

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MOTOROLA SOLUTIONS, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

STA GROUP LLC,
Patent Owner.

IPR2023-01295
Patent 8,994,830 B2

Record of Oral Hearing
Held: January 21, 2025

Before MICHAEL J. FITZPATRICK, DAVID C. McKONE, and
KEVIN C. TROCK, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

IPR2023-01295
Patent 8,994,830

APPEARANCES:

ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER:

ELIOT WILLIAMS, ESQ.
Baker Botts, LLP
700 K Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20001-5692
(202) 639-1334
eliot.williams@bakerbotts.com

ON BEHALF OF THE PATENT OWNER:

KYLE KANTAREK, ESQ.
K&L Gates, LLP
70 West Madison Street
Suite 3300
Chicago, Illinois 60602
(312) 807-4206
kyle.kantarek@kirkland.com

The above-entitled matter came on for hearing on Tuesday, January 21, 2025, commencing at 1:00 p.m., via video teleconference.

P R O C E E D I N G S

- - - - -

JUDGE TROCK: Good day, everyone. This is Judge Trock.

With me on the panel today are Judges McKone and Fitzpatrick. We are here in the matter of Motorola Solutions, Incorporated v. STA Group LLC. This is IPR2023-01295 involving U.S. Patent 8,994,830. Let's start with appearances for Petitioner.

MR. WILLIAMS: Good afternoon, Your Honor. This is Eliot Williams for the Petitioner. I'll be presenting today. I have several of my backup counsel on listening and on the public line as well.

JUDGE TROCK: Would you identify them for us, please?

MR. WILLIAMS: I could try. So, I think we've got Katharine Burke, Clarke Stavinoha, and Matthew Thompson.

JUDGE TROCK: Thank you, Mr. Williams. Patent Owner?

MR. KANTAREK: Thank you, Your Honor. Kyle Kantarek for Patent Owner, STA Group LLC. With me on the line also is lead counsel Jason Engel. I'll be handling the presentation today.

JUDGE TROCK: Thank you, Mr. Kantarek. I see that you're a LEAP Practitioner, so that gives the Patent Owner an additional 15 minutes of time for argument today. Petitioner will have 45 minutes. Patent Owner will have 60. So, starting with Petitioner, would you like to reserve any time for rebuttal?

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, Your Honor. If you could let me know when I have seven minutes remaining for rebuttal.

JUDGE TROCK: I also noticed that there is a protective order in this case. So, the question I have is whether or not either counsel is

1 considering to discuss confidential information in the hearing.

2 MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you, Your Honor. Yeah, Petitioner is
3 not planning to discuss any confidential information. And having reviewed
4 the slides of Patent Owner, there was a debatable point as to one of them, but
5 we're content with the slide as it is. If the argument sort of drifts into
6 confidential information, I'd just request the ability to alert the Board to that
7 at the time it happens.

8 JUDGE TROCK: Patent Owner, what's your view on this?

9 MR. KANTAREK: I would agree with Mr. Williams. I don't
10 expect it to veer off into anything confidential. The slide has a quote that
11 was essentially in the public briefing. So, I think we came down on it not
12 involving confidential material.

13 JUDGE TROCK: Okay. So, if we stray from that, just let me
14 know ahead of time because we do have a public line here. And if we're
15 going to discuss confidential information, we're going to have to disconnect
16 that. Okay?

17 MR. KANTAREK: Absolutely, Your Honor.

18 JUDGE TROCK: All right. Thank you, Counsel. So, with that,
19 Mr. Williams, the floor is yours.

20 MR. WILLIAMS: Okay. And I was going to attempt to share my
21 demonstratives, Your Honor, so just bear with me one second. Okay. Did
22 that -

23 JUDGE FITZPATRICK: We can see Slide 14 it looks like right
24 now.

25 MR. WILLIAMS: Okay. Perfect. That's what you're supposed to
26 be seeing. Okay. I'm ready, Your Honor. Thank you.

1 So, I'm going to just try to quickly go through the disputed issues
2 here beginning with Ground 1. Ground 1 is based on Shaffer as well as
3 Saylor. Shaffer is an interoperability surface that allows communications
4 among different networks where groups of endpoints can communicate
5 among each other using a multi-classed IP address assigned to that group of
6 endpoints. An overview of Shaffer's system here is shown on Slide 14.

7 If you look at Slide 19, see here, again, Figure 3 of Shaffer. And
8 as you'll see, an excerpt of paragraph 39 of Shaffer shows that the endpoints
9 in this system include various communication devices and endpoints that can
10 all communicate with each other and can do so when responding to various
11 events. So, a good example of this would be police and fire department
12 reporting to some car accident or some other event that requires
13 communication amongst a group of individuals that might not normally be
14 on the same communication channel. These endpoints in Shaffer can be
15 grouped by location. This is sort of indicated on Slide 15, which makes
16 sense in the example I gave you. If there's a car accident or there's a break-
17 in in a building on some particular campus, the endpoints would obviously
18 then be associated with a particular geographic location, being the location
19 of the event or incident that the parties are responding to.

20 The other notable feature of Shaffer, as shown here on Slide 16, is
21 that Shaffer's radios and endpoints do permit selection of particular
22 communication parameters, including frequency, that is done either
23 automatically or through a manual user interface, where the user who is
24 interested in responding to some particular incident can select the
25 appropriate channel corresponding to that incident. That channel would
26 include frequency, as shown on Figure 4.

1 Turning, again, just briefly to Saylor. Saylor is shown on Slide 17
2 here. Saylor is a system that provides for providing information relating to
3 various types of alarms or alerts. So, a typical use case here would be some
4 sort of building that's being protected by a security system. That building
5 may include various cameras or other sensors that collect information about
6 the building of interest. And that information can be transmitted up to a
7 central server where decisions are made about whether to alert one or more
8 users or entities of the alarms. And if appropriate, those alerts can also
9 include communication of information from the sensors themselves, such as
10 cameras, videos, breakage alerts, and whatnot. We'll talk about those in a
11 little more detail in a few minutes.

12 Saylor does envision contacting other entities, including entities
13 sort of outside the Saylor system, when appropriate, to respond to particular
14 incidents. So, for instance, here on Slide 20, you'll see that there is a list of
15 contacts in Saylor's database, including an emergency contact.

16 Going to Slide 21, we show you here the combination, then, we're
17 proposing between Shaffer and Saylor. And here the idea is you take
18 Shaffer's interoperability system, which communicates via multicast IP
19 addresses, and assign a particular entity of relevance, a multicast IP address,
20 which is then placed in Saylor's database, and Saylor could then use that
21 multicast IP address when it wishes to communicate with a particular
22 emergency and entity of interest.

23 Just going back quickly to Slide 17, not sure I showed you this
24 one, but as you'll see here, this excerpt on the bottom left-hand of the slide
25 talks about how the central security network can include these contacts,
26 including an emergency entity contact. So, that is just as we point out in the

1 petition.

2 Now moving to Slide 25, this is an excerpt from our expert's
3 declaration, Dr. Polish. Although Saylor does talk about the ability of its
4 system to communicate with the emergency entities, it does not actually tell
5 you how you make that connection to give the alerts and the data to those
6 entities. And so, as we point out Shaffer's interoperability system is a
7 solution to that problem. It gives you a way within this construct of Saylor
8 to communicate with those various entities by the use of that multicast IP
9 address. And we provide various, you know, justifications for that
10 combination in the petition, including the fact that both Saylor and Shaffer
11 permit and, in fact, rely on communications over the internet or other packet
12 switch networks, making them interoperable.

13 One thing I guess it's worth pointing out with respect to our
14 combination is that the level of skill in the art is shown on Slide 11. This is
15 an excerpt from our petition. This has not been disputed by the Patent
16 Owner. And as you'll note here, as we argue in the petition, the level of skill
17 in the art would include two years of experience in networking or
18 communication systems, including interoperating different types of networks
19 that include video feeds. So, precisely the type of combination we're
20 proposing here, we're showing that that would, you know, the level of skill
21 in the art would include the ability to carry that out, making it a reasonable
22 expectation of success I think essentially a foregone conclusion.

23 Moving - I can address a couple of the arguments sort of pre-
24 rebut. What I suspect are the arguments that the Patent Owner may make
25 based on their papers. Turning to Slide 27, there was an argument the Patent
26 Owner made that Shaffer and Saylor were incompatible and that there is

1 some notion of Saylor being a location-agnostic system. These arguments,
2 we think, lack merit as to the location-agnostic system. Saylor's disclosure
3 makes clear that, you know, its system is based around localities or places of
4 interest such as buildings, property, rooms of buildings, and whatnot. And
5 Patent Owner's expert on cross-examination admitted that Saylor does, in
6 fact, talk about this notion of defined areas or localities.

7 There's an argument, I think, in Patent Owner's response that we
8 allude to here on slide 30, that Saylor is a closed network and therefore
9 would not be interoperable with the interoperability system of Shaffer.
10 Again, that's incorrect. Indeed, as we've shown on Slide 17, I've shown you
11 this picture already. Saylor specifically discloses the possibility that you
12 would want to send information from the system to other entities outside of
13 the security network, including police, fire department, et cetera. And that's
14 exactly why we're turning to Shaffer as the solution to that. Okay. I think
15 that's all I had on the motivation to combine.

16 And let me move on to some of the disputed claim elements unless
17 the Board had questions about this motivation to combine argument. Okay.
18 Hearing none, let me move to Slide 51. Okay. Just beginning with element
19 1[e]. This element, as we point out in the petition and the reply maps to the
20 combination of Shaffer plus Saylor, the couple of the features, I guess, to
21 note here is let's begin with the selection piece. So element 1[e] requires
22 that you identify a video feed by selecting the at least one video feed from
23 the plurality of video feeds.

