

1 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
2 BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD
3

4 SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.;)
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.,)
5)
PETITIONER,) CASE NO.
6) IPR2024-00002
VS.)
7)
SLYDE ANALYTICS, LLC.,)
8)
PATENT OWNER.)
9)
_____)

10
11 REPORTER'S REMOTE
12 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
13 FEBRUARY 20, 2024
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 TECKLA T. CLAY, CSR 13125
OFFICIAL REPORTER PRO TEMPORE
25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

APPEARANCES:

FOR PETITIONER: O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP
BY: BRIAN COOK
TIM FINK
BEN HABER
400 SOUTH HOPE STREET
18TH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA
90071

FOR PATENT OWNER: FABRICANT LLP
BY: PETER LAMBRIANAKOS
411 THEODORE FREMD AVENUE
SUITE 206 SOUTH
RYE, NEW YORK 10580

ALSO PRESENT: JAMESON LEE, JUDGE
JOHN HORVATH
ST. JOHN COURTENAY III

1
2 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

3 FEBRUARY 20, 2024

4 8:08 A.M.

5
6 THE COURT: Good morning. This is Judge Jameson
7 Lee. I'm hear with my colleague Judge John Horvath and
8 Judge St. John Courtenay III. We are here for IPR
9 2024-00002 Samsung Electronics Company versus Slyde
10 Analytics LLC. If there's anyone on this call not for
11 this case, please disconnect. And I understand the
12 parties have arranged for a court reporter. Let me
13 take a roll call see who's here for petitioner and
14 who's here for patent owner starting with petitioner
15 please.

16 MR. COOK: Thank you, your Honor. This is Brian
17 Cook with O'Melveny and Myers for petitioner Samsung.

18 THE COURT: Yes.

19 MR. COOK: And with me today are my colleagues
20 Tim Fink and Ben Haber.

21 THE COURT: Thank you. Patent owner?

22 MR. LAMBRIANAKOS: Good morning, your Honor.
23 This is Peter Lambrianakos on behalf of the patent
24 owner.

25 THE COURT: Okay. Anyone else from patent

1 owner?

2 MR. LAMBRIANAKOS: No, your Honor.

3 THE COURT: Okay. So I understand from the
4 e-mail communication that this is a call where the
5 petitioner's requesting authorization to file
6 preliminary reply. I think most of the items
7 petitioner wants to address in a preliminary reply has
8 to do with the case 2024-00002, four zeros and a two.
9 But towards the end of the e-mail it's also mentioning
10 a symptom type issue that's common to four cases,
11 that's 224-00006, 224-00040 and 224-00041; is that
12 correct.

13 MR. COOK: This is Brian Cook your Honor, yes
14 that is correct.

15 THE COURT: So my plan is to just let counsel
16 for petitioner tell us why you should be granted
17 permission to file this preliminary reply and then turn
18 it over to patent owner to find out why patent owner
19 opposes. Go ahead, petitioner.

20 MR. COOK: Thank you, your Honor. This is Brian
21 Cook. So there are, there are 4 issues that we brought
22 up in our e-mail that we'd like to discuss today. And
23 I'm happy to respond to them all first if the Board
24 would like or we can go one at a time.

25 THE COURT: Let's get rid of the easy one, the

1 discretionary denial items, the 325D and the 314A.
2 Well perhaps maybe I can cut through some.

3 Patent owner, in light of the filing by
4 petitioner of the Sotera stipulation do you still ask
5 for discretionary denial under 314A?

6 MR. LAMBRIANAKOS: No, your Honor. We, well we
7 do, but we believe that it's likely under the case law
8 that discretionary denial will not be ruled. So, you
9 know, in our view based on the current guidance we
10 understand that it's very unlikely that discretionary
11 denial would be, would be granted.

12 THE COURT: But --

13 MR. LAMBRIANAKOS: I don't want to waive that
14 argument.

15 THE COURT: I see, okay. All right. Because if
16 you waive it then they don't need to talk about it. So
17 petitioner they're not waiving the argument. They're
18 still going to say we should discretionarily deny under
19 314A. We could, if you think it's appropriate you
20 could respond to that if it's just to say, you know,
21 whatever you want to say long or short. I think that's
22 not a problem. Is that understood?

