

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
WACO DIVISION

BROADBAND iTV, INC.,  
Plaintiff,  
vs. No. 6:19-cv-716-ADA  
DISH NETWORK, L.L.C.,  
Defendant.

\_\_\_\_\_ /

-- CONFIDENTIAL --

DEPOSITION OF MILTON DIAZ PEREZ  
Remote Zoom Proceeding  
Burlingame, California  
Monday, August 9, 2021

REPORTED BY:  
LESLIE ROCKWOOD ROSAS, RPR, CSR 3462  
Pages 1 - 109 Job No. 4748809



CONFIDENTIAL

1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
2 FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
3 WACO DIVISION  
4  
5  
6 BROADBAND iTV, INC.,  
7 Plaintiff,  
8 vs. No. 6:19-cv-716-ADA  
9 DISH NETWORK, L.L.C.,  
10 Defendant.

---

11  
12  
13 -- CONFIDENTIAL --  
14  
15 Deposition of MILTON DIAZ PEREZ, taken on behalf  
16 of DISH Network, Remote Zoom Proceeding from Burlingame,  
17 California, beginning at 9:17 a.m. Pacific Daylight Time  
18 and ending at 1:27 p.m., on Monday, August 9, 2021,  
19 before Leslie Rockwood Rosas, RPR, Certified Shorthand  
20 Reporter No. 3462.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Page 2

1 APPEARANCES:  
2  
3 FOR THE PLAINTIFF:  
4 FEINBERG DAY KRAMER ALBERTI LIM  
5 TONKOVICH & BELLOLI LLP  
6 BY: RUSSELL TONKOVICH, ESQ.  
7 577 Airport Boulevard, Suite 250  
8 Burlingame, California 94010  
9 (650) 825-4300 (Ext. 106)  
10 rtonkovich@feinday.com  
11  
12  
13 FOR THE DEFENDANT:  
14 ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP  
15 BY: WILL MELEHANI, ESQ.  
16 405 Howard Street  
17 San Francisco, California 94105-2669  
18 (415) 773-5577  
19 wmelehani@orrick.com  
20  
21  
22 Also Present: Sean Morrissey, Concierge  
23  
24  
25

Page 3

1 I N D E X  
2  
3  
4 MONDAY, AUGUST 9, 2021  
5  
6 WITNESS EXAMINATION  
7 MILTON DIAZ PEREZ  
8  
9 BY MR. MELEHANI 6  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14 QUESTIONS WITNESS INSTRUCTED NOT TO ANSWER:  
15 (NONE)  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Page 4

1 DEPOSITION EXHIBITS  
2 MILTON DIAZ PEREZ  
3 NUMBER DESCRIPTION IDENTIFIED  
4 Exhibit 1 Declaration of Milton Diaz 18  
5 Perez, 05/10/21  
6 Exhibit 2 United States Patent No. 55  
7 10,028,026 B2, 07/17/18  
8 Exhibit 3 Protective Order Material 67  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Page 5

CONFIDENTIAL

1 Burlingame, California; Monday, August 9, 2021  
2 9:17 a.m. Pacific Daylight Time  
3 --oOo--  
4 PROCEEDINGS  
5  
6 MILTON DIAZ PEREZ,  
7 having been first duly sworn, was examined  
8 and testified as follows:  
9  
10 THE WITNESS: I do. 09:17:23  
11 THE REPORTER: Thank you, sir.  
12 Will you please introduce yourselves, Counsel.  
13 MR. MELEHANI: Sure. This is Will Melehani with  
14 Orrick Herrington & Sutcliffe on behalf of the  
15 Petitioner. 09:17:36  
16 MR. TONKOVICH: This is Russell Tonkovich on  
17 behalf of BBiTV from Feinberg Day.  
18 THE REPORTER: Thank you.  
19 You may proceed, Counsel.  
20 MR. MELEHANI: All right. Thank you. 09:17:50  
21  
22 EXAMINATION  
23 BY MR. MELEHANI:  
24 Q. Okay. So Mr. Perez Diaz or Diaz Perez, that's  
25 the first question is how should I refer to you? Because 09:17:58  
Page 6

