```
1
            UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
 2
             BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD
 3
      TCT MOBILE (US), INC.; TCT MOBILE (US) HOLDINGS, INC.;
 4
 5
        HUIZHOU TCL MOBILE COMMUNICATION CO. LTD.; AND TCL
 6
                      COMMUNICATION, INC.,
 7
                          Petitioners,
 8
                              vs.
          FUNDAMENTAL INNOVATION SYSTEMS INTERNATIONAL LLC,
9
10
                          Patent Owner.
11
12
             IPR2021-00395 (Patent No. 7,239,111)
13
             IPR2021-00410 (Patent No. 6,936,936)
14
             IPR2021-00428 (Patent No. 8,624,550)
15
             IPR2021-00597 (Patent No. 8,169,187)
16
             IPR2021-00598 (Patent No. 8,232,766)
17
             IPR2021-00599 (Patent No. 7,834,586)
18
19
                    TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
20
                     Thursday, March 25, 2021
21
22
     Reported by:
23
     DEBBIE RAZAVI, CSR NO. 9989
2.4
     Job No. 4517581
25
     PAGES 1 - 12
                                                     Page 1
```



```
1
    APPEARANCES (TELEPHONIC):
2.
    ADMINISTRATIVE PATENT JUDGES:
        ARTHUR M. PESLAK
4
        JON B. TORNQUIST
        LYNN PETTIGREW
        JO-ANNE KOKOSKI
6
        RAE LYNN GUEST
8
        BRIAN MOORE
9
    FOR PETITIONER:
10
        ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE, LLP
11
        BY: JEFFREY JOHNSON, ESQUIRE
             JEREMY LANG, ESQUIRE
12
13
        609 Main Street, 40th Floor
        Houston, Texas 77002-3106
14
15
        (713) 658-6450
16
        jj@orrick.com
17
         jlang@orrick.com
18
    FOR PATENT OWNER:
19
        IRELL & MANELLA LLP
20
        BY: HONG ANNITA ZHONG, ESQUIRE
21
        1800 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 900
22
        Los Angeles, California 90067-4276
23
        (310) 203-7183
24
        hzhong@irell.com
25
```

Page 2



1	THURSDAY, MARCH 25, 2021
2	10:15 A.M.
3	
4	PROCEEDINGS
5	
6	THE COURT: Welcome to the Patent Trial and
7	Appeal Board. This is Judge Peslak. On the line with
8	me are Judge Pettigrew, Judge Guest, Judge Kokoski,
9	Judge Tornquist and Judge Brian Moore.
10	We are on the record in IPR2021-00395,
11	IPR2021-00410, IPR2021-00428, IPR2021-00597,
12	IPR2021-00598 and IPR2021-00599.
13	Whose on the line for petitioner?
14	MR. JOHNSON: Hi, Your Honor. This is Jeffrey
15	Johnson. I'm counsel for petitioner. We may have one
16	other person on.
17	THE COURT: Do you have a court reporter on?
18	THE REPORTER: Yes, this is Debbie Razavi, the
19	court reporter.
20	THE COURT: Who is on the line for patent
21	owner?
22	MS. ZHONG: Your Honor, this is Annita Zhong
23	on behalf of patent owner.
24	THE COURT: Good afternoon.
25	And, Mr. Johnson, did you arrange for the
	Page 3



1 court reporter? 2 MR. JOHNSON: I did not, Your Honor. THE COURT: Ms. Zhong, did you arrange for the 3 4 court reporter? MS. ZHONG: Yes. Patent owner did arrange for 6 the court reporter, and we will file the transcript when we receive it. THE COURT: Okay. Yeah, I just wanted to make 8 9 sure. 10 The reason we are here today is the Board received an E-mail from Mr. Johnson dated March 23, 2021 11 12 requesting leave to file a corrected petition in each of 13 the six cases to correct what petitioner deems to be a 14 clerical error. 15 And just to sort of summarize, each of the 16 petitions relied on a Japanese patent application referred to as Morita in the 395 case, Exhibit 1017. 17 18 Petitioner wants to change two sentences in the petition 19 on Page 28. First change is to specifically the date, 2.0 publication date, for Morita of June 16, 2000. And then 21 the next sentence currently reads "Morita is prior art 22 under at least Section 102-B," and petitioner wants to 23 change that sentence to say "Morita is prior art under 24 Section 102-A and 102-B." 25 Mr. Johnson, we are a little puzzled why this



Page 4

change is necessary. The publication date is printed on the front of Morita, and it seems like that second sentence you did put patent owner on notice that you may be relying on something other than Section 102-B.

So why don't you explain, we want to make sure we are not missing anything here, so why don't you explain why you think this change is necessary.

MR. JOHNSON: Well, Your Honor, that's exactly right. We didn't really think it was necessary, but we just didn't want a technical argument that because we didn't affirmatively state the publication date or list out 102-A and B that they would try to just have a technical argument about that it was not prior art or that we didn't prove it was prior art and have our petition thrown out. So we just thought the better course would be to reach out to them and see if they were going to challenge it as prior art, and if they were then we would file to correct.

In response to our reaching out last week when we recognized the issue, they didn't respond one way or the other whether or not they were going to challenge it as prior art. They just said that they found it to be substantive and that we needed to re-file, so at that point we were left with no option but to just seek to correct it. We think it's pretty obvious what it is

Page 5



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.

