

1 PROCEEDINGS:

2 DISH NETWORK, L.L.C. BROADBAND iTV, INC., CASE NO.  
3 IPR2020-01267, U.S. PATENT NO. 10,028,026

4 DISH NETWORK, L.L.C. BROADBAND iTV, INC., CASE NO.  
5 IPR2020-01268, U.S. PATENT NO. 10,028,026

6 DISH NETWORK, L.L.C. BROADBAND iTV, INC., CASE NO.  
7 IPR2020-1280, U.S. PATENT NO. 9,998,791

8 DISH NETWORK, L.L.C. BROADBAND iTV, INC., CASE NO.  
9 IPR2020-1281, U.S. PATENT NO. 9,998,791

10 DISH NETWORK, L.L.C. BROADBAND iTV, INC., CASE NO.  
11 IPR2020-1332, U.S. PATENT NO. 10,506,269

12 DISH NETWORK, L.L.C. BROADBAND iTV, INC., CASE NO.  
13 IPR2020-1333, U.S. PATENT NO. 10,506,269

14 DISH NETWORK, L.L.C. BROADBAND iTV, INC., CASE NO.  
15 IPR2020-1359, U.S. PATENT NO. 9,648,388

16 DISH NETWORK, L.L.C. BROADBAND iTV, INC., CASE NO.  
17 IPR2020-1360, U.S. PATENT NO. 9,648,388

18 Wednesday, November 25, 2020

19 3:00 p.m.

20 BEFORE:

21 JUDGES: ARBIS, SMITH AND GALLIGAN

22

23

24

25

BBiTV EX2030  
AT&T v. Broadband iTV  
IPR2020-00556

1 A P P E A R A N C E S :

2

3 ATTORNEYS FOR PETITIONER

4 ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE, LLP  
5 BY: PATRICK HERMAN, ESQUIRE

6

7 ALYSSA CARIDIS, ESQUIRE

8

9

10 ATTORNEYS FOR PATENT

11 STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX, LLC  
12 BY: MICHAEL D. SPECHT, ESQUIRE

13

14 RICHARD M. BEMBEN, ESQUIRE

15

16

17 REPORTED BY: JOSEPH HENRY

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 ADMINISTRATIVE PATENT JUDGE ARBIS: Good  
2 afternoon. This is Judge Arbis of the patent  
3 trial and appeal board. I have with me on the  
4 line, Judge Smith and Judge Galligan. This is  
5 a conference call in a series of eight cases,  
6 IPR2020-1267 through 1360. Do we have counsel  
7 for petitioner on the line?

8 MR. HERMAN: Yes, Your Honor. This is  
9 Patrick Herman from Orrick, Herrington &  
10 Sutcliffe, here on behalf of petitioner. And  
11 also on the line with me is Alyssa Caridis,  
12 also from Orrick.

13 ADMINISTRATIVE PATENT JUDGE ARBIS: Okay.  
14 Thank you. And counsel for patent owner?

15 MR. SPECHT: Yes, Your Honor. This is  
16 Mike Specht. I'm with Sterne Kessler, counsel  
17 for patent owner. And also with me is Richard  
18 Bemben, who's also with Sterne Kessler, and  
19 counsel for patent owner. I believe there also  
20 should be a court reporter on. We arranged for  
21 one.

22 ADMINISTRATIVE PATENT JUDGE ARBIS: Sure,  
23 that's fine. And, Counsel, if you can please  
24 file a copy of the transcript as an exhibit in  
25 all eight proceedings once it's available.

1 MR. SPECHT: We will do that.

2 ADMINISTRATIVE PATENT JUDGE ARBIS: Okay.

3 I believe the call today was requested by  
4 petitioner to seek authorization to file a  
5 reply in these cases. So, counsel for  
6 petitioner, would you like to explain the basis  
7 for your request?

8 MR. HERMAN: Yes, Your Honor. In all  
9 eight of the IPR proceedings, patent owner has  
10 filed a preliminary response that dedicates a  
11 substantial amount of space to Section 314,  
12 discretionary denial issue, and petitioner  
13 would like to file a short reply addressing an  
14 aspect of the arguments that patent owner is  
15 making. In particular, though, it's relating  
16 to the scheduled trial date in the co-pending  
17 Western District of Texas litigation. And it's  
18 petitioner's view that good cause for a reply  
19 that, because in the middle of November, the  
20 federal circuit issues a decision that in  
21 petitioner's view has bearing on the viability  
22 of the currently scheduled trial date, and  
23 whether trial will occur at all in the current  
24 venue. And that that decision did not become  
25 available until this November. It's not

1 something that petitioner could have addressed  
2 in the petition when they were originally  
3 filed. I'm happy to go more into what we'd  
4 like to say, but I just don't want to stray too  
5 far into the substance, unless Your Honors  
6 would like to hear that.

7 ADMINISTRATIVE PATENT JUDGE ARBIS: Yes,  
8 actually, if you can give us a little bit more  
9 detail as to why you believe that decision  
10 impacts the potential trial date or the  
11 viability of having a trial in that venue.

12 MR. HERMAN: Sure. So, with respect to  
13 the viability of the trial date, it's  
14 petitioner's view that the decision essentially  
15 held that it was error for the district court  
16 to consider its early scheduled trial date in  
17 determining whether it was appropriate to  
18 transfer to another jurisdiction. And instead,  
19 it should have been looking at the average time  
20 to trial in that particular jurisdiction.  
21 Particularly because that particular judge in  
22 that particular jurisdiction does not have a  
23 significant amount of experience in actually  
24 making it to trial, so the more relevant  
25 metric, according to the federal circuit, 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.