

1 IPR TELECONFERENCE 6-21-18

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

9

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

10

11

12

LG ELECTRONICS, INC., LG ELECTRONICS U.S.A., INC., LG

13

ELECTRONICS MOBILECOMM U.S.A., LG ELECTRONICS MOBILE

14

RESEARCH U.S.A. LLC, AND LG ELECTRONICS ALABAMA, INC.

15

Petitioner

16

v.

17

FUNDAMENTAL INNOVATION SYSTEM INT'L, LLC

18

Patent Owner

19

20

IPR2018-00493

21

IPR2018-00495

22

IPR2018-00508

23

24

Reported by Carrie LaMontagne, CSR

25

Job No. 143973

Page 2

1 IPR TELECONFERENCE 6-21-18  
 2  
 3 Thursday, June 21, 2018  
 4 3:00 p.m.  
 5  
 6  
 7 Telephone proceeding held before the United  
 8 States Patent and Trademark Office before Carrie  
 9 LaMontagne, a certified shorthand reporter for the  
 10 states of California and Oklahoma.  
 11  
 12  
 13  
 14  
 15  
 16  
 17  
 18  
 19  
 20  
 21  
 22  
 23  
 24  
 25

Page 4

1 IPR TELECONFERENCE 6-21-18  
 2 P R O C E E D I N G S  
 3 JUDGE PESLAK: Good afternoon. This is Judge  
 4 Peslak. This is a conference call on three IPRs, IPR  
 5 2018-0493, IPR 20018-0495, IPR 20018-000508. On the  
 6 call with me are Judge Pettigrew, Judge Tornquist, and  
 7 Judge Ogden.  
 8 For the record the spelling of our names, my name  
 9 is Peslak, P, as in Peter, E-S-L-A-K. Judge Pettigrew,  
 10 is P, as in Peter, E-T-T-I-G-R-E-W. Judge Tornquist, T,  
 11 as in Thomas, O-R-N-Q-U-I-S-T, and Judge Ogden,  
 12 O-G-D-E-N.  
 13 I understand there's a court reporter. Who  
 14 arranged for the court reporter?  
 15 MR. HUH: Yes, your Honor. This is  
 16 Gregory Huh on behalf of Petitioner LG Electronics, and  
 17 we arranged for the court reporter.  
 18 JUDGE PESLAK: So we'll ask that you file the  
 19 transcript as an exhibit in all three cases as soon as  
 20 possible.  
 21 MR. HUH: Will do, your Honor.  
 22 JUDGE PESLAK: So who is on the line for  
 23 Petitioner?  
 24 MR. HUH: Yes, on behalf of Petitioner, this  
 25 is Gregory Huh and I also have Mr. Adam Fowles.

Page 3

1 IPR TELECONFERENCE 6-21-18  
 2 A P P E A R A N C E S  
 3 (all appearances via telephone):  
 4  
 5 HAYNES AND BOONE  
 6 Attorneys for Petitioner:  
 7 2505 N. Plano Road  
 8 Richardson, Texas 75082  
 9 BY: GREGORY HUH, ESQ.  
 10 ADAM FOWLES, ESQ.  
 11  
 12 IRELL & MANELLA  
 13 For Patent Owner:  
 14 1800 Avenue of the Stars  
 15 Los Angeles, California 90067  
 16 BY: ANNITA ZHONG, ESQ.  
 17 MICHAEL FLEMING, ESQ.  
 18 JASON SHEASBY, ESQ.  
 19  
 20 BEFORE: FOR THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD:  
 21 JUDGE ARTHUR M. PESLAK  
 22 JUDGE LYNNE E. PETTIGREW  
 23 JUDGE JON TORNQUIST  
 24 JUDGE BRIAN WHITE  
 25 JUDGE CHRISTOPHER L. OGDEN

