

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

FREDMAN BROS. FURNITURE COMPANY, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

BEDGEAR, LLC,
Patent Owner.

Cases¹

IPR2017-00350 (Patent 8,887,332 B2)

IPR2017-00351 (Patent 9,015,883 B2)

IPR2017-00352 (Patent 8,646,134 B1)

Before HYUN J. JUNG, BART A. GERSTENBLITH, and
AMANDA F. WIEKER, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

JUNG, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

SCHEDULING ORDER

37 C.F.R. § 42.5

¹ We exercise our discretion to issue one order to be entered in each case. The parties are not authorized to use a caption identifying multiple proceedings.

Case IPR2017-00350 (Patent 8,887,332 B2)

Case IPR2017-00351 (Patent 9,015,883 B2)

Case IPR2017-00352 (Patent 8,646,134 B1)

A. GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

1. Requests for an Initial Conference Call

Unless at least one of the parties requests otherwise, we will not conduct an initial conference call as described in the Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48,756, 48,765–66 (Aug. 14, 2012). In lieu of such a call, we instruct the parties as follows:

a. If a party wishes to request an initial conference call, that party shall request the call no later than 25 days after the institution of trial;

b. A request for a conference call shall include: (1) a list of proposed motions, if any, to be discussed during the call; and (2) a list of dates and times when the parties are available for the call; and

c. The parties shall be prepared to discuss during the initial conference call their concerns, if any, relating to the schedule in this proceeding as set forth below.

2. Protective Order

A protective order does not exist in this proceeding unless the parties file one and the Board approves it. If either party files a motion to seal before entry of a protective order, a jointly proposed protective order should be presented as an exhibit to the motion. We encourage the parties to adopt the Board's default protective order if they conclude that a protective order is necessary. *See* Default Protective Order, Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48,756, App. B. If the parties choose to propose a protective order deviating from the default protective order, they must submit the proposed protective order jointly along with a marked-up comparison of the proposed and default protective orders showing the

Case IPR2017-00350 (Patent 8,887,332 B2)

Case IPR2017-00351 (Patent 9,015,883 B2)

Case IPR2017-00352 (Patent 8,646,134 B1)

differences; and the parties must explain why the proposed deviations from the default protective order are necessary.

The Board has a strong interest in the public availability of the proceedings. We advise the parties that redactions to documents filed in this proceeding should be limited to isolated passages consisting entirely of confidential information, and that the thrust of the underlying argument or evidence must be clearly discernible from the redacted versions. We also advise the parties that information subject to a protective order will become public if identified in a final written decision in this proceeding, and that a motion to expunge the information will not necessarily prevail over the public interest in maintaining a complete and understandable file history. *See Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. at 48,761.*

3. Motions to Amend

Patent Owner may file a motion to amend without prior authorization from the Board. Nevertheless, Patent Owner must confer with the Board before filing such a motion. *See 37 C.F.R. § 42.121(a).* Patent Owner should arrange for a conference call with the panel and opposing counsel at least one week before DUE DATE 1 in order to satisfy the conferral requirement. We direct the parties to the Board's website for representative decisions relating to Motions to Amend, among other topics. The parties may access these representative decisions at: <https://www.uspto.gov/patents-application-process/patent-trial-and-appeal-board/decisions>.

4. Discovery Disputes

The panel encourages parties to resolve disputes relating to discovery on their own and in accordance with the precepts set forth in 37 C.F.R.

Case IPR2017-00350 (Patent 8,887,332 B2)

Case IPR2017-00351 (Patent 9,015,883 B2)

Case IPR2017-00352 (Patent 8,646,134 B1)

§ 42.1(b). To the extent that a dispute arises between the parties relating to discovery, the parties shall meet and confer to resolve such a dispute before contacting the Board. If attempts to resolve the dispute fail, a party may request a conference call with the Board and the other party in order to seek authorization to move for relief.

In any request for a conference call with the Board to resolve a discovery dispute, the requesting party shall: (1) certify that it has conferred with the other party in an effort to resolve the dispute; (2) identify with specificity the issues for which agreement has not been reached; (3) identify the precise relief to be sought; and (4) propose specific dates and times at which both parties are available for the conference call.

5. Depositions

The parties are advised that the Testimony Guidelines appended to the Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. at 48,772 (Appendix D), apply to this proceeding. The Board may impose an appropriate sanction for failure to adhere to the Testimony Guidelines. 37 C.F.R. § 42.12. For example, reasonable expenses and attorneys' fees incurred by any party may be levied on a person who impedes, delays, or frustrates the fair examination of a witness.

Whenever a party submits a deposition transcript as an exhibit in this proceeding, the submitting party shall file the full transcript of the deposition rather than excerpts of only those portions being cited. After a deposition transcript has been submitted as an exhibit, all parties who subsequently cite to portions of the transcript shall cite to the first-filed exhibit rather than submitting another copy of the same transcript.

Case IPR2017-00350 (Patent 8,887,332 B2)

Case IPR2017-00351 (Patent 9,015,883 B2)

Case IPR2017-00352 (Patent 8,646,134 B1)

6. *Cross-Examination*

Except as the parties might otherwise agree, for each due date—

a. Cross-examination begins after any supplemental evidence is due. 37 C.F.R. § 42.53(d)(2).

b. Cross-examination ends no later than a week before the filing date for any paper in which the cross-examination testimony is expected to be used. *Id.*

7. *Motion for Observation on Cross-Examination*

A motion for observation on cross-examination provides the parties with a mechanism to draw the Board's attention to relevant cross-examination testimony of a reply witness because no further substantive paper is permitted after the reply. *See* Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. at 48,768. The observation must be a concise statement of the relevance of precisely identified testimony to a precisely identified argument or portion of an exhibit. Each observation should not exceed a single, short paragraph. The opposing party may respond to the observation. Any response must be equally concise and specific.

B. DUE DATES

This order sets due dates for the parties to take action after institution of the proceeding. The parties may stipulate to different dates for DUE DATES 1 through 5 (earlier or later, but no later than DUE DATE 6). A notice of the stipulation, specifically identifying the changed due dates, must be promptly filed. The parties may not stipulate to an extension of DUE DATES 6 and 7.

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.