

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

DISH NETWORK, LLC,  
Petitioner,

v.

TQ DELTA, LLC,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2016-01469 (Patent 9,094,268)  
Case IPR2016-01470 (Patent 8,611,404)

---

Record of Oral Hearing  
Held: November 8, 2017

---

Before SALLY C. MEDLEY, TREVOR M. JEFFERSON, and MATTHEW  
R. CLEMENTS, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

Case IPR2016-01469 (Patent 9,094,268)

Case IPR2016-01470 (Patent 8,611,404)

APPEARANCES:

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

HEIDI KEEFE, ESQUIRE  
JEN VOLK-FORTIER, ESQUIRE  
Cooley, LLP  
3175 Hanover Street  
Palo Alto, CA 94394

ON BEHALF OF PATENT OWNER:

RAJENDRA A. CHIPLUNKAR, ESQUIRE  
PETER MCANDREWS, ESQUIRE  
McAndrews Held & Malloy, Ltd.  
500 West Madison Street  
34th Floor  
Chicago, Illinois 60661

The above-entitled matter came on for hearing Wednesday, November 8, 2017, commencing at 2:45 p.m., at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, 600 Dulany Street, Alexandria, Virginia.

1

PROCEEDINGS

2

- - - - -

3

JUDGE CLEMENTS: Good afternoon. This is the final hearing for  
4 IPR 2016 01469 and 01470 between petitioner DISH Network LLC and  
5 patent owner TQ Delta LLC.

6

I'm Judge Clements, participating remotely from San Jose, and in the  
7 room with you are Judges Medley and Jefferson. At this time we'd like  
8 counsel to introduce yourselves, beginning with counsel for petitioner,  
9 please.

10

MS. KEEFE: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Heidi Keefe on behalf of  
11 DISH Network. With me at counsel table is Jen Volk-Fortier. With me also  
12 from Cooley is Steven McBride, and I'm also pleased to introduce my clients  
13 Larry Katzen and Jim Hemps from DISH Network.

14

JUDGE CLEMENTS: Welcome.

15

And counsel for patent owner?

16

MR. McANDREWS: Good afternoon, Your Honors. Peter  
17 McAndrews for patent owner TQ Delta, LLC. I have with me Rajendra  
18 Chiplunkar, who will be making the argument, Tom Wimbiscus, Chris  
19 Scharf, and from TQ Delta, Nabha Rege.

20

JUDGE CLEMENTS: Okay. Thank you. Before we proceed, I have  
21 a couple reminders. Number one, each party will have 45 minutes total time  
22 to present arguments for the two cases. Petitioner will proceed first and may  
23 reserve rebuttal time. Thereafter, patent owner will respond to petitioner's  
24 presentation, and petitioner may then make use of any time it has reserved.

25

Number two, with respect to demonstratives, please refer to the slide  
26 number so that it appears in the record and so that I can follow along

Case IPR2016-01469 (Patent 9,094,268)

Case IPR2016-01470 (Patent 8,611,404)

1 remotely. I have a copy of your demonstratives in front of me.

2 Any questions, counsel for the petitioner?

3 MS. KEEFE: No, Your Honor.

4 JUDGE CLEMENTS: Okay. Any questions counsel for patent  
5 owner?

6 MR. McANDREWS: No, Your Honor.

7 JUDGE CLEMENTS: Very good.

8 Ms. Keefe, would you like to reserve any rebuttal time?

9 MS. KEEFE: Yes. I'd like to reserve 20 minutes, please.

10 JUDGE CLEMENTS: I'll give you a heads up when we approach  
11 that; and otherwise, you may begin when ready.

12 MS. KEEFE: Thank you, Your Honor.

13 As Your Honor I'm sure is aware, many of the arguments will overlap  
14 with what you just heard, so I'll try to be brief as to those. The big  
15 difference, obviously, is the use of the secondary references, the other  
16 materials that we're using in combination with Bowie. Bowie, of course, is  
17 in common with all.

18 For the '268 patent, just to reorient us, DISH has proposed Bowie in  
19 view of Morelli and the 1995 ADSL standard for claims 1, 2, 11, 12. And for  
20 claims 4, 14, 16, and 18, Bowie in view of Morelli.

21 For the '470 patent, claims 6, 11, 16, and 20 are rendered obvious in  
22 view of Bowie, the 1995 ADSL standard, and I'm going to call it the "Van  
23 reference" -- I apologize -- but for the record to be clear, it is the  
24 Vanzielegem, V-A-N-Z-I-E-L-E-G-H-E-M, reference. And I hope the  
25 Board understands if I simply call it "Van" because I'll never get this  
26 pronunciation right.

Case IPR2016-01469 (Patent 9,094,268)

Case IPR2016-01470 (Patent 8,611,404)

1           Before I dive too much farther into the arguments, I wanted for us to  
2 take just a quick step back up to remember what these patents are all about.  
3 All of these patents and all of the references -- sorry. I should say the patent  
4 in question and all the references being used to invalidate them are looking  
5 at multi-carrier systems and ways of reducing power in those multi-carrier  
6 systems.

7           One of the best reasons that all of these are easily combinable is that  
8 in fact even their titles tell us that that's exactly what they are. They are  
9 multi-carrier systems with low power modes or multi-carrier systems with a  
10 sleep mode. And so this is one of the few cases that I've had the pleasure of  
11 arguing where even the titles tell us that they are the proper obviousness  
12 combinations to make.

13           With respect to the '268 patent, the first element that I'd like to point  
14 to is the element in claim 2, maintaining synchronization. Now, obviously,  
15 when you have two things that are trying to talk to each other, and one of  
16 them goes to sleep, there's a need for people to be able to make sure that the  
17 two things that are supposed to talk are on the same page, to use a terrible  
18 colloquialism, but to make sure that people are speaking the same way, that  
19 you're still talking about the same things even though one of those elements  
20 has perhaps gone to sleep and may not be in the same place.

21           Patent owner is trying to argue a definition of synchronization that we  
22 think is too narrow. Patent owner's proposed construction of maintaining a  
23 timing relationship between two transceivers by correcting errors or  
24 differences in the timing of the timing reference of the transceiver and the  
25 timing reference of the second transceiver is simply not supported by the  
26 specification of the patent. Nothing about the last segment -- the by

# 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.