front of the issues, but then it would immediately provide, you know, the reasons why we believe each of these issues are new and should have been raised and are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	So I don't think that's a concern right now, I think we just need a starting point to see what you're talking about and then we can go from there. Any other questions? MR. McCOMBS: Not from Petitioner. Thank you. JUDGE MEDLEY: Okay, thank you. We are adjourned. MR. McANDREWS: Your Honor, I apologize. Peter McAndrews. The timing of this? JUDGE MEDLEY: Uh-huh. It will be short.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	even file a motion to strike in the first instance causes significant delay, this is going to be difficult for us to pull off in the limited amount of time. And so I'd just like to make a request that Patent Owner would prefer to be allowed to go right to the motion to strike where, of course, we would provide a summary listing up front of the issues, but then it would immediately provide, you know, the reasons why we believe each of these issues are new and should have been raised and are violative of the trial guide in CFR.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	So I don't think that's a concern right now, I think we just need a starting point to see what you're talking about and then we can go from there. Any other questions? MR. McCOMBS: Not from Petitioner. Thank you. JUDGE MEDLEY: Okay, thank you. We are adjourned. MR. McANDREWS: Your Honor, I apologize. Peter McAndrews. The timing of this? JUDGE MEDLEY: Uh-huh. It will be short. If we send out an order tomorrow, Patent Owner will
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	even file a motion to strike in the first instance causes significant delay, this is going to be difficult for us to pull off in the limited amount of time. And so I'd just like to make a request that Patent Owner would prefer to be allowed to go right to the motion to strike where, of course, we would provide a summary listing up front of the issues, but then it would immediately provide, you know, the reasons why we believe each of these issues are new and should have been raised and are violative of the trial guide in CFR. JUDGE MEDLEY: Okay, I understand, and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	So I don't think that's a concern right now, I think we just need a starting point to see what you're talking about and then we can go from there. Any other questions? MR. McCOMBS: Not from Petitioner. Thank you. JUDGE MEDLEY: Okay, thank you. We are adjourned. MR. McANDREWS: Your Honor, I apologize. Peter McAndrews. The timing of this? JUDGE MEDLEY: Uh-huh. It will be short. If we send out an order tomorrow, Patent Owner will probably need to get in their list by, you know,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	even file a motion to strike in the first instance causes significant delay, this is going to be difficult for us to pull off in the limited amount of time. And so I'd just like to make a request that Patent Owner would prefer to be allowed to go right to the motion to strike where, of course, we would provide a summary listing up front of the issues, but then it would immediately provide, you know, the reasons why we believe each of these issues are new and should have been raised and are violative of the trial guide in CFR. JUDGE MEDLEY: Okay, I understand, and I'm sure Petitioner opposes that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	So I don't think that's a concern right now, I think we just need a starting point to see what you're talking about and then we can go from there. Any other questions? MR. McCOMBS: Not from Petitioner. Thank you. JUDGE MEDLEY: Okay, thank you. We are adjourned. MR. McANDREWS: Your Honor, I apologize. Peter McAndrews. The timing of this? JUDGE MEDLEY: Uh-huh. It will be short. If we send out an order tomorrow, Patent Owner will probably need to get in their list by, you know, I'd say mid next week and followed by Petitioner's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	even file a motion to strike in the first instance causes significant delay, this is going to be difficult for us to pull off in the limited amount of time. And so I'd just like to make a request that Patent Owner would prefer to be allowed to go right to the motion to strike where, of course, we would provide a summary listing up front of the issues, but then it would immediately provide, you know, the reasons why we believe each of these issues are new and should have been raised and are violative of the trial guide in CFR. JUDGE MEDLEY: Okay, I understand, and I'm sure Petitioner opposes that. MR. McCOMBS: Yes, Your Honor.