

EXHIBIT A

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 EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION

| | | |
|---------------------------------|-----|-----------------------|
| AGIS SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT, LLC, |) (| CIVIL ACTION NO. |
| |) (| 2:21-cv-00072-JRG-RSP |
| PLAINTIFF(S), |) (| (Lead Case) |
| |) (| |
| versus |) (| MARSHALL, TEXAS |
| |) (| OCTOBER 21, 2021 |
| T-MOBILE USA, INC., and |) (| |
| T-MOBILE US, INC., |) (| |
| |) (| |
| DEFENDANT(S). |) (| |

| | | |
|---------------------------------|-----|-----------------------|
| AGIS SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT, LLC, |) (| CIVIL ACTION NO. |
| |) (| 2:21-cv-00024-JRG-RSP |
| PLAINTIFF(S), |) (| (Member Case) |
| |) (| |
| versus |) (| |
| |) (| |
| LYFT, INC. |) (| |

| | | |
|---------------------------------|-----|-----------------------|
| AGIS SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT, LLC, |) (| CIVIL ACTION NO. |
| |) (| 2:21-cv-00026-JRG-RSP |
| PLAINTIFF(S), |) (| (Member Case) |
| |) (| |
| versus |) (| |
| |) (| |
| Uber TECHNOLOGIES, INC., |) (| |
| d/b/a Uber, |) (| |

| | | |
|---------------------------------|-----|-----------------------|
| AGIS SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT, LLC, |) (| CIVIL ACTION NO. |
| |) (| 2:21-cv-00029-JRG-RSP |
| PLAINTIFF(S), |) (| (Member Case) |
| |) (| |
| versus |) (| |
| |) (| |
| WHATSAPP, INC. |) (| |

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE HONORABLE ROY S. PAYNE
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

1 MR. REITER: Thank you, Your Honor.

2 THE COURT: Certainly.

3 MR. ITURRALDE: Your Honor, Enrique Iturralde for
4 plaintiff AGIS.

02:01PM 5 For the next term, term F, using the IP address
6 previously, defendants argued that there is a typographical
7 error in this limitation and that the typo should result in a
8 finding of indefiniteness for the entire claim. Typographical
9 errors do not rise to the level of indefiniteness.

02:01PM 10 Here, this typo does not render the claim itself
11 indefinite, and a person of ordinary skill in the art would
12 recognize that the meaning of the claim -- would recognize the
13 meaning of claim with reasonable certainty.

14 THE COURT: What is the typo that you see in this?

02:01PM 15 MR. ITURRALDE: The typo that defendants have pointed
16 out is that using the IP address previously does not include
17 any additional information about what IP address is being
18 referenced. That's what the defendants assert. So a missing
19 word or two.

02:02PM 20 THE COURT: And that's what I'm asking. What is your
21 position on what's missing?

22 MR. ITURRALDE: Yes, Your Honor. To the extent the
23 Court finds that it's necessary to clarify this term, we would
24 submit that the term should be construed to mean using the IP
02:02PM 25 address previously transmitted to the server.

1 THE COURT: And so you're referring back to the earlier
2 part of the limitation. Tell me specifically which IP address
3 above you would be saying is referred to.

02:02PM 4 MR. ITURRALDE: Yes, Your Honor. So after the word
5 "or," there's an "or transmission of a network IP, network
6 participant's IP address to a server which then transmits data
7 to other network participants using the IP address previously"
8 -- and then we would insert transmitted -- previously
9 transmitted to the server.

02:03PM 10 THE COURT: So you'd be referring back to the network
11 participant's IP address?

12 MR. ITURRALDE: Yes, Your Honor.

13 THE COURT: All right.

14 MR. ITURRALDE: I think the briefing is clear as to
02:03PM 15 where the support for that is in the specification. And if
16 Your Honor has any further questions, we can address those now
17 or after defendants have a chance.

18 THE COURT: Why don't you go ahead and tell me what part
19 of the specification you believe supports that.

02:03PM 20 MR. ITURRALDE: Yes, Your Honor.

21 This is in column 10, line 57, through column 11,
22 line 15. This process is described in the specification in the
23 context of anonymous communications. One example of anonymous
24 communications in this part of the specification, when network
02:04PM 25 users sign on to the network and shake hands with the server,

1 the network user transmits its IP address to the server and the
2 server receives the network user's IP address. Because of this
3 previous transmission, when a first network user wants to send
4 a message to the second network user, the first network user
02:04PM 5 does not need to know the IP address of the second network
6 user.

7 THE COURT: So you're suggesting then that the IP
8 address previously at the end of the limitation that we're
9 talking about, that that would be used by the server as the
02:05PM 10 originating IP address of the message instead of the
11 destination of it?

12 MR. ITURRALDE: Your Honor, it would be the IP address
13 of the first network user who initially signed on.

14 THE COURT: So how is the server using it?

02:05PM 15 MR. ITURRALDE: The server is using it as the address to
16 identify the destination.

17 THE COURT: Okay. So you're saying, in other words,
18 that it's being sent to the IP address previously?

19 MR. ITURRALDE: Yes, Your Honor.

02:06PM 20 And so the way this works is the first user and the
21 second user can log on to the network, and when the second user
22 wants to send a message to the first user the second user
23 doesn't need to know the IP address of the first user because
24 during login process the first user already transmitted its IP
02:06PM 25 address to the server. So the server already has the IP

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.