

1 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

2 \* \* \*

3 BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

4 \* \* \*

5 NEW WORLD MEDICAL, INC.,

6 Petitioner,

7 v.

8 MICROSURGICAL TECHNOLOGY, INC.,

9 Patent Owner.

10 \* \* \*

11 IPR2020-01573, IPR2020-01711, IPR2021-00017,

12 IPR2021-00065, IPR2021-00066

13 \* \* \*

14 Telephonic Hearing Held on Thursday, July 15,

15 2021, before the Honorable:

16 RYAN H. FLAX, DEVON ZASTROW NEWMAN,

17 ROBERT A. POLLACK, Administrative Patent Judges.

18 \* \* \*

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 2

1 APPEARANCES:  
2 On behalf of the Petitioner:  
3 Calfee, Halter & Griswold, LLP  
4 By: Todd R. Tucker  
5 Kyle T. Deighan  
6 Attorneys at Law  
7 1405 East 6th Street  
8 The Calfee Building  
9 Cleveland, Ohio 44114  
10 216-622-8231  
11 ttucker@calfee.com  
12 kdeighan@calfee.com  
13 On behalf of the Patent Owner:  
14 Wiley Rein, LLP  
15 By: Lawrence M. Sung  
16 Teresa M. Summers  
17 Attorneys at Law  
18 1776 K Street, NW  
19 Washington, D.C. 20006  
20 202-719-4181  
21 lsung@wileyrein.com  
22 tsummers@wileyrein.com  
23  
24  
25

Page 3

1 JUDGE FLAX: We are here concerning  
2 IPR 2020-01573, 2020-01711, 2021-00017,  
3 2021-00065, 2021-00066, if I am correct. Does  
4 anyone have anything else that they wanted to add  
5 to that list, is that correct?  
6 MR. SUNG: That's correct, your  
7 Honor.  
8 MR. DEIGHAN: Nothing from patent  
9 owner, your Honor.  
10 JUDGE FLAX: To help the court  
11 reporter when you speak, could you please identify  
12 yourself? And this is Judge Flax again.  
13 Each of these IPRs concerns New World  
14 Medical, Inc., as the petitioner versus  
15 Microsurgical Technology, Inc., as the patent  
16 owner. We are also joined by Judge Zastrow  
17 Newman. The panels on each of these cases are not  
18 identical, but we have judges from each panel.  
19 So on July 12th, we received an  
20 e-mail from petitioner's counsel concerning their  
21 desire to depose witness Dr. Manual Quintana, the  
22 patent owner's witness, who according to the  
23 e-mail is not in the United States but is in  
24 Spain.  
25 So what I will do is let petitioner

Page 4

1 explain what it wants and why it needs it, and I  
2 will give patent owner an opportunity to respond  
3 also. So if you could identify yourselves as far  
4 as who we are speaking with and for which party,  
5 please start there.  
6 MR. DEIGHAN: Thank you, your Honor.  
7 This is Kyle Deighan representing petitioner. And  
8 also on the line is my colleague, Todd Tucker, for  
9 petitioner.  
10 MR. TUCKER: Hello, your Honor. I  
11 think it's going to be him doing the argument.  
12 JUDGE FLAX: Okay. And who else do  
13 we have?  
14 MR. SUNG: Good morning, your Honor.  
15 For patent owner, this is Lawrence Sung, and with  
16 me is Teresa Summers.  
17 JUDGE FLAX: Is Ms. Summers on record  
18 in the case? I don't recall seeing her name.  
19 MR. SUNG: Yes, she is, your Honor.  
20 And just as a point of clarification -- I  
21 apologize, as a point of clarification, with one  
22 of the IPRs, the patent owner in that case is the  
23 Regents of the University of California.  
24 JUDGE FLAX: Oh, okay. Thank you for  
25 updating that. Okay. So let's move ahead to what

Page 5

1 petitioner has to say. Mr. Deighan, please go  
2 ahead.  
3 MR. DEIGHAN: Thank you, your Honors.  
4 So as a matter of routine discovery, petitioner is  
5 entitled to depose Dr. Quintana. And under 37 CFR  
6 42.53, a deposition should take place within the  
7 United States. Patent owner has indicated that  
8 Dr. Quintana will not be made available for  
9 deposition in the United States.  
10 Petitioner believes that it's crucial  
11 that we have an opportunity to depose Dr. Quintana  
12 in person and consistent with the rules in the US.  
13 I won't go too far into the weeds on this. But  
14 just to provide a little bit of background,  
15 Dr. Quintana is the author of one of petitioner's  
16 prior art references, which was written by  
17 Dr. Quintana in English in 1985.  
18 Patent owner has submitted a  
19 declaration from Dr. Quintana in these proceedings  
20 that from our perspective we believe contradicts  
21 the clear words of the prior art reference, and so  
22 the words are crucial here. To complicate  
23 matters, patent owner has indicated that  
24 Dr. Quintana does not speak English, and so we  
25 will require an interpreter or translator for a