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	So I don't think that's a concern right now, I think we just need a starting point to see what you're talking about and then we can go from there. Any other questions? MR. McCOMBS: Not from Petitioner. Thank you. JUDGE MEDLEY: Okay, thank you. We are adjourned. MR. McANDREWS: Your Honor, I apologize. Peter McAndrews. The timing of this? JUDGE MEDLEY: Uh-huh. It will be short. If we send out an order tomorrow, Patent Owner will probably need to get in their list by, you know, I'd say mid next week and followed by Petitioner's list three or four days after that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	even file a motion to strike in the first instance causes significant delay, this is going to be difficult for us to pull off in the limited amount of time. And so I'd just like to make a request that Patent Owner would prefer to be allowed to go right to the motion to strike where, of course, we would provide a summary listing up front of the issues, but then it would immediately provide, you know, the reasons why we believe each of these issues are new and should have been raised and are violative of the trial guide in CFR. JUDGE MEDLEY: Okay, I understand, and I'm sure Petitioner opposes that. MR. McCOMBS: Yes, Your Honor. JUDGE MEDLEY: All right. So let us	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	So I don't think that's a concern right now, I think we just need a starting point to see what you're talking about and then we can go from there. Any other questions? MR. McCOMBS: Not from Petitioner. Thank you. JUDGE MEDLEY: Okay, thank you. We are adjourned. MR. McANDREWS: Your Honor, I apologize. Peter McAndrews. The timing of this? JUDGE MEDLEY: Uh-huh. It will be short. If we send out an order tomorrow, Patent Owner will probably need to get in their list by, you know, I'd say mid next week and followed by Petitioner's list three or four days after that. Okay. Any other questions?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	even file a motion to strike in the first instance causes significant delay, this is going to be difficult for us to pull off in the limited amount of time. And so I'd just like to make a request that Patent Owner would prefer to be allowed to go right to the motion to strike where, of course, we would provide a summary listing up front of the issues, but then it would immediately provide, you know, the reasons why we believe each of these issues are new and should have been raised and are violative of the trial guide in CFR. JUDGE MEDLEY: Okay, I understand, and I'm sure Petitioner opposes that. MR. McCOMBS: Yes, Your Honor. JUDGE MEDLEY: All right. So let us confer for a few minutes, and then we'll get back	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	So I don't think that's a concern right now, I think we just need a starting point to see what you're talking about and then we can go from there. Any other questions? MR. McCOMBS: Not from Petitioner. Thank you. JUDGE MEDLEY: Okay, thank you. We are adjourned. MR. McANDREWS: Your Honor, I apologize. Peter McAndrews. The timing of this? JUDGE MEDLEY: Uh-huh. It will be short. If we send out an order tomorrow, Patent Owner will probably need to get in their list by, you know, I'd say mid next week and followed by Petitioner's list three or four days after that. Okay. Any other questions? All right, thank you. We are adjourned.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	even file a motion to strike in the first instance causes significant delay, this is going to be difficult for us to pull off in the limited amount of time. And so I'd just like to make a request that Patent Owner would prefer to be allowed to go right to the motion to strike where, of course, we would provide a summary listing up front of the issues, but then it would immediately provide, you know, the reasons why we believe each of these issues are new and should have been raised and are violative of the trial guide in CFR. JUDGE MEDLEY: Okay, I understand, and I'm sure Petitioner opposes that. MR. McCOMBS: Yes, Your Honor. JUDGE MEDLEY: All right. So let us confer for a few minutes, and then we'll get back online.