Page 5

1 IPR TELECONFERENCE 6-21-18  
 2 JUDGE PESLAK: All right. And who is on the  
 3 line for the patent owner?  
 4 MS. ZHONG: For the patent owner, this is  
 5 Annita Zhong, and also with me is Mr. Michael Fleming and  
 6 Mr. Jason Sheasby.  
 7 JUDGE PESLAK: Okay. Just so the record is  
 8 clear, when you begin to speak, please identify  
 9 yourself.  
 10 The board received an e-mail from Petitioner on  
 11 June 12 requesting authorization to file a five-page  
 12 reply to Patent Owner's preliminary response in each of  
 13 the three identified IPRs. The e-mail indicates that  
 14 Patent Owner opposes.  
 15 We'll hear from the petitioner first. If your  
 16 argument is the same for all three IPRs, there's no need  
 17 to repeat it; but if there's something specific for one  
 18 of the IPRs, please make that clear on the record.  
 19 So starting with the petitioner, can you please  
 20 tell us the facts that you contend support a finding of  
 21 good cause under 42 CFR, Section 108, Paragraph C to  
 22 allow the filing of a reply.  
 23 MR. HUH: Yes, your Honor. This is  
 24 Gregory Huh on behalf of Petitioner. And under the  
 25 circumstances, we believe there are three reasons why

Page 6

1 IPR TELECONFERENCE 6-21-18  
 2 there is good cause for us to have leave to file a reply  
 3 to Patent Owner's preliminary response.  
 4 The first reason is that it wasn't foreseen that  
 5 Patent Owner would have filed the deposition transcript  
 6 of Mr. Garney who was not LG Electronics expert, and LG  
 7 Electronics was not a part to the proceeding to which  
 8 that transcript pertains.  
 9 Had LG Electronics filed this transcript with its  
 10 petition, it wouldn't have been able to produce  
 11 Mr. Garney for cross-examination during the proceeding.  
 12 Therefore, Petitioner could not have submitted this  
 13 transcript along with petition at the early stage of the  
 14 proceeding.  
 15 Had LG Electronics filed this transcript with its  
 16 petition, it wouldn't have been able to produce  
 17 Mr. Garney for cross-examination during the proceeding.  
 18 Therefore, Petitioner could not have submitted this  
 19 transcript along with petition at the early stage of the  
 20 proceeding.  
 21 The second reason why there is good cause is that  
 22 although Patent Owner argues that LG Electronics was  
 23 provided this transcript during litigation, LG  
 24 Electronics' counsel for litigation is different than  
 25 the counsel for IPRs in all of these three cases.  
 And at the time of the filing of the petition, IPR  
 counsel was not, was not aware of this transcript at all  
 existing. Moreover, there's a protective order  
 prohibiting LG Electronics' litigation counsel from  
 sharing these documents with us and for us to produce  
 them outside of litigation.

Page 8

1 IPR TELECONFERENCE 6-21-18  
 2 expectation of success in the combination of Shiga and  
 3 the Dougherty reference, which is a primary reference in  
 4 all of these proceedings that were filed by Petitioner  
 5 LG Electronics.  
 6 JUDGE PESLAK: Counsel, I think you're  
 7 deviating from the issue here, which is good cause.  
 8 You're getting into the merits.  
 9 MR. HUH: Yes. And the point is, your Honor,  
 10 that what Patent Owner has done is they've omitted  
 11 relevant testimony from Mr. Garney that provides proper  
 12 context to evaluate that testimony and recognize that,  
 13 in fact, it doesn't stick for the proposition that they  
 14 actually assert that it stands for.  
 15 So we believe that in order to give the board a  
 16 full appreciation of what Mr. Garney's testimony stands  
 17 for and to allow the board to properly weigh that  
 18 evidence as it pertains to the claims and the prior art,  
 19 which is how Patent Owner had argued in their POPR, we  
 20 would ask that we have an opportunity to file a reply to  
 21 address the arguments raised by Patent Owner in  
 22 connection with Mr. Garney's testimony.  
 23 For those three reasons, your Honor, we think that  
 24 there are distinct reasons why we should, in fact, have  
 25 an opportunity here to address the testimony of

Page 7

1 IPR TELECONFERENCE 6-21-18  
 2 So we could not have filed Mr. Garney's testimony  
 3 at the petition stage since we didn't have it in hand  
 4 and we were not aware of it. For that reason there's  
 5 good cause, and we should actually have an opportunity  
 6 now to reply to the filed transcript by Patent Owner.  
 7 Third, and I think probably most importantly, is  
 8 that it would inform the board's analysis and put proper  
 9 context from Mr. Garney's testimony. And this is  
 10 important because when you put Mr. Garney's testimony in  
 11 context, it shows that Mr. Garney was talking about an  
 12 SE1 signal occurring after enumeration, whereas in the  
 13 context of the claims of the patent, they require  
 14 without enumeration.  
 15 What that means is that the claims as the SE1  
 16 states are occurring before enumeration, and this is the  
 17 same context for Shiga. Shiga provides an SE1 signal,  
 18 which is Exhibit 1008, and that signal occurs before  
 19 enumeration. The petition never argued that the SE1  
 20 signal would be utilized after enumeration, which means  
 21 that Mr. Garney's testimony, which pertains to events  
 22 occurring after enumeration, has no bearing.  
 23 I also want to note that because Shiga itself does,  
 24 in fact, provide an SE1 signal followed by USB  
 25 communication, it demonstrates that there's an

