

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

CELLCO PARTNERSHIP D/B/A VERIZON WIRELESS,
Petitioner,

v.

GENERAL ACCESS SOLUTIONS, LTD.,
Patent Owner.

IPR2023-01147
Patent 9,426,794 B2

Before KEN B. BARRETT, BARBARA A. PARVIS, and
TERRENCE W. MCMILLIN, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

BARRETT, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

ORDER
Conduct of the Proceeding
37 C.F.R. § 42.5

The parties, during the oral argument in this case, referred numerous times to a District Court construction of the term “routes.” *See, e.g.*, Paper 39 (oral argument transcript) at 10:15–17 (Petitioner: “Now, there is a claim construction for route that the District Court adopted and both parties have sort of aligned to here in this proceeding which is basically it transmits along a specified path.”); *id.* at 40:14–17 (Patent Owner: “For the routing itself, you know, there is a District Court construction and that’s a construction that the other—the Petitioner did not ask for determination whether that’s appropriate or not appropriate here.”).

Patent Owner, in its Response to the Petition, includes a table listing the district court’s constructions for certain terms, including “routes” and “routing.” Paper 18 at 26 (citing Ex. 2006, 20–24). Patent Owner argues: “Particularly relevant to Petitioner’s Grounds is the district court’s construction of ‘[routes/routing] information to the first mobile station and the second mobile station, respectively’ as ‘[directs/directing] information through a specified path to the first mobile station and the second mobile station, respectively.’” *Id.* (citing Ex. 2006, 21–24) (brackets in original).

Patent Owner’s Exhibit List identifies the cited Exhibit 2006 as “Claim Construction Order, *General Access Solutions, Ltd. v. Cellco Partnership D/B/A Verizon Wireless, et al.*, Case No. 2:22-cv-00394-JRG (E.D. Tex. Jan. 12, 2024).” Paper 36. We, however, are unable to locate an Exhibit 2006 in the Patent Trial and Appeal Case Tracking System (P-TACTS) for this *inter partes* review. We note that a document bearing the same title is filed in the related case IPR2023-00978 as Exhibit 2027.

The parties shall meet and confer, and, if neither party objects, Patent Owner shall promptly file, in the record of this case, Exhibit 2006, the

district court's claim construction order. If a party objects to the filing of the claim construction order, the parties shall notify the Board at the email address Trials@uspto.gov. The email shall inform the Board that a party objects and identify the objecting party, but shall not contain substantive argument.

It is so ORDERED.

IPR2023-01147
Patent 9,426,794 B2

FOR PETITIONER:

Justin J. Oliver
Stephen K. Yam
VENABLE LLP
joliver@venable.com
syam@venable.com

Brian A. Rosenthal
GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
brosenthal@gibsondunn.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

Sarah E. Spires
SKIERMONT DERBY LLP
sspires@skiermontderby.com

Mark L. Levine
Nosson D. Knobloch
BARTLIT BECK LLP
michael.valaik@bartlitbeck.com
nosson.knobloch@bartlitbeck.com