1 I've seen it every which way and I'm not sure.  
2 A. I've given up. It's -- it's -- so formally it's  
3 Milton Diaz Perez, or Diaz Perez. Informally, it's Diaz.  
4 Q. Okay. So it's never just Perez, which I think  
5 is what I had been using. 09:18:20  
6 A. No. In terms of the Hispanic naming  
7 conventions, it's never Perez.  
8 Q. Okay. Well, I apologize if you've read any  
9 documents --  
10 A. No worries. 09:18:29  
11 Q. -- that I've had a role in that refer to you as  
12 Mr. Perez.  
13 A. No worries.  
14 Q. So you've been deposed before, at least twice;  
15 is that right? I mean -- 09:18:42  
16 A. Yes.  
17 Q. And at least you were deposed for, I guess, a  
18 partial deposition that's still to be continued in  
19 connection with the litigation in the BBiTV versus DISH  
20 and DirecTV matters; is that right? 09:18:59  
21 A. That's correct.  
22 Q. And then I know you've also been deposed in  
23 connection with the litigation several years back against  
24 Time Warner and Hawaiian Telecom; is that right?  
25 A. Yes. 09:19:13  
Page 7

1 Q. Other than those two depositions, have you ever  
2 been deposed before?  
3 A. No.  
4 Q. Okay. Other than those two depositions, have  
5 you ever submitted testimony, either in a declaration or 09:19:28  
6 in actual court, in any proceeding before?  
7 A. We have this declaration that we're dealing with  
8 today.  
9 Q. Right. Yeah, obviously that one, yes. But  
10 other than that one, too, is there any other time you've 09:19:49  
11 submitted a declaration in a Court before? I know you  
12 have in connection with patent prosecution with the PTO,  
13 but other than that, in like a litigation-type setting,  
14 have you ever submitted testimony?  
15 A. That I recall, no. 09:20:02  
16 Q. Okay. Well, I know you probably are familiar  
17 with the rules with how depositions work, given that  
18 you've done it before, but just in case, I'll just go  
19 over some basic ground rules. Especially because we're  
20 doing this by, you know, video conference, it really 09:20:22  
21 helps if people are familiar.  
22 So first and foremost, it's important that we  
23 don't talk over each other, both because the software  
24 doesn't handle it well and because the court reporter is  
25 trying to write down everything. 09:20:36  
Page 8

1 Do you understand?  
2 A. Yes.  
3 Q. Okay. And after I ask a question, generally  
4 your counsel has an opportunity to object, and then you  
5 have to answer unless your counsel instructs you not to 09:20:54  
6 answer.  
7 Are you familiar with that process?  
8 A. I was waiting for him to object. Okay. Yes.  
9 Q. Okay. And if you can't understand me for any  
10 reason, if I slur or mumble or if there's a technical 09:21:16  
11 issue, please let me know. I can try again or fix the  
12 problem, and I will assume that if you don't let me know,  
13 that there is no issue and you've understood me properly;  
14 is that fair?  
15 A. Yes. 09:21:35  
16 Q. Okay. Now is there any reason why you would not  
17 be able to fully and truthfully testify here today, like,  
18 for example, medications or some other issue that could  
19 interfere with your ability to testify?  
20 A. No. 09:21:55  
21 Q. Now I want to talk with you a bit about the  
22 prior deposition, or I guess it's sort of a half  
23 deposition that you gave in connection with the  
24 litigation between BBiTV and DISH and DIRECTV.  
25 Do you remember that deposition? 09:22:11  
Page 9

1 A. From June?  
2 Q. Yeah, recent, yeah.  
3 A. Yes.  
4 Q. Okay. Now prior to that depo, you were sworn in  
5 and gave an oath to testify truthfully; right? 09:22:29  
6 A. Yes.  
7 Q. And did you have an opportunity, prior to that  
8 depo, to review the testimony that you gave? I'm sorry,  
9 let me scratch that and rephrase.  
10 Prior to this deposition, did you have an 09:22:50  
11 opportunity to review the testimony you gave in  
12 connection with the District Court deposition that you  
13 gave in June?  
14 MR. TONKOVICH: Objection. Scope.  
15 THE WITNESS: Yes. 09:23:11  
16 Q. BY MR. MELEHANI: Okay. And do you stand by the  
17 testimony that you gave in June as correct and accurate  
18 and truthful?  
19 MR. TONKOVICH: Objection. Scope.  
20 THE WITNESS: I believe it was accurate. 09:23:23  
21 Q. BY MR. MELEHANI: Okay. Are you aware of the  
22 fact that the parties have an agreement that your  
23 testimony from that deposition can be used in connection  
24 with this IPR proceeding, and that testimony from this  
25 IPR proceeding can be used in connection with the 09:23:44  
Page 10