23 MR. COOK: Okay. That's understood. And that
24 applies to all 4 of the cases then?

25 THE COURT: No, if you could start with 325D

1 which is, oh the rest of the issues all have to do with
2 this particular case, 2024-00002. So you can start
3 with 325D and then move into the other 2 technical
4 issues. We would appreciate it.

5 MR. COOK: Okay. Thank you, your Honor. This
6 is Brian Cook again. So the 325D issue, this is patent
7 owner's argument that the petition should be denied
8 under 325D. As we understand it the patent owner is
9 arguing that the hoteling reference which is Exhibit
10 1006, is previously considered art because it's
11 incorporated by reference into a different hoteling
12 reference which I'll call hoteling 535 which was
13 discussed during prosecution.

14 And we believe this is just contrary to
15 the MPP and support precedent. And this is what we
16 want to address in our papers. And I can also go into
17 that issue in more detail if the Court would like.

18 THE COURT: This sounds a little odd. You're
19 saying there's a hoteling reference and it is
20 incorporated by reference into another reference which
21 is also named hoteling.

22 MR. COOK: That's correct, your Honor. It's an,
23 it's another patent by the same inventor. The inventor
24 has dozens of patents. They're unrelated patents in
25 the sense that they have different disclosures.

1 They're not cumulative of one another and patent owner
2 does not argue it's cumulative. But it does happen to
3 incorporate by reference the other hoteling patents
4 that we rely on as a secondary reference.

5 THE COURT: I see. There's no misunderstanding
6 by the parties that there's like a double, two
7 references by the same name and one is incorporated by
8 the other. That's not the issue of misidentification;
9 is that right?

10 MR. COOK: I don't believe so.

11 THE COURT: Okay. Okay you can move on to the
12 other two. Well maybe let's solve this 325D. Let's
13 hear from Patent owner on 325D. Why would you oppose a
14 preliminary reply addressing the 325D?

15 MR. LAMBRIANAKOS: Patent owner opposes because
16 the petitioner hasn't stated any reason why to adopt
17 the argument in it's petition. The hoteling reference
18 that it relies on, hoteling 1006 incorporated by
19 reference into the hoteling application that was
20 considered by the PTO, that's readily apparent from any
21 review of the prosecution history we obviously found
22 that when we reviewed the background of the, of the
23 patent at issue.

24 It's not simply enough to say that, you
25 know, they have an argument as to why 325D shouldn't

1 apply. The question for the call, my understanding is
2 that they need to tell us why they didn't address the
3 issue although it was apparent at the time of the
4 petition.

5 It's not as if we raised an issue which
6 they couldn't know about, didn't know about, which
7 wasn't, which they could not anticipate. And so
8 putting aside whether they think they have a response
9 to the argument, the issue of whether it should have
10 been addressed in the petition is clear and that is it
11 should have. And therefore there shouldn't be the
12 opportunity for more papers on this issue.

13 THE COURT: We understand your position. Okay
14 before we move on to the other two subject matter, is
15 there anything else you want to say on 325D,
16 petitioner?

17 MR. COOK: Yes, if I could just address that
18 briefly I think the issue is, the case law is quite
19 clear in the MPP and the Court precedent is that
20 reference incorporated by reference by another one does
21 not make it considered art. That's why we didn't need
22 to address that issue. So this is not something we
23 expected Patent owner would bring up as a reason to
24 deny the petition. That's why we wanted to have the
25 opportunity to address it here.

1 THE COURT: Okay thank you. Now if you can go
2 over to the two technical arguments about what the art
3 does, but does not show we would appreciate it.

4 MR. COOK: Yes, thank you. So the second issue
5 is that we would like to, we believe that the, the
6 Patent owner's preliminary response characterizes the
7 reference, the prior art references and what's in the
8 petition and takes kind of a narrow view of what's
9 disclosed.

10 The first issue we wanted to address was
11 the limitation about whether or not the card widget
12 occupies the entire matrix display. Patent owner
13 suggests that the only disclosure in there or that the
14 only disclosure that petitioner relies on is something
15 that the cards occupy substantially all of the display
16 and argues that petitioner is arguing that
17 substantially all, discloses all.