24 So, in our combination, this was largely performed by Saylor. The
25 Saylor is monitoring various sensors, including cameras, to look for
26 incidents that may trigger an alarm. That happens in, as shown here on the

1 slide, in two different places. So, the first is that the camera itself is going to
2 be monitoring its data to find motion. When it does that, that triggers a need
3 to then compress the images and send them up to, as you see here on Figure
4 10 on the right. You'll see eventually if there's motion, that that image or
5 video would get sent to the security network. The security network would
6 then make a further decision based on these two steps, 1022 and 1024, doing
7 this additional processing on the video as well as accessing the database to
8 decide what to do with this new information. Is this an alert that's going to
9 be required that you send some sort of notification out to another user or
10 group of users? Or maybe there's nothing that you need to do just based on
11 what the user has set up in his database. This is what we're talking about
12 when we talk about selecting the at least one video feed. So, these decisions
13 are made by the Saylor system before anything happens.

14 JUDGE TROCK: Counsel, this is Judge Trock. So, what are you
15 identifying as the plurality of video feeds?

16 MR. WILLIAMS: Yeah, so as to the plurality of video feeds, great
17 question, that's actually part of our mapping of element 1[c], which we map
18 to the plurality of video cameras in the Saylor system. And the examples we
19 give are several from Saylor. For instance, in the petition we talk about how
20 in a building or campus there would be multiple - a plurality of cameras
21 with associated video feeds. And that's exactly the kind of thing we're
22 talking about here. The system is going to monitor those plurality of video
23 feeds until it finds one where there is some alert that gets triggered based on
24 some activity. Which could be motion.

25 JUDGE TROCK: Do you have a citation to that in your petition?

26 MR. WILLIAMS: In the petition, we talk about this at page 35 of

1 the petition. So, this is element 1[c] begins here at the bottom of page 35.
2 So, the example we give, for example, Saylor discloses video cameras
3 located in a geographic zone. For example, a building of a business, in
4 particular, any monitored location. Sorry, any identified location may be
5 monitored by video or other recording device. And if motion detected,
6 video clips may be sent to a central security network.

7 JUDGE TROCK: Did the Patent Owner challenge your evidence
8 here on 1[c]?

9 MR. WILLIAMS: So, we don't believe so. And when we cross-
10 examined Dr. Akl, trying to find his - sorry, just before I joined my PDF
11 viewer crashed, so I have to find his testimony again. Give me just one
12 moment. In his deposition at page 70, we do ask him about this, and I'll just
13 read you the question and answer. The question, okay, "So would you agree
14 that Saylor discloses multiple video cameras?" The answer is, "It doesn't use
15 the word multiple explicitly, but it uses video cameras, plural." So, I don't
16 believe they actually dispute that there are multiple video cameras in Saylor.

17 JUDGE TROCK: All right, thank you.

18 MR. WILLIAMS: Sure. This citation, by the way, to column 10,
19 line 32, talks about within a house a user may have a window and door
20 contacts, smoke detectors, motion sensors, video cameras, plural, et cetera.
21 And I think that was the testimony that you were asking - that was the
22 disclosure we were asking Dr. Akl about during his deposition.

23 Okay. Let me talk about there's another argument made with
24 respect to selecting that I think might benefit from a few moments. And
25 that's, you know, there's some suggestion in the Patent Owner's argument
26 that they're - the selecting needs to be done in some particular part of the

1 system. I think that's sort of the premise of the argument they're making.
2 We don't see any requirement that there be a particular component that
3 actually do the selecting, and that is consistent with how the Patent Owners,
4 at least their infringement expert, is interpreting this claim language in the
5 parallel District Court litigation. And so, you see here an excerpt from their
6 infringement report where, you know, this is - I can't remember if it's Dr.
7 Pooley or Mr. Pooley. But anyway, the infringement expert, Pooley,
8 indicates here that the means by which they're identifying by selecting by the
9 at least one video feed is not limited by the claim language, meaning that
10 anything can do this step and still practice the claim.

11 There's a similar argument being made, I think, by Patent Owner
12 that somehow identifying a video feed based on a trigger such as motion is
13 not within the claim scope. And we don't see any such restriction in the
14 claims, and Patent Owner's expert could not explain to us why this type of
15 motion-based trigger wasn't within the scope of the claim, sort of saying he
16 didn't have an opinion on that one way or another. And again, in District
17 Court, Patent Owner's theory is that triggers that create alarms or alerts are
18 within the scope of this claim. Okay. I'm just looking to see if I have
19 anything else to say about that. I don't think I do.

20 There's a final argument that I wanted to address related to this
21 element. I think we can hit that on my Slide 62. Let me just go there.
22 Right. So, Patent Owner seems to have some sort of argument here that the
23 video feed can't be associated with a communication channel until a user
24 accesses that channel. And that seems to us inconsistent with what the
25 specification actually says. So, we have this excerpt here on the bottom left
26 of Slide 62 from the patent itself explaining that video feeds may be

1 automatically associated with the first channel so that in use when any user
2 sets an associated mobile communication device to the first channel, the
3 video feeds are made accessible. Again, suggesting that this, what I assume
4 is some sort of temporal argument Patent Owner is making, is just not
5 consistent with the way the claim actually is written or the text of the patent
6 is written. Our combination essentially works the same way as it is
7 disclosed in the '830 patent. So therefore, if there's anything within the
8 scope of these claims, then the combination is going to map to it, the claim is
9 going to map to that combination.

10 Okay. Let me turn to another argument about a different element
11 that Patent Owner's making having to do with the plurality of radio
12 frequencies in element 1[b]. This we address beginning on Slide 42 of our
13 demonstratives. And here, as you see in Figure 4 of Shaffer, Shaffer
14 explicitly contemplates the possibility that a particular geographic region
15 could be associated with multiple frequencies here. City A may have
16 different frequencies depending on whether you're accessing the fire or
17 police channels. I mean, obviously these are just examples of the teachings
18 in Shaffer, but the point is that Shaffer explicitly gives you the possibility of
19 multiple frequencies associated with geographic zones. And similarly in our
20 combination, those would continue to exist.

21 As we see on Slide 44, and I think this is addressing the institution
22 decision, so I think the Board already understands this. But just as a
23 reminder, in Shaffer, this ability to pick the frequency can be done either
24 automatically or by a user's display, including a touch screen, so that it's
25 clear that the, you know, one way Shaffer works is a user can, himself or
26 herself, make the selection of picking the particular frequency or channel

1 they're interested in with the associated frequency.

2 Okay. Let me turn to the monitoring a selection element. This is
3 element 1[a] under this ground. Okay. And this element has to do with
4 monitoring, you know, selection of a channel by a user of a device. So, as
5 we point out, Shaffer's interoperability system, which is designated IS,
6 monitors the selection of a communication channel by the user to set it to the
7 communication - to set the mobile communication device to the
8 communication channel. I think we also, as we point out in the petition, this
9 is, I believe, on Petitioner's Slide 31, it could also happen that the selection
10 is monitored by the mobile endpoint itself, so the mobile endpoint can access
11 the channel to receive and transmit. So, I think that we have two theories in
12 the petition. They're both, I think, well supported by the disclosures as we
13 explain in the petition and the reply.

14 Okay. Okay. I was going to turn to the dependent claims unless
15 the Board had any further questions about Claim 1 they wanted me to
16 address. Okay. Let me turn to Claim 3, which we address here on Slide 68.
17 Okay. So Claim 3, both Claim 3 and Claim 2 have this notion of a database
18 in them. And so, in the petition we started by analyzing the database in
19 Claim 2, and then when we got to Claim 3 we sort of incorporated that
20 analysis by reference. But the gist of Claim 3 is that there's a database of the
21 plurality of members of the emergency response team, including the user
22 who's ultimately going to make the frequency selection that we talked about.

23 We have two theories for that in the petition. One is just that the
24 Saylor database itself that has already an entry, an IP address for some
25 response group, whether it's the police department or fire or whatever it is
26 that the user has set up in that database, that that database itself has the

1 identity of a plurality of members already in it. That's the point of the entry
2 in the database is to give you the multicast IP address associated with that
3 plurality of members who may respond, whether, you know, perhaps it's just
4 the police department. That is within the scope of the claim. And by
5 identifying the police department you have obviously identified the plurality
6 of members, which is going to include the member who ultimately, from the
7 police department, who tunes in to the radio.

8 We have another theory in the petition related in particular to Slide
9 2, having to do with providing updates to the Saylor database over time as
10 individual users join the channel. There's an obviousness theory there where
11 we can go back and read having to do with tracking the location of the users
12 as they're logging into the - as they're joining that channel. Although that
13 theory works equally well for Claim 3, it's, I think, unnecessary for Claim 3,
14 so I'm not planning to address it in more detail here. But in any event, we
15 think that's sufficient to practice this claim.

16 Let me just turn, I think, the last of the dependent claims I want to
17 address is Claim 7. And we start here on Slide 74. So, this claim has to do
18 with monitoring an audio signal in proximity to the video signal that you're
19 getting. And as we see here on Slide 74, Saylor itself discloses that in
20 addition to cameras, other sensors you may have would be breakage sensors
21 or sound sensors. And as we talk about in the petition and in Dr. Polish's
22 declaration, that disclosure in and of itself would render obvious a sound
23 sensor near a front door to detect breaking glass or near a window to detect
24 breaking glass where there is already a camera present in the system, and he
25 explains how these sensors were known to exist at the time and would have
26 been obvious, therefore, to implement as one of the breakage or sound

1 sensors that Saylor itself talks about.