Page 9

1 IPR TELECONFERENCE 6-21-18  
 2 Mr. Garney.  
 3 JUDGE PESLAK: Okay. Patent Owner.  
 4 MS. ZHONG: This is Annita Zhong. I'm going to  
 5 be arguing on behalf of Patent Owner.  
 6 What I have heard is an evolving story. In the  
 7 e-mail to the board the petitioner said they should be  
 8 allowed to file a reply because Mr. Garney's testimony  
 9 is hearsay. Now they have totally abandoned that  
 10 argument because they -- I think they realized that  
 11 the objection to evidence should not occur -- does not occur  
 12 until ten days after institution. So the argument to  
 13 the evidence itself on hearsay ground is basically  
 14 premature.  
 15 Second of all, regarding the good cause or more  
 16 likely its foreseeability, I would say it's totally  
 17 foreseeable based on their own argument, which is, I  
 18 quote -- using IPR2018-508 as an example, page 23 to 24,  
 19 they say SE1 should be used because its obvious  
 20 beneficial predictable results. They say SE1 should be  
 21 used because its suitable for USB signaling. They say  
 22 SE1 should be because it's logical and [indiscernible].  
 23 In response to those arguments it is foreseeable  
 24 that Patent Owner is going to raise to counter each of  
 25 those points. And Mr. Garney's testimony directly



1 IPR TELECONFERENCE 6-21-18  
 2 undermines those points, so it's fair -- it's  
 3 foreseeable that Patent Owner is going to raise such  
 4 testimony by another neutral expert.  
 5 JUDGE PESLAK: What were you just reading  
 6 from?  
 7 MS. ZHONG: I'm reading from the petition,  
 8 page 23 and 24 of IPR2018-00508 petition.  
 9 MR. HUH: To be clear -- this is Gregory Huh,  
 10 Petitioner never argued that the SE1 signal will be  
 11 occurring after enumeration and that's exactly what  
 12 Mr. Garney's testimony pertains to.  
 13 MS. ZHONG: Well, first of all, this is wading  
 14 into the merits of the argument. Second of all, their  
 15 petition never says that SE1 is going to occur before or  
 16 after enumeration. That never appeared --  
 17 JUDGE PESLAK: We're all getting too far into  
 18 the merits. Can you get back to why Patent Owner  
 19 doesn't believe there's good cause here.  
 20 MS. ZHONG: Okay. Regarding the second, to  
 21 say that they are not aware of the Garney testimony,  
 22 that is just false. It was provided to them. They  
 23 don't deny that LG is in possession of that transcript  
 24 two to three weeks before filing it, and that transcript  
 25 is not sealed. So I don't see what prevents the LG IPR

1 IPR TELECONFERENCE 6-21-18  
 2 counsel receiving that and reviewing that. But in any  
 3 event, the petition is filed on behalf of LG, and LG was  
 4 in possession of that transcript before.  
 5 So the third point is we feel that just by arguing  
 6 the merits on the phone just now, the petitioner has  
 7 achieved what they could not have done under general  
 8 plastics. Basically, what they have noticed is they  
 9 found the board's prior position in IPR2018-00111 and  
 10 they realize the gap in the petition, the logic, so  
 11 they're trying to make new arguments, and they already  
 12 did that by arguing to your Honors the alleged  
 13 differences between the Garney testimony and what their  
 14 petition is.  
 15 Those differences -- the alleged difference of what  
 16 they are actually arguing does not appear in the  
 17 petition, and so basically they've already achieved  
 18 that, what they could not do with general plastics,  
 19 which is by or through a petition, and to make new  
 20 arguments and make it better.  
 21 We find that's totally prejudicial for the patent  
 22 owner. And I don't know what the remedy is right now  
 23 because the cat is out of the bag, and I don't know how  
 24 that is going to influence your Honor's positions from  
 25 this point onward because you've heard it. And I don't

