

EXHIBIT 8

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

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.;)
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.,)
)
PETITIONER,) CASE NO.
) IPR2024-00002
VS.)
)
SLYDE ANALYTICS, LLC.,)
)
PATENT OWNER.)
_____)

REPORTER'S REMOTE
TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
FEBRUARY 20, 2024

TECKLA T. CLAY, CSR 13125
OFFICIAL REPORTER PRO TEMPORE

1 multiple cards go by? But in any event you think the
2 petitioner established that the art does have it.

3 MR. COOK: That's correct, yes.

4 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Okay. Let's go
5 to Patent owner to respond to these two technical
6 matters petitioner wants to address more.

7 MR. LAMBRIANAKOS: Your Honor, with respect to
8 issue two, it sounds like the petitioner is asking the
9 Board for permission to repeat it's argument in a
10 reply. So petitioner says that it's already made the
11 argument that the scroll cards occupy the entire
12 digital matrix display.

13 Petitioner says that it's expert has
14 already addressed that issue as well. But for some
15 reason it's necessary for the petitioner to point out
16 where it has already made those arguments to the Board.
17 Our view is that the Board is perfectly capable of
18 reading the petition and the accompanying declaration,
19 identifying the arguments and evaluating them.

20 And without more there's no need for a
21 reply in such a situation. It's simply an attempt to
22 perhaps better explain or change perhaps an argument.
23 Of course that's not what they're asking for. They're
24 simply asking to point out what they've already said.

25 We see no reason for that. We don't know

1 of any, any rule or precedent of the Board that allows
2 a reply pre-institution for petitioner to simply repeat
3 arguments or point out where they're located. So with
4 respect to item two we don't believe there's, it's been
5 stated any reason for a reply.

6 With respect to the third argument it
7 sounds like the petitioner is trying to cast this as a
8 matter for claim interpretation. And that a reply is
9 necessary in order to address claim interpretation.

10 Now where the Patent owner is suggesting a
11 claim interpretation which is not the claim in
12 ordinary, meaning which is not applying simply the
13 words of the claim in an easily understood way, I would
14 understand the need for a reply. But here we simply
15 apply the term in the claim where it says that the
16 processing circuit is specifically laid out so as to
17 cause said, several available cards to scroll past.

18 And we believe that the obvious, the plain
19 meaning of those words is that scrolling involves
20 causing several available cards to scroll past. And so
21 we made the argument that Duarte only discloses
22 dragging a single card at a time. And that can't be
23 within the meaning of the claim that requires several
24 such available cards to scroll past.

25 Now those words are right there in the

1 claim. And any petitioner should have addressed how
2 the dragging of a single card at a time meets that
3 limitation. They failed to do so. Our argument is not
4 one which the petitioner, which should not have
5 anticipated and should not have addressed head on in
6 the petition.

7 And so given that the alleged claim
8 interpretation dispute is one which was readily
9 apparent at the time of the petition we don't believe
10 that a reply is appropriate. Unless the Court has any
11 questions those are my arguments on those two points.

12 THE COURT: Thank you. Can you give me a minute
13 so I can converse with my colleagues? Thank you.

14 MR. COOK: Your Honor, would it be possible for
15 me to respond to this briefly?

16 THE COURT: Are you petitioner?

17 MR. COOK: Petitioner, yes.

18 THE COURT: What, you want another, you want
19 some more time to respond?

20 MR. COOK: I want to make one quick point.

21 THE COURT: Okay go ahead.

22 MR. COOK: I just wanted to say that our point
23 is really that the Patent owner misrepresented the
24 argument. We don't want to change anything. We want
25 to point out that they misrepresented in that they said

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.