2 The only thing this claim adds is that that sensor is in proximity to
3 a video camera, which, of course, inherently makes sense because sound and
4 breakage sensors would necessarily be detecting something going on in a
5 particular proximity, and you would want presumably a camera there to see
6 what's going on to know if that breakage was the kind of thing that you want
7 to create an alert based on, whether it's just a cat knocking over a lamp.
8 Okay, and that probably isn't in the petition. The cat knocking over the lamp
9 thing actually happened to me once, which woke me up at 3:00 in the
10 morning when our alarm went off. So, that's how we know that that's
11 something you'd want to try to distinguish.

12 Okay. Just moving then to Ground 2. Unless the Board has any
13 further questions about Ground 1, I'm going to move on to Ground 2. Okay.
14 So, Ground 2 involves Gogic, and another reference called Opitz I'll get to it
15 in a second. Gogic is essentially a system that allows ad hoc groups to be
16 centered around some location of interest, some event that's going on of
17 interest, and these communication devices can include push-to-talk systems.
18 So, it can certainly be police radios that we're talking about here or fire
19 department radios. Generally, it's the same kind of idea. We've got a public
20 service individual who's responding to some event. Gogic explains that
21 these devices can have video cameras on them, or in other places Gogic
22 explains that the devices on the system can be video cameras, such as
23 wireless video cameras in existing public or nonpublic locations.

24 Okay. Now, the way Gogic works, we'll talk about this in a
25 second, you can sort of see on the Slide 89 here, is that there is some base
26 station, and in fact in Gogic there are going to be multiple base stations that

1 are all associated with some particular location. These are sort of
2 geographic base stations that are going to communicate with radios or
3 mobile devices that are in their sort of sphere of influence. And Gogic will,
4 when you're connected to one of these base stations, and there's an event of
5 interest going on in that particular region, Gogic will broadcast these
6 indiscriminate invitations and then make decisions about whether particular
7 devices within that - that detected that invitation are permitted to join the
8 channel that's going to be set up for the particular incident. I'll talk more
9 about that in a minute. I'm just trying to set up the overview here. So, that's
10 the gist of Gogic.

11 We turn to Opitz, or Opitz I should say, to address the possibility,
12 which sometimes happens, that you've got a device moving from region to
13 region and you need a way to connect to a radio station in that particular
14 location of interest. That's shown here on Slide 91. So, there's this sort of
15 truck shown here moving between two geographic regions, 100 and 102,
16 where there's going to be different base stations that the radio and the truck
17 may want to connect to, and you need a way to get the truck connected to the
18 particular base station of interest. That's what this Opitz reference is
19 addressing. And as shown here on Slide 91, there's some examples from the
20 specification of Opitz about how that selection takes place, which is
21 essentially by scanning frequencies in the region to identify carriers or
22 channels that you may want to connect to, and that may also involve use of
23 GPS technology to help identify particular frequencies.

24 Okay. So, that is the combination. As I mentioned, Gogic does
25 describe how its devices can be video-enabled or cameras. This is Slide 113
26 of our demonstratives, taking some excerpts from paragraph 25 and 35 of

1 Gogic to show how these communication devices can be video cameras and
2 include video data in their transmissions. This paragraph 25 here, which is
3 excerpted on the right of the slide, it does go on to further describe how
4 although Gogic sometimes uses the word speech or talk on these
5 frequencies, what he says, "Is the use of the term speech, talk, as used
6 throughout is illustrative and contemplates all the various forms of media,
7 including but not limited to voice, speech, data, video, as well as other
8 signaling techniques." So, it's a fairly broad disclosure that includes, you
9 know, video, not just police officers talking to each other, but also showing
10 pictures and video of what's going on at the area of interest.

11 Okay. Let me talk about now element 1[a] of the claim in view of
12 this combination. This is the element that, again, requires selecting, sorry,
13 monitoring selection of a communication channel. And Gogic essentially,
14 when it creates these ad hoc groups, will create a communication channel for
15 all the groups, all the members of the group to talk to each other over. As
16 shown on Slide 94 then, the next slide, when a user of a communication
17 device wants to communicate over that channel they would indicate that by
18 pushing a push-to-talk button on the communication device. That's shown in
19 Slide 94 in the excerpt on the left. And by doing so, they're indicating to the
20 base station or to the communication manager that's monitoring all these
21 base stations that there's a request to obtain transmission privilege from that
22 communication manager to talk on the channel. That, to us, is the selection
23 of a communication channel by a user. They're selecting the channel by
24 holding that button down. They're saying, I want to transmit on this channel.
25 The communication manager, as shown on the next slide, is monitoring
26 those requests, and it determines whether or not to permit the requesting

1 communication device to transmit on that channel, as indicated by its
2 response to this floor request.

3 Okay. This approach that I just described is pretty much identical
4 to what's described in the '830 patent. So, for instance, if we look at Slide
5 97, when we asked Dr. Akl about this in his deposition, and he essentially
6 conceded that the communication channel in Claim 1 could be a push-to-talk
7 channel. He says, "I think the answer to that question is yes." And as we
8 talked about earlier with respect to Ground 1, there's no requirement in the
9 claims that the user create the channel in transmitting. So, the excerpt we
10 looked at previously, shown again on Slide 96 of the '830 specification,
11 makes clear that the user can select the communication channel that he's
12 been tuned to already. Okay. Or that he's tuned to, I should say.

13 Okay. The other issue, I don't need to see if there's anything else I
14 want to say on motivation to combine. I mean, the Patent Owner does
15 challenge motivation to combine, but I think largely they've sort of
16 misunderstood the operation of these systems. I can cover that more in
17 rebuttal if it becomes relevant, but, again, the idea in Opitz is that you need
18 to first connect yourself to a base station by finding frequencies of potential
19 base stations you can communicate with. Once you're connected to the base
20 station, then the technique in Gogic kicks in, which involves transmitting
21 invitations and making decisions about who can join the talk group.

22 Okay. Let me move on to element 1[b]. It starts on Slide 100
23 here. So, this is, again, the picture from Opitz where you're seeing the
24 mobile user moving from region to region. As what happens in Opitz is
25 there's a frequency scanner in this, you know, in the mobile device of the
26 user that's going to identify potential frequencies that the user can connect

1 to. As we look to the next slide in 101, these types of the signals, the
2 transmitters that this device can connect to is meant to be broad and can
3 include, notably, these police, fire, or other kind of public service radio
4 connections, in addition to other types, obviously, that are discussed here
5 like cellular or telephone signals.

6 Opitz does teach, as we see here on element 102, that there's a
7 display on these radios or these devices that can show you the frequency of
8 the transmission. So, the frequencies that are, you know, the potential
9 frequencies available to you are identified and displayed in Opitz, which is
10 what this claim is getting at. So, as we point out in the petition, this
11 technique can then just easily be applied to Gogic's system of mobile
12 communication devices, such as phones, radios, and laptops, to do the
13 frequency selection to join the base station in the first instance.

14 Okay. Let me just move on to, I think, the last element I want to
15 address, which is element 1[e]. Okay. 1[e] has to do with identifying a
16 video feed, I just want to point out, you know, I've already sort of addressed
17 the plurality of video feeds that are going on here in this combination, as
18 Gogic explains that each of these communication devices can have video
19 data associated with them and can themselves be video cameras. If there's a
20 camera near some, you know, wildfire that someone's responding to, for
21 instance, that could be one of the devices that is accessing the system to
22 transmit information. The feeds in Gogic are based, well, Gogic itself is
23 entirely based on location, as we just sort of alluded to in my earlier
24 comments.

25 But as you see here on Slide 15, the way that this communication
26 manager, 218, sets up these ad hoc groups is based on location. So, it says

1 it's a location-based membership criteria, and it's further restricted by, you
2 know, authorized and trained persons. So, just because you have a
3 connection to the base station doesn't mean you get to join the talk group and
4 talk to everybody or hear what they're saying. You have to also be sort of an
5 authorized entity. And this ad hoc group is based on location. And as you
6 see here in paragraph 58 of Gogic, the group membership can include a
7 boundary. So, it's not just everyone who's connected to the base station, but
8 it's people in the base station who are, you know, within some geofence of a
9 location center point, whatever the incident is.

10 Okay. I think that's all I really had. Unless the Board had any
11 other questions, I can just reserve the remainder of my time for rebuttal.

12 JUDGE TROCK: Mr. Williams, you've got an extra four minutes
13 here. So, that would give you 11 for your -

14 MR. WILLIAMS: Okay.

15 JUDGE TROCK: All right. Patent Owner, the floor is yours.

16 MR. KANTAREK: Petitioner reserves five minutes for surrebuttal
17 time, if you could let me know, Panel, when that has come. And with that,
18 I'm ready.

19 JUDGE TROCK: You can proceed when you're ready.

20 MR. KANTAREK: Thank you, Your Honors. Oh, we can share
21 our slides. Start on the first. Can the Board see our demonstratives?

22 JUDGE TROCK: Yes.

23 MR. KANTAREK: Okay. So, this is IPR2023-1295. My name is
24 Kyle Kantarek. I represent Patent Owner STA Group LLC. Sorry.
25 Including in the - sorry. Petitioner - sorry, Patent Owner STA Group
26 provides mobile applications and strategies, including in the emergency

1 space. So, this patent, the '830 patent, was part of a group of patents that
2 STA Group acquired from Cisco to revive and reimagine that technology.

3 If we turn to slide - Patent Owner's Slide 3. So, Independent
4 Claims 1 and 15 of the '830 patent are about providing access to video
5 streams associated with communication channels and a communication
6 network. This is - it also is allowing radio frequencies associated with
7 geographic zones to be selected and identifying video feeds relevant to the
8 user based on the user policies for reference. And so, Claims 1 and 15,
9 Claim 1 is a method claim, Claim 15 is an apparatus claim, but the issues
10 with the petition apply equally to both of those claims.

