

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

CISCO SYSTEMS, INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

FOCAL IP, LLC,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case: IPR2016-01254<sup>1</sup>  
Patent 8,457,113 B2

---

Before SALLY C. MEDLEY and BARBARA A. PARVIS,  
*Administrative Patent Judges.*

PARVIS, *Administrative Patent Judge.*

ORDER  
Conduct of the Proceeding  
*37 C.F.R. § 42.5*

On September 14, 2017, a conference call was held with Judges Medley and Parvis and counsel for the parties in attendance. Patent Owner

---

<sup>1</sup> This Order addresses the same issues in the *inter partes* reviews IPR2016-01254, -01257, -01259, -01261, -01262, and -01263, also listed in the Appendix. Therefore, we issue one Order to be filed in all of the cases. The parties, however, are not authorized to use this style of filing in subsequent papers.

IPR2016-01254  
Patent 8,457,113 B2

requested the conference call to raise objections to demonstrative slides filed by Petitioner Cisco Systems Inc. in IPR2016-01254 and -01257, and demonstrative slides filed by Petitioner Bright House Networks, LLC, WideOpenWest Finance, LLC, Knology of Florida, Inc., and Birch Communications (herein “Bright House Networks Group”) in IPR2016-01259, 01261, -01262, and -01263. During the call, Petitioners Cisco Systems Inc. and Bright House Networks Group indicated that Patent Owner’s slides are similar to their slides, so if we agree with Patent Owner, then in Petitioners’ view, Patent Owner’s slides are objectionable for the same reasons.

Regarding the remaining proceedings, Patent Owner explained that it does not have objections to slides filed by Petitioner YMax Corporation in IPR2016-01256, -01258 and -01260 and is not aware of objections by Petitioner YMax Corporation to Patent Owner’s slides in these proceedings. Accordingly, this Order does not pertain to demonstrative exhibits filed in in IPR2016-01256, -01258 and -01260.

We turn to Patent Owner’s objection to certain of Petitioners’ slides as including new annotations and, therefore, new argument. As an example, Patent Owner identified Petitioner Cisco Systems Inc.’s slide 38 in demonstrative slides for IPR2016-01254 and -01257. Patent Owner indicated that this slide includes new arrows highlighted in colors, which in Patent Owner’s view constitutes a new argument. Patent Owner further indicated that Bright House Networks Group similarly includes new annotations in certain of its demonstrative slides.

Cisco Systems Inc. and Bright House Networks Group acknowledged that certain of their slides include annotations that are not provided in their

papers. Cisco Systems Inc. and Bright House Networks Group, however, argue that such annotations are not new argument, but instead useful in facilitating the presentation to the Board.

During the call, we asked Cisco Systems Inc., Bright House Networks Group, and Patent Owner to provide input regarding possible remedies to this dispute, as follows: (1) we expunge demonstrative slides after the hearing; or (2) the parties present their arguments using only papers in the record and ELMO audio visual equipment, instead of demonstrative slides. Petitioners Cisco Systems Inc. and Bright House Networks Group generally favored the first remedy, whereas Patent Owner favored the second remedy. Cisco Systems Inc. argued that a judge participating remotely would benefit from demonstrative slides, but as no judge in this proceeding will be participating remotely, we need not consider further those arguments.

As set forth in the guidance provided in the Order Granting the Parties' Requests for an Oral Hearing in each of the proceedings (*see, e.g.*, IPR2016-01254, Paper 47), we have discretion to limit the parties' demonstratives to pages in the record should there be no easy resolution to objections over demonstratives. *CBS Interactive Inc. v. Helferich Patent Licensing, LLC*, Case IPR2013-00033 (PTAB Oct. 23, 2013) (Paper 118). At this stage in the instant proceedings, nothing new can be presented, no new evidence, no new arguments. *See* Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48,756, 48,768 (Aug. 14, 2012).

We are not persuaded by Cisco Systems Inc. and Bright House Networks Group that their currently filed demonstrative slides present arguments consistently with the guidance given in the Orders Granting the Parties' Requests for an Oral Hearing in each of the proceedings (*see, e.g.*,

IPR2016-01254  
Patent 8,457,113 B2

IPR2016-01254, Paper 47). Cisco Systems Inc. and Bright House Networks Group acknowledged that their presentations include annotations not already present in the record. Based on the characterizations provided during the call, these modifications are not consistent with our guidance to the parties in preparing for the Oral Hearing. *See, e.g.*, IPR2016-01254, Order Granting the Parties' Requests for an Oral Hearing (Paper 47) (*citing St. Jude Medical, Cardiology Division, Inc. v. The Board of Regents of the University of Michigan*, Case IPR2013-00041 (PTAB Jan. 27, 2014)(Paper 65); *CBS Interactive Inc. v. Helferich Patent Licensing, LLC*, Case IPR2013-00033 (PTAB Oct. 23, 2013) (Paper 118)). Additionally, Patent Owner explained that its preference is that both parties' restrict their presentation to papers in the record. Accordingly, we expunge both parties' demonstrative slides in IPR2016-01254, -01257, -01259, 01261, -01262, and -01263.

In light of the preferences of Cisco Systems Inc. and Bright House Networks Group to use demonstrative slides during the Oral Hearing, we allow the parties the opportunity to further meet and confer and, if the parties arrive at an agreement, the parties may re-file their demonstrative slides in IPR2016-01254, -01257, -01259, 01261, -01262, and -01263 on or before noon Eastern Monday September 18, 2017. If the parties elect to re-file their demonstrative exhibits, in light of the late re-filing of these demonstrative exhibits just one day prior to the Oral Hearing, we caution the parties that we may determine that the parties are not permitted to use their re-filed demonstrative slides, if further objections are raised. Therefore, even if the parties elect to re-file, the parties should be prepared to present their arguments at the Oral Hearing based on the papers in the record. As a further caution to the parties, if a party raises objections to demonstrative

IPR2016-01254  
Patent 8,457,113 B2

slides during the Oral Hearing, that party should consider that time allocated toward arguing objections to a parties' demonstratives may be counted against that party in total time allocated for oral argument, particularly if efforts have been made to remedy the objections previously raised.

ORDER

In consideration of the foregoing, it is hereby:

ORDERED that, in each of IPR2016-01254, -01257, -01259, 01261, -01262, and -01263 Petitioner's and Patent Owner's demonstrative slides, set forth in the Appendix, *shall be expunged without prejudice* to Petitioner and Patent Owner revising and refiling their demonstrative exhibits on or before noon Monday September 18, 2019.

# 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.