18 And that's just not the case. Petitioner
19 has pointed out separate disclosures, a Louse reference
20 that clearly states it includes the entire display
21 area. And we also rely on expert testimony that, why
22 it would be obvious that that entire display area
23 disclosure discloses the (inaudible) limitation.

24 We wanted to point out the petition's, the
25 portions of the petition and the references in our

1 expert declaration to make sure that that's not
2 overlooked.

3 THE COURT: This has to do with item 2 in your
4 e-mail, not item 3.

5 MR. COOK: Item 2, that's correct.

6 THE COURT: And this is the only thing you want
7 to say something about because there's quite a bit of
8 argument on that matter, whether cards are being
9 scrolled and whether cards are being scrolled in their
10 expanded form. Those are also issues or from what I
11 just heard you only care about whether substantially
12 all names entire; is that right?

13 MR. COOK: Well I would say what we want to
14 address is that in both the Louse reference, the first
15 primary reference and the second primary reference
16 similar argument is raised. And the argument is that
17 it's whether you can scroll cards in their, as entire,
18 considering the entire display area.

19 We do want to address specifically the
20 entire display area disclosure and the arguments that
21 open widgets can be scrolled and open widgets would
22 also occupy the entire display area. That's for the
23 Louse reference and similar argument for the Duarte.

24 THE COURT: Let's not go to Duarte yet. Item 2
25 doesn't have to do with Duarte. Item 2 only has to do

1 with the first ground.

2 MR. COOK: Item 2 actually deals with both
3 references, both the Louse and the Duarte references I
4 believe.

5 THE COURT: All right. Item 2 cuts across both
6 grounds, right?

7 MR. COOK: That's correct.

8 THE COURT: But I'm still a little confused, you
9 know, that the language is all inclusive. It includes
10 so many different things. It includes when the cards
11 are scrolled are they being scrolled in an expanded
12 form? That's one possibility. And another possibility
13 is can the cards even be scrolled? That's another
14 possibility.

15 And the third possibility is just that,
16 yeah they're being scrolled, and they're being scrolled
17 in expanded form. But they're not expanded to cover
18 the entirety of the display. So there's so many
19 different arguments. I'm trying to get which one of
20 those three or all of them do you want to respond to?

21 It sounds like you only wanted to respond
22 to the last one which is well do they occupy the whole
23 thing because the claim says entire area. And you only
24 say that the art shows up substantially all.

25 MR. COOK: Yes that's, so the issue that we

1 really want to respond to is that we have made the
2 point in our petition that the art discloses scrolling,
3 the scrolling the widgets or the card in their entirely
4 expanded form taking up the entire display.

5 And what we want to point out is that our
6 petition makes those arguments and shows where that
7 disclosure is in the Louse reference and in the Duarte
8 reference including our expert testimony on those
9 issues. We really want to make the point that both of
10 those references disclosed that you can scroll, you can
11 scroll cards in their entirely open form in which they
12 occupy the entire display. That's the issue we want to
13 address in our papers for both.

14 THE COURT: You keep saying issues, there are
15 sub-issues. And I pointed out there are sub-issues.
16 It sounds like you want to talk about all the
17 sub-issues, whether the cards are being scrolled at all
18 and whether the cards are being scrolled in expanded
19 form and also whether the expanded form occupies the
20 whole thing. You want to talk about all of them?

21 MR. COOK: To the extent that it's necessary,
22 but I think that, I don't think that the patent owner
23 is disputing that the cards can for the last reference.
24 I think the patent owner is not disputing that the
25 cards can occupy the entire screen. I don't think that

1 the Patent owner is disputing that the cards can be
2 scrolled.

3 THE COURT: They do dispute that the cards are
4 being scrolled in expanded form.

5 MR. COOK: Correct.

6 THE COURT: I don't know if you want to talk
7 about that or simply in expanded form. It does not
8 have to occupy the whole thing, substantially all is
9 enough.