Page 6

1 deposition.  
2 And so given the technical nature of  
3 the article and the importance of the words and,  
4 you know, the language barrier issues, we believe  
5 pretty strongly that this deposition should be  
6 held in person and that it would be extremely  
7 prejudicial to petitioner to do this using some  
8 sort of remote means. And, again, the rule  
9 dictates that the deposition, you know, should be  
10 within the United States.  
11 As I mentioned, patent owner has  
12 indicated that Dr. Quintana will not be made  
13 available in the US. They have provided no  
14 justification, except for simply that Dr. Quintana  
15 refuses to travel to the US.  
16 It's our understanding that there are  
17 no COVID-related travel restrictions to travel  
18 between the US and Spain. In fact, patent owner  
19 during the parties' meet and confer last week did  
20 not even mention COVID or any other health  
21 concerns as being justification for why he would  
22 not appear in the US.  
23 And it should have been entirely  
24 foreseeable to patent owner that Dr. Quintana  
25 would need to be made available for deposition,

Page 7

1 and that would need to take place in the US when  
2 they submitted his declaration in these  
3 proceedings. And, you know, in our view just not  
4 wanting to travel to the US is not enough.  
5 And so we asked for this conference  
6 call with your Honors to seek guidance on how to  
7 proceed. You know, we think that Dr. Quintana  
8 should be ordered to be made available for  
9 deposition in the US.  
10 And if not, you know, we would seek  
11 an opportunity to move to strike his testimony.  
12 And so, again, we are kind of seeking guidance  
13 from your Honors on what the parties' next steps  
14 would be; whether it's a motion from our side,  
15 petitioner's side, to compel his deposition in the  
16 US or some other means.  
17 So, again, just seeking guidance from  
18 your Honor -- your Honors on the next steps.  
19 Thank you, your Honors.  
20 JUDGE FLAX: Okay, thank you. Moving  
21 on, Mr. Sung, what do you have to say?  
22 MR. SUNG: Yes, good morning, your  
23 Honors. This is Lawrence Sung for patent owners  
24 Microsurgical Technology and the Regents of the  
25 University of California.

Page 8

1 Dr. Quintana is an 85-year-old  
2 retired ophthalmologist who resides in Barcelona,  
3 Spain. He is a Spanish citizen. And while he  
4 does speak English, English is not his primary  
5 language.  
6 And as Exhibit 2020 in each of the  
7 five related IPRs shows, on May 17th of 2021,  
8 Dr. Quintana executed a sworn affidavit. Not a  
9 declaration, but a sworn affidavit in Barcelona,  
10 Spain, that was duly notarized and apostille under  
11 Spanish law.  
12 Now, Exhibit 2020 consists of eight  
13 paragraphs across three double-spaced pages total,  
14 five paragraphs of which are short, simple,  
15 declarative statements concerning the 1985 article  
16 that he solely authored, which is Exhibit 1004 in  
17 each of the five related IPRs.  
18 Dr. Quintana is an independent  
19 third-party fact witness. He is not being offered  
20 as an expert witness. His testimony is not on  
21 behalf of either party, but merely seeks to  
22 clarify what his article meant to report.  
23 Patent owner does not represent or  
24 speak for Dr. Quintana. And to patent owner's  
25 knowledge, neither party has sought to compel his

Page 9

1 testimony. During the July 9th, 2021, meet and  
2 confer, patent owner's counsel explained that the  
3 patent owner does not have the ability to make  
4 Dr. Quintana available for deposition in the  
5 United States.  
6 Patent owner's counsel also indicated  
7 at that time that attempting to force Dr. Quintana  
8 to travel internationally while COVID-19 is still  
9 a concern, especially at his advanced age, was not  
10 commensurate with the scope of his limited and  
11 narrow testimony in Exhibit 2020.  
12 It's unclear what prejudice, if any,  
13 petitioner in this case would suffer if the board  
14 were to decide itself the appropriate way to  
15 accord Dr. Quintana's sworn statements. Just  
16 because petitioner doesn't like what Dr. Quintana  
17 said doesn't make his testimony adverse or  
18 unreliable.  
19 But in the spirit of compromise,  
20 patent owner's counsel raised the possibility of  
21 cross-exam by written interrogatories, for  
22 example, as a more suitable alternative to pursue,  
23 given the language translation issues.  
24 Petitioner's counsel hasn't provided  
25 any insight into what information they intend to

