## **Conference Call**

Ruiz Food Products, Inc., Petitioner vs. Macropoint, LLC, Patent Owner

September 21st, 2018



Western Reserve Building 1468 West 9th Street, Suite 440 Cleveland, OH 44113 Phone: 216.861.9270

cadystaff@cadyreporting.com www.cadyreporting.com



```
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
 1
 2
             BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD
 3
 4
        RUIZ FOOD PRODUCTS, INC.,
 5
                      Petitioner,
                                        ) Case IPR2017-020161
 6
                                         ) (Patent 8,275,358 B1)
        vs.
 7
                                         ) Case IPR2017-02018
        MACROPOINT, LLC,
                                         ) (Patent 9,429,659 B1)
 8
                      Patent Owner.
                                         )
 9
                                         )
10
        Before MEREDITH C. PETRAVICK, TREVOR M. JEFFERSON,
11
                       and NATHAN A. ENGELS,
12
13
                The telephonic hearing, taken before me, the
          undersigned, Tracy Lam, Notary Public within and for
14
15
          the State of Ohio, taken via speakerphone at the
          offices of Cady Reporting Services, 1468 West 9th
16
17
          Street, Cleveland, Ohio, commencing at 11:00 a.m., the
18
          day and date above set forth.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```



```
1
        APPEARANCES:
 2
 3
        On behalf of the Petitioner (via speakerphone):
          James Murphy, Esq.
 4
          Ryan Murphy, Esq.
 5
 6
         On behalf of the Patent Owner (via speakerphone):
 7
          Kyle B. Fleming, Esq.
          Luis Carrion, Esq.
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```



1 MR. MURPHY: Good morning, Your 2 Honor. On behalf of Petitioner you have James Murphy and Ryan Murphy, both with Polsinelli. 3 MR. FLEMING: 4 Good morning. 5 behalf of Patent Owner this is Kyle Fleming. 6 MR. CARRION: And Luis Carrion is 7 also on the line. 8 MR. FLEMING: And I believe we 9 also have a court reporter on the line. 10 PATENT JUDGE: Thank you. 11 Patent Owner, I believe you requested the 12 call regarding -- or a request to file a motion to dismiss. 13 Let's begin with Patent Owner. 14 15 explain your position. MR. FLEMING: Sure. The Federal 16 17 Circuit recently issued a en banc ruling in a case called "Click to Call vs. Ingenio" in 18 which it reversed what had been the board's 19 presidential and informative decision that a 20 prior action is voluntarily dismissed did not 21 count with respect to the Section 315(b) bar 22 23 for filing of petition. 24 In this case prior to the petitions being 25 filed by Ruiz, a real party in interest,



FourKites had filed a declaratory judgment 1 2 action challenging the validity of these patents. Now, that case had been dismissed 3 4 without prejudice prior to the filing of the 5 petitions. So based on the presidential and 6 informative decisions at that time, that case was not considered for purposes of the 315 bar. 7 8 However, it's Patent Owner's position 9 that now you have Click to Call, the prior 10 declaratory judgment filing is a bar to the 11 action and the Petitioner lacks standing and 12 the board lacks jurisdiction to continue. PATENT JUDGE: Petitioner, we 13 understand from your e-mail that you have posed 14 15 the request to file a motion. 16 MR. MURPHY: Yes, Your Honor. 17 18

Can you explain your position, please?

The Click to Call decision is only about 315(b), it's not about 315(a)(1), which would be the statute at issue here. In Click to Call, and numerous other cases, the Federal Circuit has specifically pointed out the difference between service of the complaint and the filing of an action, which is precisely the difference between 315(b) and 315(a)(1). So in



19

20

21

22

23

24

25

# 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.

