```
Page 1
1
2
     UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
     BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD
     YMAX CORPORATION,
5
                              Petitioner,
6
                                                 Case No.
                       -against-
                                                 IPR2016-01256
     FOCAL IP, LLC,
8
                             Patent Owner.
9
10
                               July 13, 2017
                                9:48 a.m.
11
          Deposition of LEONARD FORYS, Ph.D., taken by
12
13
     Patent Owner, pursuant to Notice, held at the
14
     offices of Bryan Cave LLP, 1290 Avenue of the
15
     Americas, New York, New York, before Joseph R.
16
     Danyo, a Shorthand Reporter and Notary Public
17
     within and for the State of New York.
18
19
20
21
22
     Job No. 126871
23
    Reported by: Joe Danyo
24
25
```



```
Page 2
1
2
     APPEARANCES:
3
         BRYAN CAVE
4
         Attorneys for Petitioner
            1290 Avenue of the Americas
5
            New York, New York 10104
6
               ALEXANDER WALDEN, ESQ.
         By:
               FRANK FABIANI, ESQ.
7
8
         NELSON BUMGARDNER
9
         Attorneys for Patent Owner
            3131 West 7th Street
10
            Fort Worth, Texas 76107
         By:
              JOHN MURPHY, ESQ.
11
12
               -and-
13
         SIBER LAW
14
            28 West 44th Street
            New York, New York 10036
15
               VICTOR SIBER, ESQ.
         By:
16
17
                        ~000~
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```



- 1 Forys
- ² LEONARD J. FORYS, Ph.D., having
- been first duly sworn by Joseph R. Danyo, a
- 4 Notary Public, was examined and testified as
- ⁵ follows:
- 6 EXAMINATION BY MR. MURPHY:
- 7 Q. So I would like to introduce for the
- 8 record, on behalf of patent owner, John Murphy
- ⁹ and Vic Siber are here.
- Dr. Forys, how are you today?
- A. Good.
- Q. Have you given deposition testimony
- for an IPR proceeding before?
- 14 A. Yes.
- Q. When was the most recent deposition
- you gave in that regard?
- 17 A. How many?
- Q. When was the most recent one you gave
- in that regard?
- A. Probably springtime, March or April
- of this year. I think it was April. I have
- given so many that I can't remember.
- Q. So you are aware that in an IPR
- deposition, it is improper to talk to your
- 25 attorneys during the break regarding the



- 1 Forys
- substance of the deposition?
- A. That's correct.
- 4 O. Okay. So from time to time I may ask
- 5 that question after the breaks. I just want to
- 6 make sure you are on notice of that.
- ⁷ A. Sure.
- Q. When were you first contacted by
- 9 Bryan Cave regarding this case?
- 10 A. Well, a little history here. I was
- 11 first contacted by Akerman in June of last year
- to work on the litigation part of it, but it was
- quite brief because we got suspended because
- there was an IPR going on, so I did maybe a week
- 15 or two.
- Not much work at all. Just read the
- patent and formed some thoughts, but then about
- 18 May I believe is when I got a call, it was a
- 19 conference call from Bryan Cave, and I believe
- Akerman was involved in that, two people from
- 21 Akerman, about that time frame.
- Q. Around May of 2017.
- A. Yes. That's correct.
- Q. And that is when they brought the
- ²⁵ IPR?



- 1 Forys
- A. Yes. That was for the amended
- 3 claims, yes.
- Q. Did you write your declarations in
- 5 this case?
- ⁶ A. Sure.
- 7 Q. Do you recall around when you started
- 8 drafting your declarations?
- 9 A. Early June. We had talked about it
- in May. We had a series of conference calls, the
- positions and the prior art and things like that,
- but the actual putting pen to paper started
- ¹³ around that time as I recall.
- Q. And are you familiar that there is a
- former declarant in this case, Dr. Lavian?
- A. Yes, I am aware of that.
- Q. Are you aware of why you are being
- used as the expert now in this and he is not?
- A. And I don't know why. Yes.
- Q. All right. Did you attempt to do any
- prior art searches with regard to this IPR?
- 22 A. Yes, and it is pretty clear by
- looking at some of the things that are clearly
- 24 mine. Some of the prior art is clearly mine.
- 25 Some of the technical papers and things like



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.

