1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
3	ANCORA TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,)
4) Plaintiff,) No. 2:16-cv-01919-RAJ
5	vs.) Seattle, WA
6)
7	HTC AMERICA, INC., a) Washington corporation, HTC) CORPORATION, a Taiwanese) corporation,)
9	Defendants.) Markman Hearing Defendants.) March 5, 2021) 9:00 a.m.
10	
11 12	VERBATIM REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE HONORABLE RICHARD A. JONES UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
13 14	APPEARANCES:
15 16 17	FOR THE PLAINTIFF: MARC LORELLI Brooks Kushman PC 1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor Southfield, MI 48075 mlorelli@brookskushman.com
18	DUNCAN MANVILLE
19	Savitt Bruce & Willey LLP 1425 Fourth Avenue, Suite 800
20	Seattle, WA 98101-2272 dmanville@sbwllp.com
21	
22	
23	
24	HTC v. Ancora
25	IPR2021-00570 HTC Exhibit 1020



```
1
     FOR THE DEFENDANTS:
                            BRIAN CLAASSEN
                            IRFAN A. LATEEF
 2
                            DANIEL KIANG
                            COLIN BARRY HEIDEMAN
 3
                            Knobbe Martens Olson & Bear
                            2040 Main Street, 14th Floor
 4
                            Irvine, CA 92614
                            2bcc@knobbe.com
 5
                            irfan.lateef@knobbe.com
                            2dck@knobbe.com
 6
                            2cbh@knobbe.com
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
     Andrea Ramirez, CRR, RPR
     Official Court Reporter
21
     United States District Court
     Western District of Washington
22
      700 Stewart Street, Suite 17205
      Seattle, WA 98101
23
      andrea ramirez@wawd.uscourts.gov
      (206)3\overline{7}0-8509
24
     Reported by stenotype, transcribed by computer
25
```



Ancora v. HTC, 3/5/21

```
1
               THE COURT: Good morning, Ms. Ericksen. Please call
 2
     the case.
 3
               THE CLERK: Good morning, Your Honor. We are here in
     the matter of Ancora Technologies, Inc. vs. HTC America, Inc.,
 4
     et al., Cause Number C16-1919, assigned to this Court.
 5
 6
          If counsel, first for the plaintiff, could make your
 7
     appearance for the record.
 8
               MR. LORELLI: Good morning. Mark Lorelli, from
 9
     Brooks Kushman, on behalf of plaintiff Ancora Technologies,
10
     Inc.
11
               THE COURT: Good morning.
12
               THE CLERK: And counsel for defendants, please.
               MR. LATEEF: Good morning, Your Honor. Irfan Lateef,
1.3
14
     of Knobbe Martens, for defendants, and with me is my partner,
15
     Brian Claassen.
16
               THE COURT: Good morning.
17
               THE CLERK: Your Honor, we're also joined by our
18
     court reporter, Andrea Ramirez, today.
               THE COURT: Good morning. We are here for the
19
20
     Markman hearing. And, Counsel, the Court has set aside the
21
     next two hours. And we will take a break, after the first
22
     hour, to accommodate the needs for convenience breaks and so
23
     that we stay attentive. I know it's difficult to stay in these
24
     Zoom proceedings and the longevity that some of them have been
25
     taking. But, nonetheless, you'll have full opportunity to be
```



1.3

able to present your case. The Court's understanding is that you've agreed on some claim construction, but that you have disputes regarding six, and that you'll be addressing those six this morning.

Now, one of the things I want to make sure that you address during your presentation to the Court is, we have two different courts, two different judges, who have already made claim construction determinations in two different cases. And I hope that you can point to the distinctions and differences as to why this Court shouldn't follow those claim constructions, because that would be most beneficial to the Court. It's not my practice just to choose the easiest pathway and say what did some other judge do, but this Court also looks to precedent to see if there's value in what has already been previously decided by another court. It's also the Court's understanding that a significant amount of work went into those decisions by those two judges, so I don't take that lightly, as well.

I'll give you a heads-up that there appears to be, of the six disputed claims, two areas of significant dispute. So you may wish to spend, and I expect that you will be spending, your time on those two areas. And that would begin with the one of using an agent to set up a verification structure in the erasable, nonvolatile memory area of the BIOS. And the second one that appears to be hotly contested between the two parties



is a license authentication bureau, which does not have prior input from the two noted judges.

Now, regarding the using an agent, et cetera, issue, I'll note that HTC filed two notices of supplemental authority. And I'm not going to read those into the record, because the parties should have the benefit of those, and I want to maximize the time that you have; and, again, addressing similar or same type issues. So it would be helpful, in your presentations, to address those cases.

I will interrupt, if I need to interrupt, to ask a question of clarification, but I also prefer to give you the opportunity to be able to free-flow in your presentation. It looks as though each of you have PowerPoint presentations that you wish to use for purposes of your statements to the Court. It would have been my earlier preference, before I saw those, to go claim by claim, so that we can finish a claim and then go to the next one, with both sides. But if it's easier to make your presentation by taking the ball and running with it, the Court has no objection to that as well.

Again, the time will be split evenly, as soon as I stop speaking this morning, and my in-court deputy will be keeping the time. And, again, we've set aside two hours. And it may go past one 11:00, 11:00 Pacific time, so don't worry about that. But I need to keep a balance of opportunity for both sides to present their case.

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.