11 So, moving to Slide 4. This is discussing Ground 1, which is
12 Shaffer in view of Saylor. So, we have three main arguments here. One is
13 that a POSITA would not be motivated to combine Shaffer with Saylor. The
14 second is the Shaffer-Saylor combination doesn't identify a video feed from
15 a plurality of video feeds. And the third is there are additional issues with
16 dependent claims and one or two other issues with independent claims that
17 we'll discuss here.

18 Turning to slide - Patent Owner's Slide 5. So, Patent Owner's
19 argument here is that Shaffer and Saylor just wouldn't be - there would be
20 no motivation to combine them. So, Shaffer is a communication network
21 where any endpoint can join it if it has the appropriate communication
22 settings. And it's about communicating while changing location. Saylor, I
23 think about it a little bit like my Nest home security system. It's a personal
24 security network that connects to a central security network for monitoring
25 predetermined alerts. The location of the recipients of the alerts doesn't
26 really matter. And there's nothing about specifics for the geographic region.

1 So, turning to Slide 6. I think this is kind of the thrust of the
2 motivation to combine issue. Petitioner's motivation to combine is shown at
3 the top of this slide, that the issue that Petitioner identifies is that Saylor
4 describes the central security network, can identify relevant recipients in an
5 address book, but does not explain how to convey notifications to recipients
6 in different networks. In the same page, actually, the Petitioner actually
7 admits that Saylor's central security network sends communications to
8 another network via - this is in the combination. It's talking about how if
9 they combine them, Saylor would send communications to another network
10 in the manner already envisioned by Saylor. So, they contradict their
11 motivation to combine almost immediately. So, is it a needed mechanism or
12 is it something that - is it the manner that's already envisioned by Saylor?
13 We would say that Petitioner would ask the Board to say that Saylor, you
14 know, hope to send alerts to emergency personnel on different networks, but
15 didn't know how to do that. And that just doesn't make sense based on
16 Saylor's disclosure.

17 So, if you move on to Slide 7, there are multiple disclosures in
18 Saylor about how to send notifications to recipients in different networks.
19 Up here on the top left, you have alert notifications may be communicated
20 via the internet. POTS, which is the Plain Old Telephone Service, wireless
21 communication portals, voice portals, and other methods. And at the bottom
22 of that excerpt, you talk about an emergency entity such as police, fire
23 department, and/or rescue squads may receive that alert information. And I
24 think you heard Petitioner say that these emergency entities are in different
25 networks.

26 So, Saylor already talks about how to send those notifications to

1 those other networks. Similarly, in the top right, it talks about more ways.
2 You can alert users and other identified entities via wireless and/or other
3 devices, such as a mobile device, via voice alarm, text message, and other
4 notifications. For example, alerts may be transmitted to the user via email or
5 other form of electronic communication to a personal computer or other
6 device. So, here again, we have Saylor explaining how to send alerts, how
7 to convey notifications to recipients in different networks.

8 If you move on to Slides 8, this is both experts agreeing. On the
9 left, you have Patent Owner's expert, Dr. Akl, talking about what we just
10 discussed. Saylor is full of examples for how notifications can be sent to
11 another network, which is the beginning of the sentence on 62. These
12 include these examples we just went through. And then you see Dr. Akl
13 saying, such an extensive list further confirms a POSITA would have
14 understood that Saylor does explain how to convey notifications to
15 recipients in different networks. And on the right, you have Dr. Polish's
16 deposition testimony, where he was asked, "Saylor discloses how to convey
17 notifications to recipients in a lot of different forms, right?" "Yeah, Saylor
18 discloses that notifications can go out over a wide variety of different
19 communication technologies, including the ones listed." And then we asked
20 again, So, Saylor discloses how to convey notifications to recipients in
21 different networks in a myriad of ways, right?" And he says, "Saylor
22 discloses that you can do it in lots of different ways. And then it lists a lot of
23 good examples." So, I don't really understand how an admission that
24 something can be done, here's examples of how it can be done, I don't see
25 how that means that Saylor hasn't disclosed how to notify these individuals.
26 And that is what Petitioner is requiring you to find as a motivation for a

1 POSITA to combine these two references.

2 If you go to the next slide, which is, excuse me, Patent Owner's
3 Slide 9, this talks about the two important cases. One is Kinetic Concepts,
4 which is a Federal Circuit case. At the top, this is a quote from the Federal
5 Circuit where they say, "Because each device independently operates
6 effectively, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have no reason to
7 combine the features of both devices." So, their response to Kinetic
8 Concepts in the reply, it says it's different because there was no evidence of
9 why a POSITA would combine in the Kinetic Concept case. But I would
10 submit that the same is true here. They've only offered reasons that the two
11 references could be combined. The quote from - and also important, is a
12 quote from the Federal Circuit is they say the record is devoid of a reason to
13 combine, but separately they say, in addition, both independently
14 accomplish similar functions. And that's the quote below. So, even if
15 Petitioner is right that this is a different case because there is no evidence of
16 why a POSITA would combine them, the Federal Circuit said an additional
17 reason is that both independently accomplished similar functions. So, that
18 argument stands regardless of the evidence offered as to a motivation to
19 combine, which we would submit is the same here, because they only
20 offered reasons why a POSITA could combine them.

21 The second case is the Stryker v. Karl Storz case, which Petitioner
22 doesn't even address at all in its reply. Patent Owner would argue this case
23 is quite on point. The Board considered and rejected an argument that one
24 reference provided a teaching suggestion or motivation by a recognition that
25 different devices may communicate using different protocols. And this is a
26 remarkably similar assertion to Petitioner. And quoting this decision, which

1 is shown in Slide 9, quoting this decision at page 12, the statement was,
2 "That to enable communication among devices therein that operated using
3 different networks and/or command protocols." That was the stated
4 motivation to combine it by the Petitioner in that case. And the Court said
5 we failed to see, and Petitioner does - sorry, the Board said we failed to see,
6 and Petitioner does not adequately explain why it would be obvious to add
7 the translator to redundantly perform the function that Petitioner maintains is
8 performed by the interconnect devices and the network computer located
9 within the surgical network.

10 So, if you look on the next slide, which is Slide 10, this is the
11 petition, them saying that various networks could be provided as inputs to
12 Shaffer's IS. For example, if you look at the specific slide, the second
13 sentence, for example, as Shaffer describes, IS 120 is designed to connect
14 various types of networks, including a push-to-talk radio network typically
15 used by security emergency personnel and a local area network. In the
16 bottom you see in view of these disclosures a POSITA would have
17 recognized that the IS is well suited to connect to a network - connect a
18 network such as a video security system with a different network that
19 responds to incidents in those buildings. Again, this is already described by
20 Saylor. Saylor tells you that it can alert folks in different networks, and it
21 tells you how.

22 Moving to Slide 11, talk a little bit more about Petitioner's, quote,
23 "rationale about it being well suited." This is, again, this is an argument as
24 to why a POSITA would have a reasonable expectation of success, not why
25 they would make the combination in the first place. So, you can see in our
26 expert Dr. Akls' declaration, he repeats how the petition describes Shaffer's

1 IS as broadly interoperable. However, if you see at the end of paragraph 65,
2 he says, "Even if this is true, this does not mean a POSITA would have been
3 motivated to pick Saylor's notification system to combine with Shaffer's IS."
4 And in paragraph 66, he said in his opinion, "As discussed above the
5 structural differences between Shaffer's open network communication
6 system and Saylor's closed notification mechanism, and the fact that each
7 reference is self-contained and would function without the other undermines
8 the idea that a POSITA would have looked to combine the reference."

9 Moving on to Slide 12, this is the Federal Circuit. Obviousness
10 concerns whether a skilled artisan not only could have made, but would have
11 been motivated to make the combinations. And again, Petitioner's
12 arguments - the arguments that Petitioner sets forward - sets forth that are
13 not contradicted by Petitioner, by Saylor itself, and by the experts, is simply
14 that a POSITA could make the combination between Shaffer and Saylor.

15 Moving on to Slide 13. This is more evidence of the assumption
16 that a POSITA could rather than would combine. So Shaffer, as we talked
17 about, they store network parameters in transient endpoints to enable easy
18 connection to local safety and security forces. But this is again unnecessary
19 in Saylor's static central security network. You can see on the left here, this
20 is Shaffer's disclosure. And on the right you have Dr. Akl at paragraph 68,
21 explaining there would be no reason to store network details, such as a
22 multicast IP addresses in Saylor's database, because Saylor's databases
23 would not be changing locations.

24 I did want to point on this one there was a reference to their Slide
25 27. If we could pull up Petitioner's Slide 27. And this slide is Petitioner's
26 argument that Saylor's security system actually isn't location-agnostic. Now,

1 the excerpt from Saylor shown here does include the words within a defined
2 area or locality. But if you read the excerpt, it says network alerts may be
3 based on alert notifications associated with property, personal property,
4 and/or individuals within a defined area or locality. So, this is talking about
5 examples of what a user of Saylor's security system can set their alerts for.
6 It's not that Saylor itself cares about where individuals are located. It's that a
7 user who's setting up these alert notifications can decide, hey, I want to alert
8 individuals within this area of this issue. Here's the individuals and please
9 send the alert. So, Dr. Akl admitting that it does use the term within a
10 defined area or locality, so it's not entirely agnostic to location, is completely
11 consistent with Patent Owner's arguments here.

12 Turning back to Patent Owner's Slide 14. Here we show Shaffer's
13 endpoints. They're limited to communicating with devices in the same
14 physical region. Excuse me. And there's Figure 2 of Shaffer on the left. On
15 the right you have Petitioner's expert, Dr. Polish. He was asked, "Figure 2
16 doesn't teach endpoint 70, which you can see on the top left of Figure 2,
17 joining network 63, right?" Which is on the bottom right corner of Figure 2.
18 He says, "Right. I think the way that diagram is set up is that the networks
19 that are available to endpoint 70 are 61, 60 and not 63." So, you can see on
20 the top left, 61 and 60 are in the same physical region as end point 70.