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	So I don't think that's a concern right now, I think we just need a starting point to see what you're talking about and then we can go from there. Any other questions? MR. McCOMBS: Not from Petitioner. Thank you. JUDGE MEDLEY: Okay, thank you. We are adjourned. MR. McANDREWS: Your Honor, I apologize. Peter McAndrews. The timing of this? JUDGE MEDLEY: Uh-huh. It will be short. If we send out an order tomorrow, Patent Owner will probably need to get in their list by, you know, I'd say mid next week and followed by Petitioner's list three or four days after that. Okay. Any other questions? All right, thank you. We are adjourned. MR. McCOMBS: Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	even file a motion to strike in the first instance causes significant delay, this is going to be difficult for us to pull off in the limited amount of time. And so I'd just like to make a request that Patent Owner would prefer to be allowed to go right to the motion to strike where, of course, we would provide a summary listing up front of the issues, but then it would immediately provide, you know, the reasons why we believe each of these issues are new and should have been raised and are violative of the trial guide in CFR. JUDGE MEDLEY: Okay, I understand, and I'm sure Petitioner opposes that. MR. McCOMBS: Yes, Your Honor. JUDGE MEDLEY: All right. So let us confer for a few minutes, and then we'll get back online. (Discussion held off the record.)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	So I don't think that's a concern right now, I think we just need a starting point to see what you're talking about and then we can go from there. Any other questions? MR. McCOMBS: Not from Petitioner. Thank you. JUDGE MEDLEY: Okay, thank you. We are adjourned. MR. McANDREWS: Your Honor, I apologize. Peter McAndrews. The timing of this? JUDGE MEDLEY: Uh-huh. It will be short. If we send out an order tomorrow, Patent Owner will probably need to get in their list by, you know, I'd say mid next week and followed by Petitioner's list three or four days after that. Okay. Any other questions? All right, thank you. We are adjourned. MR. McCOMBS: Thank you. MR. McANDREWS: Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	even file a motion to strike in the first instance causes significant delay, this is going to be difficult for us to pull off in the limited amount of time. And so I'd just like to make a request that Patent Owner would prefer to be allowed to go right to the motion to strike where, of course, we would provide a summary listing up front of the issues, but then it would immediately provide, you know, the reasons why we believe each of these issues are new and should have been raised and are violative of the trial guide in CFR. JUDGE MEDLEY: Okay, I understand, and I'm sure Petitioner opposes that. MR. McCOMBS: Yes, Your Honor. JUDGE MEDLEY: All right. So let us confer for a few minutes, and then we'll get back online. (Discussion held off the record.) JUDGE MEDLEY: Okay, this is Judge Medley	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	So I don't think that's a concern right now, I think we just need a starting point to see what you're talking about and then we can go from there. Any other questions? MR. McCOMBS: Not from Petitioner. Thank you. JUDGE MEDLEY: Okay, thank you. We are adjourned. MR. McANDREWS: Your Honor, I apologize. Peter McAndrews. The timing of this? JUDGE MEDLEY: Uh-huh. It will be short. If we send out an order tomorrow, Patent Owner will probably need to get in their list by, you know, I'd say mid next week and followed by Petitioner's list three or four days after that. Okay. Any other questions? All right, thank you. We are adjourned. MR. McCOMBS: Thank you. MR. McANDREWS: Thank you. (Record closed at 3:16 p.m. EST)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	even file a motion to strike in the first instance causes significant delay, this is going to be difficult for us to pull off in the limited amount of time. And so I'd just like to make a request that Patent Owner would prefer to be allowed to go right to the motion to strike where, of course, we would provide a summary listing up front of the issues, but then it would immediately provide, you know, the reasons why we believe each of these issues are new and should have been raised and are violative of the trial guide in CFR. JUDGE MEDLEY: Okay, I understand, and I'm sure Petitioner opposes that. MR. McCOMBS: Yes, Your Honor. JUDGE MEDLEY: All right. So let us confer for a few minutes, and then we'll get back online. (Discussion held off the record.) JUDGE MEDLEY: Okay, this is Judge Medley back online.