Page 10

1 seek from Dr. Quintana on cross-examination that  
2 would be properly restricted to the limited  
3 testimony in the sworn affidavit. And that's all  
4 from patent owner's side, your Honors. Thank you.  
5 JUDGE NEWMAN: Counsel, this is Judge  
6 Newman. Have you explored the opportunity of a  
7 video deposition?  
8 MR. TUCKER: Your Honor, this is Todd  
9 Tucker for the petitioner. In a couple of other  
10 cases, I have been doing a series of depositions  
11 on Zoom involving translators in Macao, and it's  
12 been incredibly difficult.  
13 Given the nature with which  
14 Dr. Quintana is contradicting what he wrote in  
15 1985, I think that it will be very, very difficult  
16 when you are entirely focused on what words mean  
17 to be having a translator, a potential check  
18 translator, and all the parties on video. This is  
19 not going to be an efficient or fair deposition if  
20 it's done in that manner due to the multiple  
21 people that are going to need to be talking in  
22 this deposition.  
23 It's also -- I think there needs to  
24 be some exploration of, you know, English as  
25 second language and you need translator if you

Page 11

1 were able to write this article in 1985 to explain  
2 to the world what you were doing, which makes a  
3 little bit of this suspect. And I think it will  
4 be a difficult deposition -- extremely difficult  
5 deposition with the potential -- normally, you  
6 have two translators, the base translator and then  
7 the check translator and then multiple attorneys  
8 and the witness.  
9 It just seems like this would be  
10 very, very prejudicial and that we won't be able  
11 to test the sworn statement properly, do a proper  
12 cross-examination, your Honor. Thank you.  
13 MR. SUNG: Judge Newman, this is  
14 Lawrence Sung for patent owner. Let me just say  
15 that, of course, while we are aware that a  
16 possible mechanism would be video deposition,  
17 patent owner has taken no position on whether that  
18 would be appropriate here. And just as a  
19 remainder, we can't speak for Dr. Quintana in  
20 terms of his willingness to participate in a video  
21 deposition, either.  
22 Just as note, what I wanted to raise  
23 in response to what Mr. Tucker has mentioned,  
24 clearly the petitioner has had no problems relying  
25 on the 1985 article written in English until this

Page 12

1 very moment, and so I am not sure that the  
2 protests by petitioner regarding the deposition  
3 based on the language issues really applies in  
4 this particular case. Thank you.  
5 MR. TUCKER: If I may, your Honors, I  
6 think that's -- that's really a circular  
7 statement. This entire deposition will be what  
8 words in English mean, what they meant to  
9 Dr. Quintana when he wrote them and what they mean  
10 now that he has changed the definitions and  
11 changed the contents of his article some 30-odd  
12 years after he wrote it.  
13 So this is a deposition entirely  
14 focused on what words mean. So it is imperative  
15 that things are translated properly, that people  
16 are not speaking over each other, that we have a  
17 clear record, that we are able to overcome the  
18 communication barriers to determine exactly where  
19 he -- where the potential deponent, where this  
20 witness who is contradicting what he wrote, what's  
21 his basis for all that. And that's why this  
22 deposition needs to be in person, your Honors.  
23 JUDGE POLLACK: Counsel, this is  
24 Judge Pollack. It sounds to me as though  
25 Dr. Quintana is a third-party in a foreign

Page 13

1 country, and it might be pretty difficult to  
2 compel him to come here. So have the parties  
3 discussed taking his deposition in Spain?  
4 MR. TUCKER: Your Honor, this is  
5 Mr. Tucker again. We are willing to go to Spain  
6 if need be. We think the rule is that they need  
7 to provide him in the US. I know they are saying  
8 he is a third party.  
9 But they submitted the evidence, they  
10 need to make him available under 3742. And I am  
11 sorry, I got the rule wrong there, but under the  
12 rule. So, you know, I think if no deposition  
13 occurs, we are going to seek permission to file a  
14 motion to strike because we are not getting to  
15 test the deposition.  
16 We are willing to go to Spain,  
17 however. There are no -- again, as Mr. Deighan  
18 said, there's no travel restrictions. And  
19 Mr. Deighan and I are fully vaccinated, so we are  
20 willing to go as well. You know, if there is no  
21 deposition, however, you know, then I think we  
22 would be asking the board to strike the statement.  
23 MR. SUNG: And Judge Pollack, this is  
24 Lawrence Sung for patent owner.  
25 JUDGE FLAX: Mr. Sung, this is Judge

