```
1
                   IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
                    FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
 2
                              WACO DIVISION
 3
    ANCORA TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
 4
    VS.
                                         July 7, 2020
 5
    LG ELECTRONICS, INC., ET AL
                                      CIVIL ACTION NO. AU-20-CV-34
 6
    SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD, *
      ET AL
 7
          BEFORE THE HONORABLE ALAN D ALBRIGHT, JUDGE PRESIDING
 8
                       TELEPHONIC DISCOVERY HEARING
 9
    APPEARANCES:
10
    For the Plaintiff:
                              Charles L. Ainsworth, Esq.
                              Robert Christopher Bunt, Esq.
                              Parker, Bunt & Ainsworth, P.C.
11
                              100 East Ferguson, Suite 418
                              Tyler, TX 75702
12
13
                              Andres Healy, Esq.
                              Susman Godfrey L.L.P.
14
                              1201 Third Avenue, Suite 3800
                              Seattle, WA 98101
15
    For Defendant LG:
                              Elizabeth M. Chiaviello, Esq.
16
                              Winstol D. Carter, Jr., Esq.
                              Thomas R Davis, Esq.
                              Morgan Lewis and Bockius LLP
17
                              1000 Louisiana Street, Suite 4000
18
                              Houston, TX 77002
19
                              Collin W. Park, Esq.
                              Morgan Lewis & Bockius, LLP
                              1111 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
20
                              Washington, DC 20004-2541
21
    For Defendant Samsung:
                              Anupam Sharma, Esq.
22
                              Covington & Burling LLP
                              3000 El Camino Real
23
                              5 Palo Alto Square, 10th Floor
                              Palo Alto, CA 94306
24
25
```





25

.3

```
1
         (July 7, 2020, 2:01 p.m.)
         MS. MILES: Telephonic discovery hearing in Civil Action
 2
 3
    1:20-CV-34, styled Ancora Technologies, Incorporated versus LG
    Electronics, Incorporated and others.
 4
         THE COURT: If I could hear from counsel for plaintiff
 5
 6
    first and then counsel for defendants, and then we'll take up
 7
    the issues that brought us together.
 8
         MR. HEALY: Thank you, Your Honor. This is Mr. Healy on
 9
    behalf of the plaintiff. I believe Charley Ainsworth is also
10
    on the line.
11
         THE COURT: Okay.
12
         MR. BUNT: This is also Chris Bunt, Your Honor, on for
13
    Ancora as well.
14
         THE COURT: Very good. Thank you, sir.
15
         MR. DAVIS: And, Your Honor, this is Tom Davis for Morgan
16
    Lewis for LG. On the line also are Elizabeth Chiaviello,
17
    Collin Park and Win Carter.
18
         THE COURT: Very good. I have gone through -- and Josh is
19
    sitting here with me to try and help me get through this. I've
20
    gone through the e-mails and I know you guys have worked pretty
21
    hard to get this resolved. I'm glad for that and I'm glad that
2.2
    you've come to me, and hopefully we'll get through this today.
23
    I'm not sure exactly which side would be best starting off
24
    telling me what needs to be done. So I'll allow you all to
2.5
    decide who should go first and we'll just work our way through
```



trying to get this source code produced.

2 MR. HEALY: Yes, Your Honor. This is Mr. Healy. I'm 3 happy to start if Your Honor desires.

THE COURT: Fine.

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

2.5

MR. HEALY: Okay. So two issues today, Your Honor. Number one, as you may recall at the last hearing on June 17th, one of the issues we raised with the Court was that during our first code review, which started in May, we had told LG that there were a number of missing code modules. In particular of concern to us were the code associated with what's called a CU or C update API and the update center functionality. To make a long story short, rather than producing the source code for these modules, LG appears to have perhaps inadvertently produced the programs themselves. Given that we've been unable to get sort of a direct answer from LG as to when that code would be made available, we raised that issue with the Court, and in response the Court directed LG to let us know by the following Monday whether LG actually had that code, which was a bit of a question mark at that point, and if so, when it would be made available.

The following Monday LG responded, and that's Exhibit 1 at Pages 3 through 4, and what LG told us was that it did have the code but then said that it would be too burdensome to collect and produce that code, and instead LG proposed to load onto the source code computer something called a decompiler so that,



according to LG, our expert could decompile the relevant programs into source code.

I'll have to admit, Your Honor, that I did not know what a decompiler was or what was entailed, so I reached out to my experts to sort of get the scoop as to what -- if that was a viable option. They explained to me that basically decompiling takes an executable program and a table to successfully decompile it, basically breaks it down and translates it back into source code. So I thought, well, maybe this is a viable option.

My experts further explained to me, however, that decompiling has some fairly significant drawbacks. Number one, and I think most importantly for our discussion today, the decompiler that LG proposed to use does not work with code written in C or C plus plus, and it's -- according to my expert, the modules we are interested in, the two in particular, are written in C or C plus plus. So in short, it won't work with -- for the very purpose we're asking for it for.

Number two, my experts told me that decompiled code won't include any of the programming comments that source code normally includes which are helpful to understand how the code works. Decompiled code also is known to exclude something called variable names which my expert explained was also problematic.



2.2

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.

