```
Page 1
 1
 2
           UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
               BEFORE THE PATENT AND APPEAL BOARD
 3
 4
     GOOGLE, INC.,
 5
                 Petitioner,
                                 ) CASE IPR2017-00912
 6
               VS.
                                 ) PATENT: 8,745,149 B2
 7
    BLACKBERRY LTD.,
 8
             Patent Owner.
 9
     GOOGLE, INC.,
10
                 Petitioner,
                                 ) CASE IPR2017-00913
11
               vs.
                                 ) PATENT: 8,402,384 B2
12 BLACKBERRY LTD.,
13
                 Patent Owner.
14
15
16
17
                   TELEPHONIC MEETING BEFORE
18
              THE HONORABLES ROBERT J. WEINSCHENK
19
                     AND RICHARD MARSCHALL
20
                     MONDAY, APRIL 23, 2018
21
22
23
     REPORTED BY: TANYA L. VERHOVEN-PAGE,
                   CCR-B-1790
24
25
   JOB NO: 141199
```



```
Page 2
 1
 2
                    April 23, 2018
 3
                      3:03 p.m.
 4
             Telephonic meeting before
 5
     THE HONORABLES ROBERT J. WEINSCHENK
 6
 7
     AND RICHARD MARSCHALL, before
     Tanya L. Verhoven-Page, Certified Court
 8
 9
     Reporter and Notary Public of the State of
     Georgia.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```



```
Page 3
 1
 2
                    APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL
 3
     On behalf of the Petitioner:
 4
 5
           PAUL HASTINGS
           875 15th Street Northwest
           Washington, DC 20005
 6
                PHILLIP CITROEN, ESQ.
           BY:
 7
           BY: JOSEPH PALYS, ESQ.
                (Both By Telephone)
 8
 9
10
11
     On behalf of the Patent Owner:
12
           SIDLEY AUSTIN
           1501 K Street Northwest
13
           Washington, DC 20005
           BY:
                SHARON LEE, ESQ.
14
           BY:
                SAMUEL DILLON, ESQ.
                (Both By Telephone)
15
16
17
18
           SIDLEY AUSTIN
           787 Seventh Avenue
19
           New York, NY 10019
           BY: CHING-LEE FUKUDA, ESQ.
20
                 (By Telephone)
21
22
23
24
25
```



- 1 HONORABLE R. WEINSCHENK
- 2 ATLANTA, GEORGIA; MONDAY, APRIL 23, 2018
- 3:03 P.M.

4

5 PROCEEDINGS

6

- 7 THE COURT: Let's start with the
- 8 '912 case, and we'll start with
- 9 Mr. Dillon.
- 10 MR. DILLON: Thank you, your Honor.
- 11 This is Sam Dillon on behalf of the
- 12 Patent Owner.
- So we're requesting a short
- 14 sur-reply to respond to a specific
- 15 argument that Petitioner made regarding
- 16 our characterizations or arguments
- 17 related to the Graham reference.
- 18 Specifically they bring up certain
- 19 citations to an EPO proceeding, a
- 20 European Patent Office proceeding,
- 21 involving a related patent where the
- 22 Graham reference or a reference related
- 23 to the Graham reference was also at
- 24 issue, and they argued that we have made
- 25 characterizations of the Graham reference



- 1 HONORABLE R. WEINSCHENK
- 2 in that proceeding that are at odds with
- 3 characterizations of the Graham reference
- 4 that we have made in this proceeding, and
- 5 so we think that there would be a basis
- 6 for a sur-reply for basically two
- 7 reasons.
- 8 First that this is a new argument.
- 9 We really haven't had the opportunity to
- 10 respond to this argument in a paper.
- 11 They could have raised it in the
- 12 petition, but they only really filed this
- 13 evidence with their reply, and then,
- 14 second, we think more importantly they
- 15 have effectively alleged we're taking
- 16 positions that are at odds with each
- 17 other in front of two different patent
- 18 offices, and we think that having the
- 19 opportunity to respond to this in a paper
- 20 is the most kind of equitable way of
- 21 dealing with this issue.
- In addition, this file history that
- 23 they rely on in this related patent is
- 24 lengthy. They cite to a large number of
- 25 pages, and we think kind of unraveling



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.

