UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD CASE IPR2020-00031

GUARDIAN ALLIANCE
TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,
Petitioner,
vs.
TYLER MILLER,
Patent Owner.

Telephonic proceedings taken on
Thursday, February 6, 2020, at Advanced
Depositions, LLC, 1600 Market Street, Suite 1700,
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, commencing at
approximately 3:32 p.m., before Joanne Rose, a
Registered Professional Reporter, Registered Merit
Reporter, Certified Realtime Reporter and Notary
Public, pursuant to notice.

BEFORE:

DAVID C. McKONE Administrative Patent Judge

SALLY C. MEDLEY
Administrative Patent Judge
JOHN R. KENNY
Administrative Patent Judge



```
2
1
     APPEARANCES:
     DUNLAP CODDING P.C.
     JORDAN A. SIGALE, ESQUIRE
3
     jsigale@dunlapcodding.com
     EVAN TALLEY, ESQUIRE
     etalley@dunlapcodding.com
4
     225 West Washington Street
5
     Suite 2200
     Chicago, IL 60606
 6
     312-651-6744
         Counsel for Petitioner
7
8
     Mc LEOD LAW LLC
     RICHARD D. Mc LEOD, ESQUIRE
     law@rickmcleod.com
 9
     P.O. Box 99
10
     Woodland, WA 98674
     360-841-5654
11
         Lead Counsel for Patent Owner
12
     RYLANDER & ASSOCIATES, PC
13
     KURT M. RYLANDER, ESQUIRE
     406 West 12th Street
14
    Vancouver, WA 98660
     360-750-9931
15
         Back-up Counsel for Patent Owner
16
17
18
19
20
21
2.2
2.3
24
```



3 JUDGE McKONE: So my 1 2 understanding is that there are 3 several issues here between the parties that we're going to discuss 4 5 today. I'll start trying to go through them in order. 6 7 The first issue, I 8 understand the Petitioner is requesting a five-page motion and is 10 willing to allow a five-page response 11 from Patent Owner regarding what it 12 characterizes as a clerical error. 13 And Petitioner wants to substitute a 14 different exhibit for Exhibit 1002. 15 And I understand that 16 that's related to Patent Owner 17 requesting to file a Motion To 18 Terminate for failure to comply with 19 Section 312(a)(5) for the same 2.0 reason, the exhibit that was 1002 was 21 not the correct exhibit. 2.2 Do I understand that 2.3 correctly?



24

MR. SIGALE: Yes, you do,

4 your Honor. This is Jordan Sigale. 1 2 JUDGE McKONE: Okay. So, 3 Petitioner, why don't you go ahead 4 and go first and just give a very 5 brief background of what happened 6 here. 7 And then we'll let Patent Owner respond and then we'll try to 8 figure out the most efficient way to 9 10 divvy the issue up and brief it. 11 MR. SIGALE: Thank you, 12 your Honor. There is pending 13 District Court litigation, just to 14 kind of set the stage, involving 15 Patent Owner and its exclusive 16 licensee against one of the customers 17 of Petitioner, Guardian Alliance 18 Technologies. 19 In this petition -- I'm 20 trying to decide where to start. 21 Let's start here. When we received 2.2 the Patent Owner's response about a 23 little bit more than a week ago, the 24 Patent Owner's response dealt



extensively with the fact that Exhibit 102 was not prior art.

The Patent Owner includes in their Patent Owner's response a screenshot from Exhibit 102, which is a video, and indicates that right on the video itself there is a copyright date that is after the critical date with respect to the patent and notes that the video of Exhibit 102 doesn't match the screen excerpts that Petitioner provided to the Board in Exhibit 1022 for the convenience of the Board in case the Board members did not have a video player handy when they were looking at the petition.

What Patent Owner's response doesn't note is that in the petition itself Petitioner included the same exact screenshots that appear in Exhibit 1022.

And there are quite a number of screenshots that were taken



2.0

2.2

2.3

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.

