Apple Inc. vs. Voip-Pal.com, Inc.

Reporter's Transcript of Telephonic Hearing

June 07, 2017





Transcript of Telephonic Hearing

Apple Inc. vs. Voip-Pal.com, Inc.

	The state of the s
1	UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
2	BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD
3	
4	
5	APPLE INC.
6	Petitioner
7	v.
8	VOIP-PAL.COM, Inc.,
9	Patent Owner
10	
11	Case No. IPR2016-01198
12	U.S. Patent 9,179,005
13	Case No. IPR2016-01201 U.S. Patent 8,542,815
14	0.5. Patent 0,542,615
15	
16	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF TELEPHONIC HEARING
17	WEDNESDAY, JUNE 7, 2017
18	8:00 A.M 8:21 A.M.
19	
20	
21	
22	Reported by: Annette Moore
23	CSR No. 2648
24	Job No. 10033665
25	



Transcript of Telephonic Hearing

Apple Inc. vs. Voip-Pal.com, Inc.

1	APPEARING VIA TELEPHONE:
2	Patent Trial and Appeal Board:
3	JUDGE COX
4	JUDGE SCALA
5	JUDGE SHAGNON
6	For the Petitioner:
7	ERISE IP
8	BY: ADAM P. SEITZ, ESQ.
9	PAUL R. HART, ESQ.
10	6201 College Boulevard, Suite 300
11	Overland Park, Kansas 66211
12	(913) 777-5600
13	
14	For the Patent Owner:
15	KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP
16	BY: KERRY S. TAYLOR, ESQ.
17	2040 Main Street, 14th Floor
18	Irvine, California 92614
19	(949) 760-0404
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	



```
1
                  THE COURT: Hello, good morning.
                                                     This is
 2.
                 I'm joined on the call with Justice Scala and
     Judge Cox.
     Shagnon. Who do we have on the call for the petitioner?
 3
 4
                  MR. SEITZ: Adam Seitz. Also with me is Paul
 5
    Hart.
 6
                  THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Who do we
 7
    have on the call for the patent owner?
8
                  MR. TAYLOR: Kerry Taylor.
9
                  THE COURT: It sounds like we have a court
10
    reporter, is that correct?
11
                  THE COURT REPORTER: Yes.
12
                  THE COURT: Who arranged for the court
13
    reporter?
14
                  MR. TAYLOR: The patent owner arranged for
15
    that.
16
                  THE COURT: Once we're done with this call,
    please file the transcript, once it's available, as an
17
18
    exhibit.
19
                  MR. TAYLOR: Sure.
2.0
                  THE COURT: All right. This is a conference
21
    call in connection with two proceedings, IPR2016-01198 and
     IPR2016-01201.
22
23
         (The court reporter lost connection on the call.)
2.4
                  THE COURT:
                              Thank you. Mr. Seitz, I want to
25
    hear from you. Before you start, I wanted to ask: Have
```



2.0

you taken the position that the Board, this panel would be prohibited from allowing a sur-reply?

MR. SEITZ: No, Your Honor, we have not taken that position. Our position is just that the Board certainly has the power to grant the sur-reply. When you look at the cases that are out there, the decisions that are out there, nobody needs sur-replies. We believe that there's something very clear that's apparent there, and that is that a sur-reply is not a matter of right even when a patent owner raises an antedating prior art issue.

If you look at the cases cited by the parties, we believe that supports that, your Honor. For example, Belden, which Mr. Taylor was just discussing, clearly does not support the idea to an automatic sur-reply. They also cited the Cox case. That was unopposed because there was a new declaration, new evidence that was submitted in the reply.

There are other cases that were cited in Mr. Taylor's email that walk through whether a sur-reply was granted or not. When you look at those cases, there's, again, a very clear indication of something that was added in the reply. If you look at, for example, Cencio, these were cited in Mr. Kerry Taylor's last email, there was a challenge to inventorship that was raised for the first time in their reply brief. In the HTC case,



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.