21 Turning to Slide 15. Shaffer and Saylor just have different - so
22 not only is Saylor self-contained and is able to provide the notifications it
23 needs, but as we talked - as I mentioned before, Shaffer's about
24 communicating based on transient endpoints. And Saylor - so Saylor could
25 include, this is, again from Dr. Akl's declaration, paragraph 52. Saylor could
26 include an example situation where the user who lives in City A sets up a

1 notification system. Again, this is, I think of this as my Nest account before
2 it was ruined by Google. They live in City A to contact the police
3 department in City B in case of an alarm situation. And Dr. Polish based on
4 this testimony that we looked at on Slide 14 and Figure 2, would opine that
5 Shaffer's endpoints wouldn't work in this situation because the endpoints can
6 only connect to the network for the geographic area the endpoint is in.

7 Moving on to Slide 16, here's more evidence that Shaffer's based
8 on the endpoint's physical location and Saylor's not. On the left you have
9 the Shaffer abstract, which is about adjusting the one or more first
10 communication parameters to one or more second communication
11 parameters based on the second location. On Paragraph 8 of Shaffer, you
12 have technical advantages including providing a mobile endpoint user the
13 ability to communicate while changing locations with different
14 communication networks that utilize different communication parameters.
15 On the right here you have Dr. Polish. He's explaining that Saylor looks at
16 its database and its rules and decides who to reach out to. So, the question
17 was, Saylor queries its own databases and uses contact info to send alerts.
18 So, Saylor doesn't actually look at where people are, it looks at its database.
19 If there's an alert, then it sends out that alert based on those rules and
20 policies. And so again, Dr. Polish was clear that he doesn't think Saylor
21 talks about notifying or taking into account and notifying somebody where
22 that somebody is.

23 So moving on to - if anyone has any more questions on motivation
24 to combine, I'm happy to address them. Otherwise, I would move on to the
25 next Shaffer-Saylor element shown on Slide 22. So, this issue is that - if
26 you move on to Slide 23, we're saying this - Patent Owner's argument is that

1 the combination proposed by Petitioner, specifically the use of Saylor's
2 video feeds doesn't describe, excuse me, does not meet the claim language
3 requiring selecting a video feed from a player - or identifying a video feed
4 from a plurality of video feeds. So, on Slide 23, you can see Shaffer's
5 describing of a method for communicating using position information.

6 These - this Slide 23 and 24 are similar to what we just looked at.
7 So, moving to Slide 25, we're talking about Saylor, which is what they rely
8 on for this element. Saylor described a static security system that notifies
9 the owner, regardless of where the owner is. We look at Saylor's disclosure,
10 present invention relates generally to the field of security systems, in
11 particular to a system and method for connecting a security system to a
12 wireless communication system to automatically inform an owner and other
13 entities in a manner predetermined by the user. So, if you go to page, sorry,
14 Patent Owner's Slide 26, you can see the relevant claim language is
15 identifying at least one video feed by selecting the at least one video feed
16 from the plurality of video feeds associated with the geographic zone.

17 So, Petitioner's argument here, if you turn to Slide 27, is that
18 Saylor's - so you see on the right here, the left is the claim language again.
19 On the right of Slide 27, Saylor's central security network monitors a
20 specific video feed and identified location of a building. So, here - in here,
21 in the petition, they're saying that the central security network identifies -
22 monitors specific video feeds, but that's just not true from our discussions
23 with Dr. Polish. And then in response, we point out that actually Saylor's
24 own cameras monitor their own feeds. So, not only is Petitioner's
25 identification of the central security system monitoring the feed not true,
26 each camera, this is - again, this is their argument and to the extent that it

1 can be understood as a camera identifying at least one video feed by
2 selecting the video feed from the plurality of video feeds. There aren't a
3 plurality of video feeds. It's just the camera itself which self-selects and
4 sends alert notifications based on what it finds.

5 And that's the step 110 - step 1010 if you go to the next slide,
6 which is Patent Owner's Slide 28, at step 1010, an identified location may be
7 monitored by a video or other recording device. At step 1012, video images
8 may be compared to detect motion or other event. For example, an image
9 taken may be compared to a previous image taken. So this - Saylor will just
10 - so if there's an officer responding to issues, Saylor will just send what the
11 predefined protocols for sending videos said. It's not - this isn't relevant to
12 the user. This is, hey, there was an alert in our - the camera identified an
13 issue. It sent this alert. The central security system knows that it has to send
14 alerts to predetermined users. And so, Saylor sends that alert to the user.
15 There isn't identifying a video feed by selecting it from a plurality of video
16 feeds. There's simply one video feed that's pushed as an alert notification.

17 So, if we move to Slide 29, this is an - this is in Petitioner's reply.
18 They admit that each multiple - each camera has a video feed and one feed
19 is selected and each camera monitors its own feed. If you move to Slide 30,
20 because each - so the take home is that because each camera monitors its
21 own feed, there's no plurality to select from. Petitioner's own declarant
22 admits that the video or other recording device monitors its own feed. So, if
23 you look at the Polish deposition transcript, this is him talking about
24 monitoring a video feed. I don't think it's the central security server that's
25 doing the monitoring there. I think that's being done by the video or other
26 recording device that's doing the monitoring. And if you move on to Slide

1 31, Dr. Polish's deposition remarks align with Dr. Akl's declaration because
2 each specific video feed is monitored independently, there's no video feed
3 selected from a plurality. If you look at Dr. Akl's testimony here, paragraph
4 71, the specific video feed that Saylor's central security system allegedly
5 monitors confirms that a video feed is not selected from a plurality of feeds.

6 Slide 32. This is just that the reference to Dr. Pooley's
7 infringement report is in opposite. Dr. Pooley's infringement opinion
8 referred to a camera group. This - the Saylor disclosure is about one camera
9 itself monitoring its own feed.

10 Moving on to additional - hold on one moment. How much time.
11 All right. And then if the Board has no questions on that element, I'll move
12 on to additional issues with the Shaffer-Saylor combination. If you move to
13 Slide 37. Here we've identified Claim Element 1[d], which is monitoring a
14 selection of radio frequency by the pool - of the plurality of radio
15 frequencies by the user. And Shaffer, what it actually does is talk about
16 instructions submitted for future use. So, there is no monitoring a selection
17 of radio frequency. Instead interface on the right here, you can see the
18 evidence from Shaffer that the interface a user may use to input instructions
19 is inputting instructions for when it enters a new communication network.

20 If we move to Slide 39, looking at element 1[e][3], that the user
21 policy that identifies one or more video feeds that are relevant to the user
22 when the user accesses the selected communication channel. For Saylor,
23 this - the alarm - Saylor is pretty simple. If there's an alarm or an alert
24 notification, you notify the people who are on the list. There is not a user
25 policy identifying when to notify users that - sorry, identifying video feeds
26 that are relevant to the user when they access the communication channel. It

1 simply alerts them in a predetermined manner. And that's - and then if you
2 move to Slide 40, this is element 1[f]. This element has one or more video
3 feeds being independent of the selected communication channel.

4 This District Court construction in the bottom right corner, this
5 came out after the petition was filed. And it construed this phrase to mean
6 the one or more video feeds being capable of being associated with more
7 than the selected communication channel. Petitioner raised this in their
8 reply saying that Saylor meets this construction because the configurable
9 security network associates its video feed with - feeds with the selected
10 communication channel, regardless of which channel the user selected.

11 But their statement here actually contradicts the claim language of
12 the construction. If it's capable of being associated with more than the
13 selected communication channel, why would it associate the video feed
14 regardless of which - associate the video feed with the selected
15 communication channel, regardless of which channel the user selected. It's
16 arguably an argument that claim language can't be met because it's only ever
17 associated with a selected communication.

18 Moving on to Slide 43, I'm just going to talk a little bit about this,
19 their Claim 2 and Claim 3 analysis. If we look at Claim 3, it is the method
20 of Claim 1 further comprising, this is on the left of Slide 43, further
21 comprising accessing a database to identify a plurality of members of an
22 emergency response team. And on the right here, we have their petition
23 where they say it would have been obvious to look - to also associate video
24 feeds with a particular user selecting the channel. And they disclosed that
25 the system can be configured to send notifications to users based on a
26 defined area. Again, we talked about that actual excerpt, but then all they

1 say for Claim 3 is as described for Claim 2, Saylor's database may contain
2 location information to identify members of an emergency response team.
3 So, they just don't have evidence here to show that Claim 3 is invalidated.

4 If you move to Slide 44, Dr. Polish says the same thing. Shaffer -
5 if you see on the left, this is the petition, their analysis, and on the right is the
6 Polish declaration. It simply says they disclose it. And then they cite up to
7 Claim 2 about location information.

8 If you go to Slide 45, where you see the Consolidated Trial
9 Practice Guide, which says expert testimony is not a substitute for disclosure
10 and prior art reference itself. So, it can explain patents and printed
11 publications, but cannot provide a disclosure as well. And on Slide 46, you
12 can see that this same issue is involved with claims - Dependent Claims 7
13 and 21, where a Petitioner relies only on Dr. Polish, which again, it's not a
14 substitute.

15 So, if there are any questions about Ground 1, I can address those
16 now or I can move to Ground 2. All right. Ground 2, this is Gogic in view
17 of Opitz. If you go to Slide 47, Gogic fails to teach monitoring a selection
18 of a communication channel, a POSITA wouldn't be motivated to combine
19 the two references. The combination fails to teach providing a plurality of
20 radio frequency on display, and Gogic itself fails to teach identifying and
21 selecting a video feed.

