

APPEARANCES: (Cont'd.) Transcription Service: Peggy Schuerger Ad Hoc Reporting 2220 Otay Lakes Road, Suite 502-85 Chula Vista, California 91915 (619) 236-9325 

#### SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA TUESDAY, AUGUST 20, 2019 2:25 P.M.

--000--

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Calling Civil Matter 19-2471, Palo Alto THE CLERK: Networks, Inc. v. Packet Intelligence LLC. Counsel, please come forward and state your appearance.

MR. BATCHELDER: Good afternoon, Your Honor. For Palo Alto Networks, James Batchelder from Ropes & Gray. With me is my partner, Andrew Radsch. And from Palo Alto Networks, we have senior counsel Rachita Aguilar (ph).

THE COURT: All right. Welcome.

MR. SMITH: For the Plaintiff (sic), Brian Smith and 12 Corby Vowell.

MR. VOWELL: Good afternoon, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Good afternoon. All right. So, first, is there any question about relating the case that was filed against Juniper Networks?

MR. SMITH: From the Plaintiff's perspective, we think it makes total sense to do that, Your Honor.

> THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BATCHELDER: We have no objection to having those cases be related, Your Honor. But we would object to consolidation. My understanding is that Complainant has not even been served yet. I think it's represented in the complaint that Packet Intelligence had accused Juniper of infringement before our complaint was even filed, and so they waited over three months to



1 actually file suit.

2.0

So consolidating at this stage would slow us down in ways that we're not --

THE COURT: Okay. Well, so let's see. I know nothing about the cases other than that they were filed and they seem to be on the same paths and represented to be the same clients. And so figuring out what the schedule should be, we'll wait until Juniper Networks is in gear. And I think what I'll probably do is try to have a case management conference that has both -- both cases together in about four months or so, and then we'll see -- we'll see how they ought to be handled.

MR. BATCHELDER: Thank you, Your Honor.

MR. SMITH: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Now, you indicated that you're basically ready for mediation now; right? -- in October?

MR. BATCHELDER: We targeted September, Your Honor. That was on page 9 of our statement in Section 12, and you'll see that it was -- and the parties agreed that that timing would work, provided that the September 3rd deadline for infringement contentions is met. So we have those in hand and we think that would then give us the basis that we feel that some kind of mediation -- we have agreed to use a magistrate judge if one is available.

THE COURT: Oh, that was nice of you to agree to that.

I'm not going to appoint a magistrate judge at this point to do

that. We have a -- if you want to use one of the panel attorneys from the ADR Unit, they are knowledgeable and -- and if you're ready to talk seriously, I think they do a good job.

Down the road, you will definitely be able to have a magistrate judge. But they've got a lot on their plates and I just -- I don't appoint people that early.

MR. BATCHELDER: I understand. I know how busy they are.

MR. SMITH: And I would just add, Your Honor, that the parties met informally on a couple of occasions prior to -- prior to setting the schedule, and we essentially agreed amongst ourselves that we would -- we needed this additional information -- some early discovery. Both sides have served written discovery and I think those are due within the next two to three weeks and we plan on, as the Plaintiff -- well, as the Counter-Claimant here -- producing a significant number of documents from past litigations. So -- which would include things like all the documents that were collected in those earlier cases from the original owners of the patents, the deposition transcripts of each of the inventors, things like that.

So they'll get all that information early and the parties thought it made sense, once we exchange this initial information and infringement contentions, to then see if there's an opportunity to resolve it.

THE COURT: Okay. So instead -- so I'm happy to refer

2.0

# 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.