10 MR. COOK: Yeah I think it sounds like they, we
11 definitely want to address the entire idea that the
12 cards can be scrolled in expanded form. And from the,
13 from the confusion it sounds like yes they are
14 disputing those aspects. We want to make clear our
15 argument is the entire area that we want to address
16 cards can be expanded to the full side of the screen
17 and scrolled in their fully expanded form to encompass
18 the entire screen.

19 THE COURT: So it's multiple, multiple stuff.
20 All right. We understand that about item two. How
21 about item three the technical one.

22 MR. COOK: So then item three is, this is
23 another issue about scrolling that applies just to the
24 Duarte reference. For this issue I think the question
25 is whether the patent claims can recite, whether Duarte

1 discloses that several cards, whether Duarte causes
2 several cards to scroll past. What we see here is it
3 appears that patent owner's taking kind of a narrow
4 view of the claim language perhaps for the point of
5 claim construction argument that the single swipe or
6 single action would cause multiple cards to scroll by.

7 So I think we just want to point out in
8 our petition where we show that, well first of all
9 Duarte does disclose that we can, and I think Patent
10 owner admits that, that with multiple touches you can
11 scroll by multiple windows. To the extent they're
12 arguing that the claim requires something narrower, we
13 believe that Duarte claims that as well as we want to
14 point out in points of our petition where we made that
15 argument.

16 THE COURT: You're breaking up. One of our
17 judges can no longer hear. Let's wait a minute and let
18 him relog in.

19

20 (Technical difficulties)

21

22 THE COURT: Still having technical difficulties.
23 We'll wait another minute or so. Okay. We solved the
24 difficulty. So I think Judge Horvath missed the last
25 minute of, minute of petitioner's summary. Can you

1 rewind back about a minute or so?

2 MR. COOK: Sure that's fine. So I think what we
3 were discussing is that the main point is we're not
4 trying to bring up a new argument here. What we want
5 to do is point out places in our petition where we
6 already made, where we already made these points that
7 the Patent owner could not address. But the point was
8 I don't know how far back to go.

9 But for the initial issue of scrolling the
10 full screen widget or card we want to make the argument
11 that we pointed out in our petition where the
12 reference's disclosed that cards can take up the entire
13 screen and can be scrolled in that full entire screen
14 form.

15 THE COURT: Are you talking about, are you
16 talking about item three? I don't want you to go back
17 to item two.

18 MR. COOK: Oh, I'm sorry. Item three, so for
19 item three what we want to point out is that the, this
20 is the Duarte issue about scrolling, essentially
21 scrolling more than one card at a time. So the way
22 Patent owner is interpreting this, we believe that
23 they're making kind of a claim construction argument
24 that says, when the claim says that the processor must
25 require, enable multiple cards to scroll by, Patent

1 owner seems to be suggesting that that means that a
2 single touch of the finger or single scroll causes
3 multiple cards to scroll by.

4 I think Patent owner is admitting that
5 Duarte does at least when scrolling, you can scroll
6 multiple times to the left. There's a disclosure note
7 that Patent owner cites in the PFTR. I think they're
8 saying that Duarte does not disclose making multiple,
9 multiple cards scroll with one finger.

10 So first the one issue is that we think
11 that that's, that's a claim interpretation issue. And
12 the second issue is that we do point out in our
13 petition that Duarte does disclose multiple cards,
14 multiple cards scrolling with one finger motion.

15 If that's the claimed construction
16 position we want to point out where in our petition we
17 already made those arguments.

18 THE COURT: Okay. So you're saying they say
19 Duarte doesn't show with one finger flick you can
20 multiple cards go by. And you just want to point out
21 where in your petition you pointed that out?

22 MR. COOK: That's correct. And also just want
23 to say that we don't think the claim actually
24 necessarily requires that.

25 THE COURT: Do not require what, one flick

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

25 Now those words are right there in the

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

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

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

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

16 THE COURT: Are you petitioner?

17 MR. COOK: Petitioner, yes.

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

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

21 THE COURT: Okay go ahead.

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

1 that we omitted and said that we overlooked. We're not
2 trying to raise a new issue.