22 So, the first issue I'd like to talk about is element 1[a], which is
23 monitoring the selection of a communication channel. If you go to Slide 49,
24 Gogic teaches an ad hoc communication network. Endpoints join when they
25 meet, receive group membership location criteria. You can see this excerpt
26 from Gogic paragraph 10 on Slide 49, where the group membership location

1 criteria is evaluated at each of the plurality of wireless communication
2 devices, receiving the invitation and the communication group is formed by
3 ones with the plurality of wireless communication devices that meet the
4 location - group membership location criteria, right? So, it's an ad hoc
5 group formed according to vicinity with other users.

6 If you go to Slide 50, this is Gogic teaching a simple push-to-talk
7 communication. This is - as paragraph 42 explains that when a user of a
8 communication device in a communication system 200 wants to transmit
9 information, the push-to-talk switch located on it is depressed, sending a
10 request to obtain the transmission privilege. So, the point here is Petitioner
11 has identified this press of the push-to-talk key as monitoring a selection of a
12 communication channel, when in reality, Gogic teaches that you only use the
13 push-to-talk button when you're already part of this communication channel.
14 The push-to-talk button is simply can I transmit? Is someone else
15 transmitting? And once the communication manager identifies that no one
16 else is, you're allowed to transmit.

17 So if you go to Slide 51, here's the claim language on the left, and
18 on the right is the petition where they specifically say the push-to-talk
19 switch, located on the CD is depressed, selecting the channel over which
20 other group members can receive communications. It's just not the way
21 push-to-talk works.

22 If you go to Slide 52, push-to-talk, it's simply requests the floor.
23 And you can see in Gogic paragraph 42 on the right here, as we talked about,
24 they depress the push-to-talk switch, sending a request to obtain
25 transmission privilege.

26 JUDGE FITZPATRICK: Mr. Kantarek, can I - let me ask a

1 question on -

2 MR. KANTAREK: Please.

3 JUDGE FITZPATRICK: - the monitoring. The argument you
4 just made, is it that in Gogic that the push-to-talk is not a selection of a
5 communication channel itself, or is it that it happens at the wrong time?
6 Because I think you alluded to both. You said that this group is already -
7 the party that hits the PTT button is already on this working group. It's kind
8 of like in the channel already I think was your point at the time that they
9 push asking for permission to be the speaker. So, is it - is there a timing?
10 Isn't it possible that this could be a selection of a communication channel by
11 someone who's already in the channel?

12 MR. KANTAREK: Well, so it might, I think - yeah -

13 JUDGE FITZPATRICK: It might - yeah, as logical as you might
14 expect, but wouldn't that be, I mean, or why couldn't it be that? Why don't
15 you explain that?

16 MR. KANTAREK: Sure. So, I think it is - in explaining that it is
17 not a selection of a communication channel, we're going to talk a little bit
18 about timing. Because selecting a communication channel, if you look at the
19 claim language itself, if someone selects a communication channel, then
20 they get to choose radio frequencies, then they get to choose video feeds.
21 So, the selection of a communication channel is the beginning of the
22 relationship.

23 But the point - I think the main point for Petitioner's argument is
24 that pressing a push-to-talk button is simply not selecting a communication
25 channel. The communication channel has already been selected. The group
26 membership criteria have already been evaluated. You're already in that

1 channel. There's no need to select it further. So, I think it's informed by the
2 fact that it happens at a time after the communication device has joined the
3 channel. But the issue is that it is simply not selection of the communication
4 channel by the user. The user's already in it and they're simply asking, hey,
5 can I talk to anyone? Is anyone else talking or can I talk on this?

6 So, Slide 53, this talks about this a little bit as well. This is Dr.
7 Akl's declaration. Gogic's switch, which is used to request the transmission
8 grant, is not used to select a communication channel, but instead used to
9 request the floor after the CD is in an existing communication channel.

10 On Patent Owner's Slide 54, you can see that Gogic's channels are
11 set up to select users. Users don't select it. There's a broad indiscriminate
12 invitation to join the group that's sent out. That's on the left here. This is a
13 disclosure from Gogic, paragraph 61. And on the right here, you have Gogic
14 paragraph 62 where Figure 4 illustrates CD1, 412 as qualifying to join the
15 group and accordingly accepting the invitation. So that is - so them
16 pointing to the push-to-talk switch is simply not the selection of the channel
17 as the claim language requires.

18 If we turn to Slide 55, you see Dr. Akl supporting this. The CD -
19 that the CD makes a determination and accepts the invitation means the user
20 of this communication device does not make a selection. The
21 communication device itself makes the connection. And remember the
22 claim language is monitoring a selection of a communication channel by a
23 user of a mobile communication device. So, that may explain why
24 Petitioner chose the push-to-talk switch, but the push-to-talk switch is
25 simply not selection of a communication channel.

26 JUDGE MCKONE: Does the claim say that the user makes the

1 selection? Is that what you're saying?

2 MR. KANTAREK: Yeah, the claim says monitoring a selection of
3 a communication channel by a user of a mobile communication device. So
4 the user has to make the selection.

5 JUDGE MCKONE: So, you're saying it's the selection is done by
6 the user, not the monitoring?

7 MR. KANTAREK: I'm saying the claim language, yes,
8 specifically requires that the selection is done by a user and the method -

9 JUDGE MCKONE: Not the monitoring?

10 MR. KANTAREK: The method monitors - something monitors
11 that selection. In Petitioner's view I think they said the communication
12 manager in Gogic. Sorry. Does that answer your question, Judge McKone?

13 JUDGE MCKONE: Yes I think I understand your position.

14 MR. KANTAREK: All right. Yeah. So, this is actually what,
15 what we were just discussing. If you go to Slide 56, Gogic's communication
16 manager does not monitor the selection of a communication channel. Its
17 purpose is to prevent crosstalk between communication devices that are
18 already in a common channel. So, on the left here you have this same
19 excerpt from Gogic, paragraph 42. And on the right, you have Dr. Akl
20 explaining the purpose of CM - the purpose of communication manager
21 218, which is to prevent multiple users from transmitting at the same time or
22 to prevent crosstalk between users. Because Gogic's users request the floor
23 after joining the ad hoc communication group, communication manager
24 218's functionality is limited to communication devices that are already in
25 the group on the communication channel.

26 Moving to Slide 58. A POSITA would not be motivated to

1 combine Gogic and Opitz. This is kind of a similar issue with the
2 motivation to combine Shaffer and Saylor, but a little distinct because Gogic
3 already explains that is - that it includes an ad hoc push-to-talk network.
4 And Petitioner's issue here on Slide 58 is, is apparently that Gogic does not
5 expressly disclose how the communication devices make that initial
6 connection. And we kind of just discussed that initial connection. There's a
7 broad invitation. The CDs, if they meet the location criteria and have - and
8 if they meet the location criteria and other requirements, they join the
9 channel. There's no hole in Gogic that a POSITA would look to fill with
10 Opitz.

11 If you look at Slide 59, this is Petitioner itself outlining how the
12 connection is done. Figure 4 depicts how CM 218 forms an ad hoc
13 communication group. First, each of the CDs are communicating separately
14 with a base station. Then the CM sends a message directing the base station
15 to send an invitation to all CDs in the service area. The CD calculate their
16 location provided in the invitation, and if they qualify and accept, then it
17 accesses the communication group. The idea that a POSITA wouldn't know
18 how this push-to-talk connection is made is a little bit ridiculous.

19 Not only does Gogic explain the main and then traditional way of
20 connecting push-to-talk devices to a base station, if you go to Slide 60,
21 Gogic provides additional modes of connection to the base station. They
22 talk about a standard audio call made from a CD to a base station. And then
23 if you move to Slide 61, really the initial connection between the
24 communication device and the base station doesn't have much effect on
25 Gogic's functionality. So, that could be why the inventor Gogic himself
26 didn't see a point in explaining in tedious detail exactly how the initial

1 connection is made.

2 And if you see what Dr. Akl says here, we have paragraph 110
3 here and paragraph 112 also provides relevant information. He said Gogic
4 does not - does provide a long list of ways that CDs and base stations can be
5 connected. Plus, even this purported motivation is undermined by Gogic
6 itself. Gogic explains that base stations transmit on a common channel that
7 is regularly monitored. So, there's simply no need to combine Gogic with
8 Opitz. And the reason given is similar to the Shaffer-Saylor issue. The
9 reason given just doesn't make sense when you look at Shaffer on the one
10 hand, and when you look at Gogic, or sorry, when you look at Saylor on the
11 one hand for the first combination, and when you look at Gogic on the other
12 hand for this combination.

13 And on Slide 62, you have Petitioner's expert admitting that a
14 POSITA would certainly know a variety of ways to make such an initial
15 connection to a base station. There's just no reason to go searching for
16 another reference when there's no gap to fill.

17 So, Petitioner's argument here, if you go to Slide 63, is that a
18 method of connecting endpoints to base stations informed by Opitz would
19 work. This falls short of the requirement to detail, again, why a POSITA
20 would have been motivated to make the combination. And this is similar to
21 something Dr. Polish has done before. The reasons provided are too generic,
22 provide a credible reason why a person of ordinary skill in the art would
23 combine the cited teachings. I'd agree that the reason provided in the
24 petition is specific, but it's simply not a credible reason because it's
25 undermined by Gogic, by Gogic's own disclosure and what a POSITA would
26 know.

