

## ROUGH DRAFT

JUDGE BRADEN: This is Judge Georgianna Braden. The reason why we've asked for this phone call with the parties is because, as I'm sure you're aware, the Federal Circuit recently issued an en banc decision in Aqua Products, Inc. versus Matal. I believe that occurred on October 4, 2017.

So we are contacting the parties now because Patent Owner has filed a motion to amend -- contingent motion to amend in both proceedings. We are approximately six weeks away from oral arguments that are scheduled for November 30th, if the parties request them, and I would like to hear from both parties, starting with Patent Owner first, if you believe that Aqua Products has any impact on your motion to amend and if you believe any additional briefing is warranted in these proceedings.

Patent Owner, we'll hear from you first on behalf of Realtime.

MR. NOROOZI: Your Honor, I will begin. This is Kayvan Noroozi, and I'll also let my partner, William Rothwell, continue after I've made a few initial remarks, because this subject

1 ROUGH DRAFT

2 has sort of been raised with the Board a few  
3 times before in various forms, both before Aqua  
4 Products came down and since, and so I think  
5 it's one that has largely been covered.

6 Before the Aqua Products decision was  
7 issued, Patent Owner noted in its motion to  
8 amend that the Federal Circuit would be deciding  
9 Aqua Products en banc and that the decision  
10 could shift the burden from Patent Owner to  
11 Apple, and we preserve the right to have the  
12 revised standard apply to our motion to amend  
13 if, in fact, such a revised standard was handed  
14 down by the Federal Circuit.

15 Apple sought additional briefing space  
16 for its response before Aqua Products come down  
17 on the basis that if Aqua Products were issued,  
18 it would bear the burden -- sorry, that if Aqua  
19 Products were issued in a manner that would  
20 place the burden on Apple, Apple would now have  
21 to say more and present more to the Board than  
22 it otherwise would have in light of its new  
23 burden. My partner William Rothwell can speak  
24 more to the conversation because I was not  
25 personally on the call.

1 ROUGH DRAFT

2 But my understanding is that we  
3 explained that -- we had 25 pages of briefing in  
4 our affirmative motion when the burden was on  
5 us, and Apple had 25 pages to respond when the  
6 burden was not on them, and so there was no  
7 reason to give additional briefing or space for  
8 them to say more than we were able to say  
9 regardless of any shifts in burden. In fact,  
10 the Board denied additional pages on that basis,  
11 is my understanding, and went on to sort of  
12 defer the issue of what would happen if Aqua  
13 Products changed the law.

14 Apple proceeded with the understanding  
15 that Aqua Products could come out the way that  
16 it did, and so they submitted very lengthy  
17 declarations, I believe over a hundred pages  
18 each, from their expert attempting to put down  
19 what they thought they needed to put down in  
20 light of the possibility that they would bear  
21 the burden under a shift in law in Aqua  
22 Products.

23 We took the deposition of Apple's  
24 expert. We addressed their arguments. We  
25 addressed the lengthy discussions and the

1 ROUGH DRAFT

2 hundred-page-plus declarations and the reply  
3 briefs that we submitted just this Wednesday,  
4 and in our reply brief we addressed the import  
5 of Aqua Products to this proceeding, and we did  
6 all that within the 12-page limit of our reply.

7 We also agreed with Apple, in order to  
8 get an extension, that Apple should be allowed  
9 to submit a further brief, not to exceed  
10 12 pages, to specifically and only discuss the  
11 importance of Aqua Products onto these motions  
12 to amend, but that Apple should not be  
13 permitted -- of course this is a point that  
14 Realtime made -- that Apple should not be  
15 permitted to provide new evidence or submit new  
16 expert testimony or make new arguments or  
17 submit new prior art.

18 The record on those issues is now  
19 closed. Apple had a full opportunity to do all  
20 that in its response knowing that Aqua Products  
21 could come out the way that it did. And there's  
22 no reason to prejudice Realtime by sort of  
23 opening the record back up for Apple.

24 So in short --

25 JUDGE BRADEN: Counsel, I want to make

1 ROUGH DRAFT

2 sure that I understand, that Patent Owner would  
3 agree to allow Petitioner 12 additional pages to  
4 respond --

5 MR. NOROOZI: To specifically --

6 JUDGE BRADEN: Yeah, go ahead.

7 MR. NOROOZI: To specifically and only  
8 discuss the Federal Circuit's decision in Aqua  
9 Products and what impact it may have as a matter  
10 of law to the motions to amend, but not to  
11 introduce new arguments or evidence or facts or  
12 go back over the prior art and so forth.

13 JUDGE BRADEN: Very good. Thank you.  
14 And did your colleague, Mr. Rothwell, have  
15 something additional to add?

16 MR. ROTHWELL: No, that covers what I  
17 would have said.

18 JUDGE BRADEN: Very good. Then we'll  
19 hear from Petitioner.

20 MR. RENNER: Thank you, Your Honor.  
21 We'll start out by just noting that opposing  
22 counsel is correct that Apple and opposing  
23 counsel did discuss earlier the potential of  
24 Aqua Products, and it was in light of the page  
25 extension request that was earlier solicited.

# 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.