1 litigation; are you aware of that agreement?  
2 A. I personally am not aware of that  
3 Q. Okay. How did you -- just generally -- I don't  
4 need like specific communications. I'm certainly not  
5 looking for anything privileged, but how did you 09:24:07  
6 communicate -- or sorry -- how did you prepare for your  
7 deposition today?  
8 MR. TONKOVICH: Just caution the witness not to  
9 reveal any attorney-client communications  
10 THE WITNESS: I reviewed my deposition -- or my 09:24:20  
11 declaration and reviewed the exhibits  
12 Q. BY MR. MELEHANI: Did you review all the  
13 exhibits or a subset of the exhibits?  
14 A. I reviewed the exhibits that were referenced in  
15 my declaration 09:24:41  
16 Q. And was counsel part of that process?  
17 MR. TONKOVICH: Caution the witness not to  
18 reveal any attorney-client communications. You can  
19 answer "yes" or "no"  
20 THE WITNESS: They provided to me the materials 09:25:04  
21 I conducted the review. So the answer is "yes" in that  
22 they provided the materials  
23 Q. BY MR. MELEHANI: The process of reviewing the  
24 materials, is that something you did on your own?  
25 A. Yes 09:25:30  
Page 11

1 Q. Did you have -- and I'm just looking for a "yes"  
2 or "no" here. Did you have any conversations with  
3 counsel in preparation for this deposition today?  
4 MR. TONKOVICH: Again, just caution the witness  
5 not to reveal any communications with attorneys. You can 09:25:41  
6 answer "yes" or "no"  
7 THE WITNESS: Yes  
8 Q. BY MR. MELEHANI: Okay. And about when did you  
9 have those conversations?  
10 A. Last week 09:26:00  
11 Q. Okay. And how many conversations did you have?  
12 A. I think there were two  
13 Q. Approximately how long was the first  
14 conversation?  
15 A. Perhaps an hour and a half, two hours 09:26:22  
16 Q. How about the second conversation?  
17 A. About the same  
18 Q. And did those conversations take place before  
19 you reviewed the declaration and exhibits?  
20 MR. TONKOVICH: I would again caution the 09:26:38  
21 witness not to reveal any attorney-client communications  
22 You can answer "yes" or "no"  
23 THE WITNESS: I'm not sure. I can't recall  
24 Q. BY MR. MELEHANI: Okay. So when you reviewed  
25 the declaration and exhibits, that was approximately 09:26:53  
Page 12

1 sometime last week?  
2 A. Yes.  
3 Q. When you had these conversations with counsel,  
4 were they over the phone or in person?  
5 A. They were over the phone. 09:27:18  
6 Q. Have you read DISH's IPR petition regarding the  
7 '026 patent?  
8 A. Some parts. Not in its entirety.  
9 Q. Did you read that petition in connection with  
10 preparing for this deposition today or is it something 09:27:41  
11 you just read in the past?  
12 MR. TONKOVICH: Caution the witness not to  
13 reveal any attorney-client communications. You can  
14 answer "yes" or "no."  
15 THE WITNESS: Could you repeat the question, 09:27:51  
16 please.  
17 Q. BY MR. MELEHANI: Well, I didn't phrase it as a  
18 "yes" or "no," unfortunately, but I'll try.  
19 Is the -- was your review of DISH's IPR petition  
20 done in connection with your preparation for this 09:28:07  
21 deposition?  
22 MR. TONKOVICH: Same objection.  
23 THE WITNESS: No.  
24 Q. BY MR. MELEHANI: I'm sorry, did you say "no"?  
25 A. No. 09:28:15  
Page 13