3 THE COURT: What do you mean misrepresented the
4 art? Sometimes those words are used too loosely.
5 Misrepresentation is a harsh word. It's almost like
6 accusing somebody of cheating. Do you actually mean
7 parties have different reads of the art? You just
8 disagree with how they see the art. They don't say you
9 misrepresented the art. They just go, they disagree
10 with how you read the art. Are you saying they
11 misrepresented like lied or cheat?

12 MR. COOK: Your Honor, no I didn't mean to imply
13 that. I just meant to imply, I meant to say that we
14 did address, you know, for example the claim
15 construction issue and pointed out why Duarte discloses
16 it even under an interpretation that one touch requires
17 multiple card scrolling and have expert testimony on
18 that issue that Patent owner did not respond to or did
19 not bring up in the POPR. We just want to make sure
20 that's not overlooked.

21 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Hang on. Okay.
22 Thank you both parties. And we would like to have a
23 copy of the transcript whenever you have it and we'll
24 try to get this out as soon as we can. Thank you for
25 being available on quick notice. And we are adjourned.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

(Proceedings concluded at 8:36 a.m.)

1 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
2 BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD
3

4 SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.;)
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.,)
5)
PETITIONER,) CASE NO.
6) IPR2024-00002
VS.)
7)
SLYDE ANALYTICS, LLC.,)
8)
PATENT OWNER.)
9)

10 I, TECKLA CLAY, CSR NO. 13125, OFFICIAL
11 REPORTER OF THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF
12 CALIFORNIA, FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, DO HEREBY
13 CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING PAGES, 1 THROUGH 22
14 COMPRISE A FULL, TRUE AND CORRECT REMOTE TRANSCRIPT OF
15 THE PROCEEDINGS TAKEN IN THE ABOVE ENTITLED
16 CAUSE ON FEBRUARY 20, 2024 THIS 22ND DAY OF FEBRUARY,
17 2024.

18
19
20 
21

TECKLA CLAY, CSR NO. 13125

&	4	admits 14:10	argue 7:2
& 2:2	4 4:21 5:24	admitting 16:4	argues 9:16
1	400 2:4	adopt 7:16	arguing 6:9
1 22:13	411 2:8	ahead 4:19	9:16 14:12
1006 6:10 7:18	5	19:21	argument 5:14
10580 2:9	535 6:12	alleged 19:7	5:17 6:7 7:17
13125 1:24	8	allows 18:1	7:25 8:9 10:8
22:10,21	8:08 3:4	america 1:4	10:16,16,23
18876 22:21	8:36 21:2	22:4	13:15 14:5,15
18th 2:5	9	analytics 1:7	15:4,10,23
2	90071 2:6	3:10 22:7	17:9,11,22
2 6:3 10:3,5,24	a	angeles 2:5	18:6,21 19:3
10:25 11:2,5	a.m. 3:4 21:2	22:12	19:24
20 1:13 3:3	above 22:15	anticipate 8:7	arguments 9:2
22:16	accompanying	anticipated	10:20 11:19
2024 1:13 3:3	17:18	19:5	12:6 16:17
22:16,17	accusing 20:6	apparent 7:20	17:16,19 18:3
2024-00002 3:9	action 14:6	8:3 19:9	19:11
4:8 6:2	actually 11:2	appeal 1:2 22:2	arranged 3:12
206 2:9	16:23 20:6	appearances	art 6:10 8:21
22 22:13	address 4:7	2:1	9:2,7 11:24
224-00006 4:11	6:16 8:2,17,22	appears 14:3	12:2 17:2 20:4
224-00040 4:11	8:25 9:10	application	20:7,8,9,10
224-00041 4:11	10:14,19 12:13	7:19	aside 8:8
22nd 22:16	13:11,15 15:7	applies 5:24	asking 17:8,23
3	17:6 18:9	13:23	17:24
3 10:4	20:14	apply 8:1 18:15	aspects 13:14
314a 5:1,5,19	addressed 8:10	applying 18:12	attempt 17:21
325d 5:1,25 6:3	17:14 19:1,5	appreciate 6:4	authorization
6:6,8 7:12,13	addressing	9:3	4:5
7:14,25 8:15	7:14	appropriate	available 18:17
	adjourned	5:19 19:10	18:20,24 20:25
	20:25	area 9:21,22	avenue 2:8
		10:18,20,22	
		11:23 13:15	