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	So I don't think that's a concern right now, I think we just need a starting point to see what you're talking about and then we can go from there. Any other questions? MR. McCOMBS: Not from Petitioner. Thank you. JUDGE MEDLEY: Okay, thank you. We are adjourned. MR. McANDREWS: Your Honor, I apologize. Peter McAndrews. The timing of this? JUDGE MEDLEY: Uh-huh. It will be short. If we send out an order tomorrow, Patent Owner will probably need to get in their list by, you know, I'd say mid next week and followed by Petitioner's list three or four days after that. Okay. Any other questions? All right, thank you. We are adjourned. MR. McCOMBS: Thank you. MR. McANDREWS: Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	even file a motion to strike in the first instance causes significant delay, this is going to be difficult for us to pull off in the limited amount of time. And so I'd just like to make a request that Patent Owner would prefer to be allowed to go right to the motion to strike where, of course, we would provide a summary listing up front of the issues, but then it would immediately provide, you know, the reasons why we believe each of these issues are new and should have been raised and are violative of the trial guide in CFR. JUDGE MEDLEY: Okay, I understand, and I'm sure Petitioner opposes that. MR. McCOMBS: Yes, Your Honor. JUDGE MEDLEY: All right. So let us confer for a few minutes, and then we'll get back online. (Discussion held off the record.) JUDGE MEDLEY: Okay, this is Judge Medley back online. We've conferred. We think at this point	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	So I don't think that's a concern right now, I think we just need a starting point to see what you're talking about and then we can go from there. Any other questions? MR. McCOMBS: Not from Petitioner. Thank you. JUDGE MEDLEY: Okay, thank you. We are adjourned. MR. McANDREWS: Your Honor, I apologize. Peter McAndrews. The timing of this? JUDGE MEDLEY: Uh-huh. It will be short. If we send out an order tomorrow, Patent Owner will probably need to get in their list by, you know, I'd say mid next week and followed by Petitioner's list three or four days after that. Okay. Any other questions? All right, thank you. We are adjourned. MR. McCOMBS: Thank you. MR. McANDREWS: Thank you. (Record closed at 3:16 p.m. EST)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	even file a motion to strike in the first instance causes significant delay, this is going to be difficult for us to pull off in the limited amount of time. And so I'd just like to make a request that Patent Owner would prefer to be allowed to go right to the motion to strike where, of course, we would provide a summary listing up front of the issues, but then it would immediately provide, you know, the reasons why we believe each of these issues are new and should have been raised and are violative of the trial guide in CFR. JUDGE MEDLEY: Okay, I understand, and I'm sure Petitioner opposes that. MR. McCOMBS: Yes, Your Honor. JUDGE MEDLEY: All right. So let us confer for a few minutes, and then we'll get back online. (Discussion held off the record.) JUDGE MEDLEY: Okay, this is Judge Medley back online.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	So I don't think that's a concern right now, I think we just need a starting point to see what you're talking about and then we can go from there. Any other questions? MR. McCOMBS: Not from Petitioner. Thank you. JUDGE MEDLEY: Okay, thank you. We are adjourned. MR. McANDREWS: Your Honor, I apologize. Peter McAndrews. The timing of this? JUDGE MEDLEY: Uh-huh. It will be short. If we send out an order tomorrow, Patent Owner will probably need to get in their list by, you know, I'd say mid next week and followed by Petitioner's list three or four days after that. Okay. Any other questions? All right, thank you. We are adjourned. MR. McCOMBS: Thank you. MR. McANDREWS: Thank you. (Record closed at 3:16 p.m. EST)

4 (Pages 10 to 13)





	D 14	
	Page 14	
1	CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC	
2		
3	I certify that this transcript, consisting of 14 pages,	
4	is a complete, true, and correct transcript of the	
5	telephonic conference call proceedings taken in this	
6	case on June 21, 2017.	
7		
8 9		
10		
11	June 23, 2017	
12	Julie 23, 2017	
13		
14	Suzanno Duda (CSR-3199)	
15	Registered Professional Reporter	
16	Certified Realtime Reporter Notary Public, Clinton County, Michigan	
17	Acting in the County of Gratiot My commission expires: May 6, 2019	
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23 24		
24		

5 (Page 14)





DOCKET

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.