1 (Interruption in proceedings )  
 2 Q BY MR MELEHANI: So approximately when did you  
 3 review the '026 IPR petition?  
 4 A I think it was shortly after it was filed  
 5 Q Did you review the declaration of Dr Sam Russ 09:29:00  
 6 that was submitted with that petition?  
 7 A Not that I recall  
 8 Q Did you review any of the prior art that was  
 9 submitted with that petition? And just to help you, we  
 10 call them, Gonder, Son, and Kelts 09:29:30  
 11 A Yes  
 12 Q I guess I'll take it one at a time  
 13 So you read the Gonder reference; is that  
 14 accurate?  
 15 A I -- yes, in part at least 09:29:43  
 16 Q Okay And did you read the Son reference?  
 17 A Yes, in part  
 18 Q Is the same true for the Kelts reference?  
 19 A Yes, again, in part  
 20 Q Okay Now BBiTV submitted two responses, and I 09:30:05  
 21 think there's technical terminology for them, and I'm  
 22 just going to mess it up So I'll just try to describe  
 23 them otherwise  
 24 They submitted one response before the IPR was  
 25 instituted sort of arguing against institution, and then 09:30:23

Page 14

1 after it was instituted, they submitted a second  
 2 response.  
 3 Did you review either of those two responses?  
 4 A. I believe I -- in part.  
 5 Q. Did you review the response that -- which is the 09:30:48  
 6 one I just referred to as the second response, for which  
 7 your declaration was submitted?  
 8 MR. TONKOVICH: Objection. Form.  
 9 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, could you repeat the  
 10 question. 09:31:01  
 11 Q. BY MR. MELEHANI: So I'm asking specifically  
 12 about the second response, which is the one that your  
 13 declaration came with.  
 14 A. Uh-huh.  
 15 Q. Did you review that response? 09:31:10  
 16 A. At least in part.  
 17 Q. Are you familiar with the arguments that BBiTV  
 18 is making in connection with the IPR proceeding?  
 19 A. At least some of them, yes.  
 20 Q. So I know your declaration is largely concerning 09:31:30  
 21 the topic of conception and reduction to practice.  
 22 A. (Nods head.)  
 23 Q. There are other arguments that BBiTV makes, you  
 24 know, to distinguish the prior art and whatnot.  
 25 Are you aware of that? 09:31:43

Page 15

1 A Yes  
 2 Q Are you familiar with the arguments that BBiTV  
 3 is making on issues unrelated to conception and reduction  
 4 to practice, such as arguments to distinguish the prior  
 5 art? 09:31:58  
 6 MR TONKOVICH: Objection Scope  
 7 THE WITNESS: I'm more prepared on the  
 8 declaration than anything else  
 9 Q BY MR MELEHANI: Okay And I'm not -- I'm not,  
 10 you know -- I'm not trying to quiz you I'm just 09:32:12  
 11 wondering if you're familiar with the arguments that  
 12 BBiTV's making in the broader IPR, separate and apart  
 13 from conception and reduction to practice?  
 14 MR TONKOVICH: Objection Scope  
 15 THE WITNESS: Oh, sorry 09:32:27  
 16 MR TONKOVICH: Go ahead  
 17 THE WITNESS: My apologies  
 18 In some aspects, but really -- I contributed on  
 19 the declaration That's my focus  
 20 Q BY MR MELEHANI: Okay Are you aware that 09:32:45  
 21 Dr Michael Shamos has submitted a declaration alongside  
 22 your declaration in BBiTV's response?  
 23 A Yes  
 24 Q Have you read his declaration?  
 25 A I have not 09:33:07

Page 16

1 Q Have you ever met with Dr Shamos?  
 2 A I have not  
 3 Q So let me be more specific Have you spoken to  
 4 Dr Shamos at any point?  
 5 A I have not 09:33:24  
 6 Q Are you aware that he's already been deposed in  
 7 connection with the IPR proceedings?  
 8 A No  
 9 Q And I guess I can assume this, but I'll ask it  
 10 anyway: Have you reviewed the transcript of his 09:33:42  
 11 deposition in connection with the IPR proceedings?  
 12 A No  
 13 MR MELEHANI: So I was hoping we might get to  
 14 the technical resolution before we hit this point, but it  
 15 doesn't look like it So I'll go ahead and introduce the 09:33:59  
 16 first exhibit It's just going to be your declaration  
 17 So if you guys want to pull it up, you can But I'll go  
 18 through the process of doing it formally here So just  
 19 give me one second to --  
 20 THE WITNESS: If I can interrupt, I thought I 09:34:12  
 21 saw an email come in  
 22 MR MELEHANI: Okay  
 23 THE WITNESS: But would that have been related  
 24 to this?  
 25 MR MELEHANI: Could be Do you guys want to go 09:34:18

Page 17

# 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.