Page 14

1 Flax.  
2 MR. SUNG: I'm sorry, Judge Flax.  
3 JUDGE FLAX: This is Judge Flax.  
4 Would you be willing to assist petitioner in  
5 getting Dr. Quintana to a deposition if they  
6 travel to Spain?  
7 MR. SUNG: The understanding would be  
8 that we would make the effort to reach out to  
9 Dr. Quintana to see if that were possible, but it  
10 is our understanding that he would not be willing  
11 to voluntarily submit to deposition.  
12 And, Judge Flax, if I could just  
13 answer Judge Pollack's question very briefly. We  
14 did want to say, again, just to reiterate that we  
15 do not control Dr. Quintana, and we don't really  
16 have an ability to compel him for additional  
17 deposition or additional testimony in other  
18 measures, either.  
19 What we are trying to do is to see if  
20 we can seek some type of cooperation with him  
21 about that. And so, again, because we don't speak  
22 for him, I could not tell you on the phone today  
23 what may or may not be possible from Dr. Quintana.  
24 The other point that I did want to  
25 make because Mr. Tucker has raised it is the

Page 15

1 Quintana article is a seven-page short article.  
2 Dr. Quintana's sworn affidavit similarly brief, as  
3 I mentioned. And it's only Mr. Tucker who is  
4 asserting today that the sworn statements of  
5 Dr. Quintana are in any way different or  
6 contradictory.  
7 I think that the board is in as good  
8 a position as anyone to look at the statements and  
9 make its own determination based on what's there,  
10 and as I mentioned as well, to determine whether  
11 there should be weight accorded to the sworn  
12 statement, the sworn affidavit.  
13 Again, it's been duly notarized and  
14 apostilled, and I hear petitioner today to concede  
15 that Dr. Quintana, the person who signed the sworn  
16 statement, is the same Dr. Quintana who authored  
17 the article. Thank you.  
18 MR. TUCKER: Your Honors, if I could  
19 just briefly respond, I think patent owner is  
20 missing the point that they have submitted this  
21 statement. And this statement, we are --  
22 petitioner is entitled to test that statement.  
23 And, you know, so a written  
24 interrogatory is not going to work. This is  
25 essentially direct testimony, and we are entitled

Page 16

1 to either have an opportunity to test it or it  
2 should be withdrawn.  
3 I think it's also a little  
4 questionable for patent owner to say they have no  
5 control over the witness when they were able to  
6 probably secure a sworn statement that we will  
7 find out if they helped draft it or not, but --  
8 and we are also -- since they do not represent  
9 him, I think another area that's extremely  
10 important is they have had communications with  
11 him.  
12 And we are entitled to find out about  
13 those communications because they -- since patent  
14 owner's counsel does not represent Dr. Quintana,  
15 there is clearly no privilege. So that is another  
16 area that needs to be explored, your Honor, to  
17 truly see what is the value of this after the  
18 fact, you know, 35 years later statement, your  
19 Honor. Thank you.  
20 JUDGE FLAX: I think what we will do  
21 right now is put you, counsel and the court  
22 reporter, on hold for a moment while the judges  
23 convene, unless you have something you want to add  
24 before we do that?  
25 MR. SUNG: Nothing from patent owner.

Page 17

1 MR. TUCKER: Kyle, anything else from  
2 petitioner?  
3 MR. DEIGHAN: Nothing else from  
4 petitioner.  
5 JUDGE FLAX: Okay. Please just hold  
6 on for a moment. Thank you.  
7 (Recess taken.)  
8 JUDGE FLAX: Okay, everybody. We are  
9 back. So having considered what everybody has  
10 said today, in the interest of fairness, we think  
11 that the parties need to work together to try to  
12 secure Dr. Quintana for a deposition in Spain.  
13 Based on what everybody has said, it  
14 appears that the patent owner is not controlling  
15 Dr. Quintana, has at least some relationship with  
16 him so that they could communicate with him, be in  
17 contact with him, and try to schedule something  
18 for a convenient time for petitioner's counsel to  
19 go to Spain and take a brief deposition of the  
20 doctor.  
21 What we want you to do is make these  
22 efforts together and report back to the board by  
23 e-mail by next Friday. Does everybody understand  
24 that?  
25 MR. TUCKER: For petitioner, this is

# 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.