

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,
Petitioner,

v.

IRON OAK TECHNOLOGIES, LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2019-00106
Patent 5,699,275

Before SALLY C. MEDLEY, PATRICK R. SCANLON, and
ARTHUR M. PESLAK, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

MEDLEY, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

ORDER
Trial Hearing
37 C.F.R. § 42.70

Petitioner and Patent Owner each request oral hearing pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.70. Papers 15, 16. Petitioner proposes that each party be allocated thirty (30) minutes of total time to present arguments. Paper 23, 2. Patent Owner does not propose an amount of time to present arguments. Based on the issues presented in this case, we agree with Petitioner's proposal regarding the allocated time for the hearing. The requests for oral hearing are *granted* according to the terms set forth in this Order.

The combined oral hearing will commence at approximately 2:45 PM Eastern Time¹ on Monday, November 4, 2019, in Hearing Room B on the ninth floor of Madison Building East, 600 Dulany Street, Alexandria, Virginia. The hearing will be open to the public for in-person attendance that will be accommodated on a first-come, first-served basis. The Board will provide a court reporter for the hearing and the reporter's transcript will constitute the official record of the hearing.

Each party will have thirty (30) minutes of total time to present arguments in the above-identified proceedings. As the party with the burden of proof and persuasion, Petitioner will proceed first to present its case with regard to the challenged claim and grounds set forth in the Petitions. Thereafter, Patent Owner may respond to Petitioner's case. Thereafter, Petitioner may use any of its remaining time for rebuttal regarding Patent Owner's arguments regarding the challenged claim. And, thereafter, Patent Owner may use any of its remaining time for sur-rebuttal, to respond to Petitioner's rebuttal arguments, despite Petitioner's "opposition" for Patent

¹ Upon conclusion of the hearing for related cases IPR2018-01552 and IPR2018-01553, there will be a short recess, followed by the commencement of the hearing for IPR2019-00106.

Owner to do so. Paper 15, 2. The parties are reminded that arguments made during rebuttal and sur-rebuttal periods must be responsive to arguments the opposing party made in its immediately preceding presentation.

At least seven business days prior to the hearing, each party shall serve on the other party any demonstrative exhibit(s) it intends to use during the hearing. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.70(b). At least three business days prior to the hearing, the parties shall file any demonstrative exhibits in this case.

Demonstrative exhibits used at the oral hearing are aids to oral argument and not evidence, and should be clearly marked as such. For example, each slide of a demonstrative exhibit may be marked with the words “DEMONSTRATIVE EXHIBIT – NOT EVIDENCE” in the footer. Demonstrative exhibits cannot be used to advance arguments or introduce evidence not previously presented in the record. *See Dell Inc. v. Accelaron, LLC*, 884 F.3d 1364, 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2018) (noting that the “Board was obligated to dismiss [the petitioner’s] untimely argument . . . raised for the first time during oral argument”).

The parties should attempt to work out any objections to demonstratives prior to involving the Board. Should either party disagree with the propriety of any of the opposing party’s demonstratives, the party may send, contemporaneously with their own slides three business days prior to the hearing, an email to Trials@uspto.gov including a paper limited to identifying the opposing party’s slide(s) objected to and a brief sentence as to the general basis of the objection(s). No further argument is permitted in that paper. The Board will then take the objections under advisement, and if the content is inappropriate, it will not be considered. Any objection to demonstrative exhibits that is not timely presented will be considered

waived. The Board asks the parties to confine demonstrative exhibit objections to those identifying egregious violations that are prejudicial to the administration of justice. The parties are directed to *St. Jude Med., Cardiology Div., Inc. v. The Board of Regents of the Univ. of Mich.*, IPR2013-00041, Paper 65 (PTAB Jan. 27, 2014), for guidance regarding the appropriate content of demonstrative exhibits. In general, if the content on a slide cannot be readily associated with an argument made, or evidence referenced, in a substantive paper, it is inappropriate. The best practice is to indicate on each slide where support may be found in a substantive paper and/or an exhibit of record in this proceeding.

The parties are reminded that each presenter must identify clearly and specifically each demonstrative exhibit (e.g., by slide or screen number) referenced during the hearing to ensure the clarity and accuracy of the reporter's transcript. The parties also should note that at least one member of the panel may be attending the hearing electronically from a remote location, and that if a demonstrative is not made fully available or visible to all judges at the hearing, that demonstrative will not be considered. If the parties have questions as to whether demonstrative exhibits would be sufficiently visible and available to all of the judges, the parties are invited to contact the Board at 571-272-9797.

The Board expects lead counsel for each party to be present in person at the hearing. If a party anticipates that its lead counsel will not be attending the oral argument, the parties should initiate a joint telephone conference with the Board no later than two business days prior to the oral hearing to discuss the matter. Any counsel of record, however, may present the party's arguments.

A party may request remote video attendance for one or more of its other attendees to view the hearing from any USPTO location. The available locations include the Texas Regional Office in Dallas, Texas; the Rocky Mountain Regional Office in Denver, Colorado; the Elijah J. McCoy Midwest Regional Office in Detroit, Michigan; and the Silicon Valley Office in San Jose, CA. To request remote video viewing, a party must send an email message to Trials@uspto.gov ten business days prior to the hearing, indicating the requested location and the number planning to view the hearing from the remote location. The Board will notify the parties if the request for video viewing is granted. Note that it may not be possible to grant the request due to the availability of resources.

Per the recent update to the Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, either party may request a pre-hearing conference. Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, August 2018 Update, 83 Fed. Reg. 39,989 (Aug. 13, 2018) (found at the following link to the USPTO website: <https://go.usa.gov/xU7GP>). Requests for a pre-hearing conference must be made by Monday, October 21, 2019. To request such a conference, an email should be sent to Trials@uspto.gov including several dates and times of availability for both parties that are generally no later than three business days prior to the oral hearing. Please refer to the Guide for more information on the pre-hearing conference.

Any special requests for audio-visual equipment should be directed to Trials@uspto.gov. A party may also indicate any special requests related to appearing at an in-person oral hearing, such as a request to accommodate physical needs that limit mobility or visual or hearing impairments, and indicate how the PTAB may accommodate the special request. Any special

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.