1 IPR TELECONFERENCE 6-21-18  
 2 know whether you would have thought -- now you're going  
 3 to look for that difference even though it has nothing  
 4 to do with their petition. Never raised it.  
 5 Third of all, if your Honor wants to hear why it is  
 6 not hearsay, I'm happy to talk about it. But it was  
 7 also explained why it was not hearsay in our POPR, in  
 8 the IPR2018-00508.  
 9 JUDGE PESLAK: Okay. I don't think that's  
 10 necessary.  
 11 MR. HUH: Your Honor, this is Gregory Huh. If  
 12 I may respond on a few points.  
 13 JUDGE PESLAK: Just to clarify the record.  
 14 Don't get into the merits, please.  
 15 MR. HUH: Yes, your Honor.  
 16 So with respect to the hearsay, that was our first  
 17 point that we raised in our initial discussion was the  
 18 hearsay issue, we did not abandon that as Counsel has  
 19 argued.  
 20 Second, with respect to us not being aware, the  
 21 fact is that we were not aware. IPR counsel was not  
 22 aware. Even now we don't have possession of that  
 23 testimony. We reached out to litigation counsel a few  
 24 days ago and we asked for the testimony to be given to  
 25 us. They said it was subject to protective order and

1 IPR TELECONFERENCE 6-21-18  
 2 they could not give it us to. This is a fact.  
 3 We could not have raised any arguments pertaining  
 4 to this testimony of Mr. Garney at the petition stage.  
 5 We were not aware even, and now we cannot obtain the  
 6 full transcript. And what we would ask is that if  
 7 actually Patent Owner does have it, we would ask that --  
 8 and if Patent Owner has authority to file it, that they  
 9 would file the full transcript and can get the record,  
 10 that the board has full knowledge of everything in  
 11 regard to this prior event, not a partial snippet of the  
 12 record. We then we would have an opportunity to  
 13 actually provide context for the board.  
 14 We think it's reasonable that the board have  
 15 context and understand what Patent Owner is arguing, how  
 16 they are pulling out specific quotes that don't stand  
 17 for propositions that they're making.  
 18 MS. ZHONG: Your Honor, this is Annita Zhong.  
 19 MR. HUH: Okay. Give us a couple minutes  
 20 here.  
 21 (Pause in the proceedings.)  
 22 JUDGE PESLAK: Counsel, this is Judge Peslak  
 23 back again. We're going to take these matters under  
 24 advisement. So if you can get us the transcript as soon  
 25 as possible, and we can review what both of you have

1 IPR TELECONFERENCE 6-21-18  
 2 said today and make our decision in all three cases.  
 3 MS. ZHONG: This is Annita Zhong on behalf of  
 4 Fundamental. I just want to point out one more fact.  
 5 JUDGE PESLAK: We don't really need anything  
 6 else. Thank you.  
 7 MR. HUH: Thank you, your Honor. We  
 8 appreciate it.  
 9 MS. ZHONG: Thank you, your Honor.  
 10 JUDGE PESLAK: Thank you.  
 11 (Deposition concluded at 3:17 p.m.)  
 12  
 13  
 14  
 15  
 16  
 17  
 18  
 19  
 20  
 21  
 22  
 23  
 24  
 25

1 IPR TELECONFERENCE 6-21-18  
 2 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE  
 3  
 4 I, Carrie LaMontagne, Certified Shorthand  
 5 Reporter within and for the States of California and  
 6 Oklahoma, License Nos. 13393 and 1976, respectively, do  
 7 hereby certify that the foregoing proceeding was  
 8 reported by me on 21st June, 2018, and was thereafter  
 9 transcribed with computer-aided transcription; that the  
 10 foregoing is a full, complete, and true record of said  
 11 proceedings.  
 12 I further certify that I am not of counsel or  
 13 attorney for either or any of the parties in the  
 14 foregoing proceedings and caption named or in any way  
 15 interested in the outcome of the cause in said caption.  
 16 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my  
 17 hand and official seal this 21st day of June, 2018.  
 18  
 19 \_\_\_\_\_  
 20 CARRIE LAMONTAGNE, CSR  
 21  
 22  
 23  
 24  
 25

# 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.