Filed on behalf of YMax Corporation

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

YMAX CORPORATION,
Petitioner

v.

FOCAL IP, LLC
Patent Owner

PETITIONER'S OBSERVATIONS ON CROSS-EXAMINATION OF PATENT OWNER'S REPLY WITNESS REGIS J. "BUD" BATES

Case IPR2016-01258 U.S. Patent No. 7,764,777



LIST OF EXHIBITS

YMax Ex.	<u>Description</u>
1001	U.S. Patent No. 7,764,777 to Wood et al. (the "'777 patent")
1002	Declaration of Tal Lavian, Ph.D.
1003	U.S. Patent No. 6,463,145 to O'Neal et al. ("O'Neal")
1004	W. Bressler, SS7 Level Two over IP, dated January 1999
1005	U.S. Patent No. 6,381,323 to Schwab et al. ("Schwab")
1006	Prosecution history of U.S. Patent No. 6,529,596
1007	Prosecution history of U.S. Patent No. 7,764,777
1008	Federal Standard 1037C (Glossary of Telecommunications Terms) (Aug. 7, 1996)
1009	Newton's Telecom Dictionary (February 1999)
1010	http://www.internetlivestats.com/total-number-of-websites
1011	U.S. Patent No. 8,457,113 to Wood et al.
1012	ITU-T Specification of Signaling System No. 7 Q.700 dated March 1993
1013	http://www.thefreelibrary.com/eBay's+AuctionWeb+Tops+One+Million+Bids%3B+Leading+Online+Auctiona018940197
1014	B. Leiner, et al., The Past and Future History of the Internet, Communication of the ACM, Feb. 1997, Vol. 40, No. 2
1015	U.S. Patent No. 6,031,836 to Haserodt
1016	Curriculum vitae for Tal Lavian, Ph.D.
1017	ITU-T Recommendation Q.700-Q.705. Introduction to CCITT Signaling System Number 7. Melbourne 1988-1992
1018	http://www.speakfreely.org/history.html
1019	Lucent Technologies and Ascend Communications announce voice over IP interoperability, dated June 2, 1999
1020	C. Huitema, et al., Media Gateway Control Protocol (MGCP) Call Flows, dated January 20, 1999



1

YMax Ex.	Description
1021	C. Huitema, et al., Media Gateway Control Protocol (MGCP) Call Flow Test Case 1, dated February 25, 1999
1022	The iNOW! [VoIP Interoperability Now!] Joint Press Release, dated December 19, 1998
1023	L. Ong, et al. Framework Architecture for Signaling Transport, dated October 1999
1024	U.S. Patent No. 5,333,185 ("Burke")
1025	U.S. Patent No. 5,574,781 ("Blaze")
1026	U.S. Patent No. 5,440,613 ("Fuentes")
1027	U.S. Patent No. 6,327,258 ("Deschaine")
1028	Hanmer and Wu, Traffic Congestion Patterns ("Hanmer")
1029	U.S. Patent No. 5,566,236 ("MeLampy")
1030	U.S. Patent No. 6,747,970 ("Lamb")
1031	US Patent No. 6,169,735 ("Allen")
1032	US Patent No. 6,614,781 ("Elliot")
1033	U.S. Patent No. 6,215,790 ("Voit")
1034	U.S. Patent No. 5,377,186 ("Wegner")
1035	U.S. Patent No. 5,841,854 ("Schumacher")
1036	U.S. Patent No. 5,867,562 ("Scherer")
1037	Prosecution History of Application No. 13/358, 353 ("353 Pros.")
1038	U.S. Patent No. 8,848,894 ("the '894 patent")
1039	Signaling System #7 4 th ed. ("Russell")
1040	Divestiture: A Record of Technical Achievement, IEEE Communications Magazine, Vol. 23, Issue No. 12, Dec. 1995 ("Andrews")
1041	Transcript of Deposition of Regis Jerome "Bud" Bates taken on May 4, 2017
1042	Declaration of Dr. Leonard J. Forys in Support of Opposition to Motion to Amend



YMax Ex.	<u>Description</u>
1043	Curriculum vitae of Dr. Leonard J. Forys
1044	Affidavit of Alexander D. Walden
1045	Transcript of Deposition of Regis "Bud" Bates taken on August 9, 2017
1046	Declaration of Regis J. "Bud" Bates in Support of Patent Owner's Reply in Support of Motion to Amend (Ex. 2070, IPR2016-01260)



Pursuant to the stipulation of the parties dated July 6, 2017 (paper no. 34 at 2), Petitioner respectfully makes the following observations regarding the August 9, 2017 cross-examination testimony of Patent Owner's Reply declarant, Regis J. Bates (Ex. 1045):

- 1. In Exhibit 1045, on page 7, lines 7-18, the witness testified that in preparing his declarations in support of the Patent Owner's replies he "tried not to read [the references] in full --if it only cited to a specific quote." The testimony is relevant because it demonstrates that Mr. Bates' testimony regarding the scope of the teachings of the prior art cited in Petitioner's Opposition to the Motion to Amend should be given little to no weight.
- 2. In Exhibit 1045, on page 8, line 21 page 9, line 11, the witness testified that he didn't believe that Lamb used the term "edge switch." This testimony is relevant to the argument on pages 12-13 of Petitioner's Opposition to the Motion to Amend (paper no. 32) and to the argument on page 1 of Patent Owner's Reply in Support of the Motion to Amend (paper no. 38). The testimony is relevant because it supports Petitioner's argument that Lamb's public phone switch 202-2 may be a tandem switch. *See also* Exhibit 2071, p. 43, l. 25 p. 46, l. 3 (Dr. Forys testifying regarding Lamb's options for placement of the TNS). This testimony is also



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.

