EXHIBIT 1



```
1
                IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
                 FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
2
                           WACO DIVISION
 3
     VOIP-PAL.COM, INC.
                                   February 15, 2023
     VS.
4
                              * CIVIL ACTION NO. W-20-CV-272
5
     AMAZON.COM, INC., ET AL *
6
               BEFORE THE HONORABLE ALAN D ALBRIGHT
                    MARKMAN HEARING (via Zoom)
7
     APPEARANCES:
8
     For the Plaintiff: Lewis E. Hudnell III, Esq.
                          Hudnell Law Group P.C.
9
                          800 W. El Camino Real, Suite 180
10
                          Mountain View, CA 94040
11
     For Defendants:
                          Daniel T. Shvodian, Esq.
                          Perkins Coie, LLP
12
                          3150 Porter Drive
                          Palo Alto, CA 94304
13
     Court Reporter:
                         Kristie M. Davis, CRR, RMR
14
                          PO Box 20994
                          Waco, Texas 76702-0994
15
                          (254) 340-6114
16
       Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography,
17
     transcript produced by computer-aided transcription.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```



looks like I have Mr. Shvodian. So I guess if I can't 1 09:36 2 have a young first-year associate, I can't do any 09:36 3 better than you. So I'm happy to hear your arguments. 09:36 MR. SHVODIAN: Well, thank you, Your 09:36 4 5 Honor. 09:36 And as you know, the parties were able to 6 09:36 7 meet and confer and narrow the issues here today, and 09:36 8 we have narrowed it down to just one claim term. 09:36 09:36 9 I know Your Honor is generally familiar 10 with the VoIP technology. You have the other VoIP-Pal 09:36 11 cases pending in front of you. So I don't intend to 09:36 12 spend time going over the technology, other than to 09:36 note that this is a highly technical area, the area of 09:36 13 voice-over IP calling. 14 09:36 15 And it's not an area that the lay jury 09:36 would be typically familiar with and wouldn't have an 09:36 16 17 understanding how a person of ordinary skill in the art 09:36 09:37 18 back in 2006/2007 would understand a technical claim 19 term such as "routing message." 09:37 20 And there is a clear dispute between the 09:37 21 parties as to what this term means. So we think this 09:37 22 is an issue of claim construction that needs to be 09:37 23 resolved today. And we believe there is a clear 09:37 24 definition of this term in the patent. 09:37 25 And, Your Honor, if I may share my screen 09:37



-2/

```
Chrysler case that Mr. Hudnell cites also says that
       1
10:10
       2
           claim differentiation, the concept of that is much
10:10
       3
           weaker when trying to compare across different patents
10:10
           as opposed to if it -- they were claims in the same
10:10
       4
       5
10:10
           patent.
       6
                          Does Your Honor have any further
10:10
       7
           questions?
10:10
       8
                          THE COURT: No. Anything else?
10:10
                          Mr. Hudnell?
10:11
       9
      10
                          MR. HUDNELL: I think the -- just one
10:11
      11
           last point, Your Honor. I think it's important to keep
10:11
      12
           in mind, specifically with respect to the time to live
10:11
           field, that has absolutely nothing to do with routing.
10:11
      13
           That is so that these -- these patents come from the
10:11
      14
           RBR family, routing, billing and rating. There's three
10:11
      15
           concepts contained in these patents.
10:11
      16
      17
                          That time to live field is an optional
10:11
10:11
      18
           component that can be added to the message so that you
10:11
      19
           know how long the call is so that -- for billing
10:11
      20
           purposes.
10:11
      21
                          And the reason why the claims of the --
10:11
      22
           of the other patents, the parent patents and the family
      23
           of the '606, recite that feature in the dependent
10:11
      24
           claims is because you can have a routing message that
10:11
      25
           doesn't have a time to live field. It's completely
10:11
```



25

```
optional. It's there for billing purposes.
10:11
       1
       2
                           The '606 claims don't deal with billing,
10:11
       3
           and so there's nothing inherent about a routing message
10:11
           to require a field that's associated with billing.
10:11
       4
       5
                           And so we think that that, at a minimum,
10:12
           should be excluded from Amazon's construction.
       6
10:12
       7
                           THE COURT: Anything else, Mr. Shvodian?
10:12
      8
                           MR. SHVODIAN: Your Honor, I just note
10:12
           that the RBR is not something that's said in this
10:12
       9
           patent. That's a phrase that VoIP-Pal has made up for
      10
10:12
           this litigation. And I note that the title of this
      11
10:12
      12
           patent is "Producing Routing Messages For Voice-Over IP
10:12
           Communications."
10:12
      13
                           THE COURT: Mr. Hudnell?
10:12
      14
10:12
      15
                          MR. HUDNELL: Nothing, Your Honor. Thank
10:12
      16
           you.
                           THE COURT: I'll be back in a few
10:12
      17
10:12
      18
           seconds.
10:12
      19
                           (Pause in proceedings.)
      20
                           THE COURT: If we could go back on the
10:28
      21
           record.
10:28
      22
                           And I thank you for your patience.
10:28
      23
           took longer than usual for us to -- not back and forth
10:28
      24
           on our end to try and get it right.
10:28
      25
                           However, I am persuaded by defendants
10:28
```



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.