1 And if you go to Slide 64, not only is Gogic already - does Gogic
2 already explain how to make the connection, Opitz explains connecting via
3 proximity is the same - as the same method. Both Gogic and Opitz offer
4 that same connection. We have Gogic on the left, paragraph 31, CDs
5 transmit and receive communication signals from base stations, generally
6 depending on their proximity. Opitz 2:47 through 58, for example, in close
7 proximity to region 100, local municipal police fire and rescue channels for
8 city 100 will generally be available to be received. They work the same
9 way. There's no reason for a POSITA to look to something that's exact - if
10 there is an issue with connecting Gogic, Gogic's CDs, the initial connection,
11 which again, we don't believe there is, Opitz explains the exact same
12 connection.

13 So, moving on to Slide 65, it's again similar to the Shaffer-Saylor
14 combination. This is kind of reasons why Gogic could be combined with
15 Opitz. And they say they could be combined because they're analogous.
16 And if you look at the petition, they talk about they would be motivated
17 because they both disclose the system relating to monitoring,
18 communicating with specific groups and locations. CDs communicate via
19 base stations, just like the scanning radios and Gogic's CDs are mobile and
20 can move between base station locations, just like the radios in Opitz, which
21 is what we just talked about before. It's the same initial connection. So, if
22 there was a gap, Opitz wouldn't even address it if a POSITA were looking to
23 explain this basic connection of CDs to base stations.

24 Moving on to Slide 66, the reasons why that a POSITA would
25 have been particularly motivated to combine. These are again, statements
26 that they're analogous, right? And you have down here, you have Sisvel v.

1 Sierra, 82 F.4th, 1355, Federal Circuit case. We agree with the Board. The
2 first, second, and third reasons to combine were merely assertions that the
3 references were analogous art, which without more than an insufficient
4 articulation for motivation to combine. Again, their motivation to combine
5 is that there's no connect - that Gogic doesn't explain how to set up an initial
6 connection to a base station. And that's just not true.

7 Moving on to Slide 68, this is a failing to teach, or sorry, we're
8 going to skip Slide 68. We're going to move to Slide 72, where this is the
9 argument that Gogic fails to teach identifying and selecting a video feed
10 from a plurality of video feeds. If you look on the left here, you have the
11 claim language from the plurality of video feeds associated with the
12 geographic zone. On the right here, you have the '830 patent explaining that
13 video feeds are media streams for one or more of the cameras.

14 On Slide 73, you have the petition where Petitioner explains that a
15 video feed is another communication device, which can have video
16 streaming capability, even though all we talked about with communication
17 manager 218 is that only one device can be transmitting at a time over this
18 ad hoc group. So, it just simply doesn't make sense that there would be a
19 plurality of video feeds associated with the geographic zone. There's only
20 one CD that can communicate across the channel in Gogic at a time.

21 So, if you move on to 74, this is kind of a collection of where that
22 issue takes us. Petitioner relies on Gogic's CDs as the video feeds. They're
23 also the mobile communication devices and other people, other CDs with
24 other people's communication devices, other group members, these are the
25 claimed plurality of video feeds. So, this issue with identifying a
26 communication device as three different claim elements, it is an issue for

1 clarity and an issue for Patent Owner's response to Petitioner's position. And
2 that's shown on the next slide, Slide 75, which is where the petition
3 improperly shifts the burden of deciphering or arguments onto the Patent
4 Owner and the Board, which is contrary to the regulation provisions
5 governing IPR.

6 And Slide 76 is what I just talked about. Gogic's communication
7 manager ensures there is no plurality of transmissions occurring at the same
8 time. So, how a video feed, even if a communication device streaming a
9 video after the user has pressed push-to-talk and is streaming over Gogic's
10 communication channel, there's no other video feed that can be - that it can
11 be selected from. It can't be selected from the plurality. Simply whoever is
12 pressing push-to-talk, if it's available - if the transmission privilege is
13 available, they can take it over and broadcast in video. So you - on the left
14 here, you have Dr. Polish agreeing that the whole point of this is taking the
15 floor - this whole point of this taking the floor thing is to prevent more than
16 one CD from transmitting at a time. And on the right here, you have Gogic
17 explaining the transmission privilege where only one device can
18 communicate at once.

19 And so, I'll save the rest of my time for surrebuttal unless there are
20 any questions.

21 JUDGE MCKONE: I'm sorry, what claim language are you
22 pointing to to show that we have to have multiple transitions occurring at the
23 same time?

24 MR. KANTAREK: So, if you go back to Slide 74, the claim
25 language is identifying at least one video feed by selecting the at least one
26 video feed from the plurality of video feeds associated with the geographic

1 zone saying there's only one feed at a time. These are media streams,
2 according to the '830 patent, which is that's on Slide 72. And so, when one
3 person is streaming their video that they can stop and someone else can try
4 to stream their video, but there is no plurality of video feeds associated with
5 the zone that can be at - one can be identified and selected from. Like
6 there's no group to identify one and select it from.

7 JUDGE MCKONE: Okay.

8 MR. KANTAREK: And if there are no more questions, I'll reserve
9 the rest of my time. Thank you.

10 JUDGE TROCK: Thank you, Counsel.

11 JUDGE FITZPATRICK: Counsel, I'm sorry. I have one question.
12 If you wouldn't mind putting back up that slide, I think - was it 74?

13 MR. KANTAREK: Is that the one?

14 JUDGE FITZPATRICK: Yeah. Yeah. Thank you. Yes. Thank
15 you. The highlighted claim language that you were just reading. The at
16 least phrase shows up in that highlighting once, twice, I guess twice. So,
17 identifying at least one video feed by selecting the at least one video feed.
18 What would - if all the video feeds are from I guess just one geographic
19 zone in the prior art - or let me put it this way. Does that limitation read on
20 selecting two video feeds or a group of video feeds?

21 MR. KANTAREK: Yeah. At least one video feed would be
22 satisfied by identifying two video feeds by selecting both. You would have
23 to select them both from the plurality of video feeds.

24 JUDGE FITZPATRICK: Okay. But I mean, you could, whatever
25 your plurality is, let's say it's four, if you select all four of them, that's fine
26 for the claim, right? That that meets the claim language, right?

1 MR. KANTAREK: If you identify four and select those four from
2 the - and out of those four -

3 JUDGE FITZPATRICK: If the plurality - I'm sorry. I wasn't very
4 clear. If the plurality is in whatever we're talking about, let's say there's four
5 video feeds that that's what - that's the universe of the plurality, can you
6 select all of them? Or do you have to select a subset?

7 MR. KANTAREK: It looks like you could select - if all of them
8 are relevant - if all of the selection is done based on the user policy that
9 identifies them that are relevant to the user when they access the
10 communication channel, I would agree with you that the claim language
11 allows for selecting however many of the plurality. If the plurality is four,
12 then it can be one through four, it seems.

13 JUDGE FITZPATRICK: Thank you.

14 JUDGE TROCK: Thank you, Counsel. Petitioner, you have 11
15 minutes.

16 MR. WILLIAMS: I've got to get myself unmuted here. Okay. All
17 right. I'll share my slides again. Okay. All right. Thank you, Your Honor.
18 Let me just try to go roughly in order here. So, regarding the Shaffer-Saylor
19 combination and the motivation to combine. I mean, Patent Owner's
20 argument largely seems to be that there's something redundant about this
21 communication, but - about this combination, but they're nothing - it's not
22 like redundant here at all.

23 As Dr. Polish explains, this is also in our petition, but I'm showing
24 you Slide 25. This is his declaration talking about what's going on here.
25 You know, Saylor teaches you that you can have an address book of
26 contacts. And in that address book, you can have an emergency contact for

1 the police or the fire department. But what it doesn't tell you is how you
2 then go ahead and convey those notifications to the police or to the fire
3 department. I mean, after all here we've got some video feed in your data
4 set, and you want to convey that. You know, practically how do you
5 implement that? What do you do?

6 And what he tells you, what Dr. Polish tells you is that, you know,
7 Shaffer's IS system is the needed mechanism here to create this interoperable
8 communication. So, yeah, I mean, it's true. Saylor says, functionally, yeah,
9 we'll have an address book and we can send things to the police. But, you
10 know, as Dr. Polish explains, you're going to need more to actually build this
11 system. As a person of skill in the art, what you need is some sort of
12 network bridge or interoperability system that can take that communication
13 from your network and put it into the network of individuals responding, in
14 this case the police or the fire. And that is explained also in the petition.
15 Page 27 we explain how both these references are providing this same
16 motivation.

17 So, Shaffer describes that the networks can be associated with
18 businesses and campuses and would have realized that Shaffer's IS is well
19 suited to connect video security system, like Saylor's, that's designed to
20 monitor particular buildings with a different network that responds to
21 incidents, such as Shaffer security or emergency communication system
22 where you've got responders. So, there's just nothing redundant. And I
23 think the case law that Patent Owner is relying on is just inapplicable given
24 that we actually do have an explanation here of why this combination was
25 needed to actually implement what Saylor is talking about.

26 JUDGE TROCK: Counsel, this is Judge Trock. So, how do you

1 respond to Patent Owner's Slide 7, where they have highlighted for us a
2 number of disclosures in Saylor which appear to indicate different sort of
3 methodologies that Saylor could use to provide this information?

4 MR. WILLIAMS: Yeah. I mean, I think those just provide, again,
5 we, you know, we don't hide from those. Those are just showing that Saylor
6 is analogous. It teaches you that you've got a network, and you want to
7 communicate outside the network. And he says, you can do this in many
8 ways. There are many known ways, like email. Well, you know, that's fine.
9 We're not denying that. But what do you do then? If you want to get that
10 email to a police officer in the field, who's showing up to look for the
11 burglar or to help, you know, or the paramedic who is trying to help
12 somebody who's collapsed on the ground, Saylor doesn't tell you how to
13 connect that missing piece up. He just tells you, here's all sorts of ways you
14 can communicate outside of our network, but and including suggesting - go
15 ahead.

16 JUDGE TROCK: All right. I don't want to put words in your
17 mouth, but is it your argument that Shaffer provides the infrastructure for
18 Saylor to do this communication? Is that what you're arguing?

19 MR. WILLIAMS: I would say the IS itself is - if you mean the IS
20 itself as the infrastructure, then yes. I mean, what Shaffer has is a network
21 that's an interoperability system. That's the whole point. He has this central
22 hub that's designed to permit your first responders to receive data from other
23 networks. So, if you want to implement what Saylor is talking about, when
24 he says, let's send an emergency alert out to an emergency responder that
25 can help whatever's going on at the current moment, you know, you need
26 some physical infrastructure to make that last connection between the

1 database here and the email address that's in that database with an actual
2 police officer or a paramedic in the field. And that's what Shaffer is
3 providing.

4 JUDGE TROCK: All right. Thank you.

5 MR. WILLIAMS: Okay. Going back to the plurality issue. Let's
6 - we're focusing here for a second on Ground 1, so the Shaffer grounds. I
7 just have - I read this earlier, but I just found that I do have this excerpt
8 actually on Slide 72 of our petitions, but, you know, Saylor teaches that
9 within a house or, you know, again, Saylor is talking about monitoring
10 buildings and structures and the example he gives here is a house. Within a
11 house a user may have a window/door contacts, smoke detectors, motion
12 sensors, video cameras, plural. So, it's undisputed that Saylor has in his
13 system multiple cameras. The examples we talked about in the petition also
14 would include things like college campuses, where you're going to have
15 obviously multiple cameras that could be potentially, you know, relevant
16 depending on what the particular situation is that you're being asked to
17 respond to.

18 Going to Slide 51, I mentioned this earlier, but it's not the case that
19 all that happens is the cameras monitor motion and then trigger an alert.
20 That's not how Saylor's system works. As you see on Slide 51 motion
21 triggers the first step, which is to send the motion - the images or the video
22 up to the central server, but then further steps take place. There is this whole
23 processing step that has to take place based on the user information that's in
24 the database at the central server to then decide whether you're going to send
25 a particular video feed to the response team. So, that's where the
26 identification by selection is taking place.

1 JUDGE TROCK: Counsel, this is Judge Trock again. What in
2 Saylor is doing this monitoring?

3 MR. WILLIAMS: So, Saylor has a central system. I forget what
4 he calls it exactly, but the gist of it is shown on the Slide here 51, it's step
5 1024, the image video clips may be processed to determine whether certain
6 user defined conditions are met for alarm triggers and other actions. As
7 you'll see, this piece in Saylor is happening at his central security system.
8 Not - it's not happening down at the sensor itself. Oh, he calls it, sorry, the
9 central security network. It's right here in the section above on the slide.
10 The middle excerpt on the slide gives you the term he uses for that, central
11 security network.

12 JUDGE TROCK: Okay. Thank you, Counsel.

13 MR. WILLIAMS: Okay. I should address this independent of
14 point that came up after our petition was filed. The District Court did
15 construe the term independent of the communications channel. And you
16 have that whole record. I mean, the Board has the District Court's opinion.
17 You can see what was going on there, which was, it was an indefiniteness
18 argument that the Board - sorry that the District Court rejected. Although
19 he did find that the word - the term was confusing and he did further
20 clarification. So, he picked the definition that neither party had actually
21 proposed. But even under that new definition that he's given us, the petition
22 I think adequately explains how these cameras satisfy his construction.

23 So, for instance at the bottom of page 41 of the petition, which is a
24 different page in the PDF, so I apologize. Oh, here it is. The petition
25 explains the video feed selected by Saylor's central security network or
26 video surveillance cameras at a building or home in the combined system.

1 Saylor's configurable central security network can associate the video feeds
2 with the communication channel based on the user's preferences and the
3 occurrence of relevant events, triggering the forwarded video feeds to the
4 multicast channel.

5 So, there's no, you know, the cameras themselves are not bound to
6 particular channels. It's configurable so that you can, if you have a video
7 feed that's relevant to a particular responding user, you can send that video
8 feed to a channel, but there's no sort of, you know, one-to-one mapping
9 between video feeds and channels. And in fact, as we explained elsewhere
10 in the petition, like it's like page 37, you know, you can send a video feed
11 not just to police officers, but you can send a video feed to a user if the front
12 door opens.

13 So, every time the front door opens, you can send a clip to a user.
14 If that front door opening is associated with an alarm, then you could also
15 send it to a police officer, so, that same video feed. So, the video feeds
16 themselves are not, you know, bound up somehow inextricably with
17 particular channels. The configurable system here is what allows you to
18 associate those feeds with channels as relevant.

19 Okay. I was going to turn to the Gogic Ground 2. Do you have
20 any other questions about Ground 1?

21 JUDGE TROCK: No, you have about two minutes left.

22 MR. WILLIAMS: Perfect. Okay. Let me just try to very quickly
23 identify a couple issues here. In terms of push-to-talk monitoring, I mean, I
24 think the issue I want to point you to here is this element 1[a], monitoring
25 selection. It doesn't have to occur before the radio frequencies are displayed
26 or that the particular user selects a radio frequency. There's no such

1 requirement in the claim. So, the fact that the push-to-talk button is
2 depressed, which would indicate now a user is wanting to communicate on
3 that channel, could satisfy the monitoring step 1[a]. We don't see anything
4 in the claims or specification that would exclude that.

5 JUDGE TROCK: Well, this is Judge Trock again. So, how do
6 you respond to Patent Owner's argument that push-to-talk is a request for the
7 floor and it's not a selection of a channel?

8 MR. WILLIAMS: Well, I mean, to us, that is the selection of the
9 channel. That's the user saying, okay, I now want to talk on our group call
10 chat, on our group panel. That's the button. I push that button when I'm
11 telling the system, yeah, I now want to talk on this channel. So, that is the
12 selection that we're talking about.

13 JUDGE TROCK: Okay. Thank you. Thirty seconds.

14 MR. WILLIAMS: Okay. The only thing I guess we'll cover on the
15 combination, I mean, I think I covered this already, but it's shown on Slide
16 108. In Gogic, there is no explanation as to how the initial connection to the
17 base station occurs. That's why we have to turn to some other references to
18 show that when you've got a wandering radio that's entering a channel, he
19 has a way to connect to the base station in the first instance.

20 And, you know, the last point on Gogic, as my time ends here is,
21 and I think the Board was alluding to this in its question to Patent Owner's
22 counsel, but there's no requirement that you transmit multiple feeds at the
23 same time. You just have to have a plurality of feeds in a region. And then
24 individual, you know, that are selected for the particular incident. And then
25 as the incident goes on, one or more of those can be transmitted at a time,
26 but there's nothing in the claims that precludes that.

1 With that, I think I have ran out of time unless the Board has any
2 other questions for me.

3 JUDGE TROCK: Hearing none, thank you, Counsel. Patent
4 Owner, you have 11 minutes.

5 MR. KANTAREK: Thank you, Your Honors. So, what we have
6 up here is Figure 10 of Saylor. And I just wanted to talk about this a little
7 bit, because there was a question about this as well. At step 1010, which we
8 talk about on Patent Owner's Slide 28, an identified location may be
9 monitored by a video or other recording device. At step 1012 video images
10 are compared. They look for motion at 1014. They compress the images at
11 1016. And then it's not until 1020 that the images and/or information is sent
12 to the central security network.

13 So, if you look at Patent Owner's Slide 30, we talked to their expert
14 about this, and he said he doesn't think it's a central security server that's
15 doing the monitoring there. That's being done by the video or other
16 recording device. So, if you look at the claim language, the video or other
17 recording device only has one feed that it's identifying and selecting
18 something from. So, it's simply not the central security network of Saylor
19 that does this stuff at all.

20 And moving on to - I just want to briefly touch on the motivation
21 to combine Shaffer and Saylor again. I think the key here is that Petitioner
22 thinks the disclosure of emailing notifications to security systems needs
23 more explanation, and Patent Owner would submit that that just doesn't
24 make any sense. A POSITA knows how to do this sort of stuff, and Saylor
25 explaining that this can be done and explaining ways to do it is explaining
26 how to do it.

1 If you look at slide, Patent Owner's Slide 9, I would say, again,
2 take a look at the Stryker case. They don't - Petitioner doesn't respond to it
3 at all, and it's pretty on point about redundantly performing the function that
4 Saylor already offers its solution to.

5 I didn't have anything else that I specifically wanted to cover. If
6 there are any questions, I'm happy to address those. Otherwise, happy to
7 give the time back for the LEAP practitioner.

8 JUDGE TROCK: Okay. Thank you, Counsel. It doesn't appear
9 that the panel has any more questions. So with that, we conclude the
10 hearing. I would request that counsel stay on the line in case the court
11 reporter has any spellings that they need assistance with. And with that, the
12 case is submitted and we will issue a final decision in due course. I thank
13 you all for your time. It's been very helpful.

14 MR. KANTAREK: Thank you, Your Honor.

15 MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you.

16 (Whereupon the above-entitled matter went off the record at 2:44
17 p.m.)

IPR2023-01295
Patent 8,994,830

PETITIONER:

Eliot Williams
Michael Knierim
Clarke Stavinoha
Joseph Cahill
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
eliot.williams@bakerbotts.com
michael.knierim@bakerbotts.com
clarke.stavinoha@bakerbotts.com
joe.cahill@bakerbotts.com

PATENT OWNER:

Jason Engel
Katherine Allor
Nolan Hubbard
Samuel Richey
Kyle Kantarek
K&L GATES LLP
jason.engel.ptab@klgates.com
katy.allor@klgates.com
nolan.hubbard@klgates.com
samuel.richey@klgates.com
kyle.kantarek@kirkland.com