b	11:13 12:11,17 12:18,23,25 13:1,3,12,16 14:1,2,6 15:12 15:25 16:3,9 16:13,14,20 17:1,11 18:17 18:20,24 care 10:11 case 1:5 3:11 4:8 5:7 6:2 8:18 9:18 22:5 cases 4:10 5:24 cast 18:7 cause 14:6 18:17 22:16 causes 14:1 16:2 causing 18:20 certify 22:13 change 17:22 19:24 characterizes 9:6 cheat 20:11 cheating 20:6 circuit 18:16 cites 16:7 claim 11:23 14:4,5,12 15:23,24 16:11 16:23 18:8,9 18:11,11,13,15 18:23 19:1,7 20:14	claimed 16:15 claims 13:25 14:13 clay 1:24 22:10 22:21 clear 8:10,19 13:14 clearly 9:20 colleague 3:7 colleagues 3:19 19:13 common 4:10 communication 4:4 company 3:9 comprise 22:14 concluded 21:2 confused 11:8 confusion 13:13 considered 6:10 7:20 8:21 considering 10:18 construction 14:5 15:23 16:15 20:15 contrary 6:14 converse 19:13 cook 2:3 3:16 3:17,19 4:13 4:13,20,21 5:23 6:5,6,22 7:10 8:17 9:4 10:5,13 11:2,7	11:25 12:21 13:5,10,22 15:2,18 16:22 17:3 19:14,17 19:20,22 20:12 copy 20:23 correct 4:12,14 6:22 10:5 11:7 13:5 16:22 17:3 22:14 counsel 4:15 county 22:12 course 17:23 court 3:6,12,18 3:21,25 4:3,15 4:25 5:12,15 5:25 6:17,18 7:5,11 8:13,19 9:1 10:3,6,24 11:5,8 12:14 13:3,6,19 14:16,22 15:15 16:18,25 17:4 19:10,12,16,18 19:21 20:3,21 22:11 courtenay 2:12 3:8 cover 11:17 csr 1:24 22:10 22:21 cumulative 7:1 7:2 current 5:9
c			
california 2:5 22:12 call 3:10,13 4:4 6:12 8:1 capable 17:17 card 9:11 12:3 15:10,21 18:22 19:2 20:17 cards 9:15 10:8 10:9,17 11:10			

[cut - go]

cut 5:2	discretionarily 5:18	entire 9:12,20	far 15:8
cuts 11:5	discretionary 5:1,5,8,10	9:22 10:12,17	february 1:13
d	discuss 4:22	10:18,20,22	3:3 22:16,16
day 22:16	discussed 6:13	11:23 12:4,12	file 4:5,17
deals 11:2	discussing 15:3	12:25 13:11,15	filing 5:3
declaration 10:1 17:18	display 9:12,15	13:18 15:12,13	find 4:18
definitely 13:11	9:20,22 10:18	17:11	fine 15:2
denial 5:1,5,8	10:20,22 11:18	entirely 12:3,11	finger 16:2,9
5:11	12:4,12 17:12	entirety 11:18	16:14,19
denied 6:7	dispute 13:3	entitled 22:15	fink 2:3 3:20
deny 5:18 8:24	19:8	essentially 15:20	first 4:23 9:10
detail 6:17	disputing 12:23	established 17:2	10:14 11:1
different 6:11	12:24 13:1,14	evaluating 17:19	14:8 16:10
6:25 11:10,19	double 7:6	event 17:1	flick 16:19,25
20:7	dozens 6:24	example 20:14	floor 2:5
difficulties 14:20,22	dragging 18:22	exhibit 6:9	foregoing 22:13
difficulty 14:24	19:2	expanded 10:10 11:11,17	form 10:10
digital 17:12	duarte 10:23	11:17 12:4,18	11:12,17 12:4
disagree 20:8,9	10:24,25 11:3	12:19 13:4,7	12:11,19,19
disclose 14:9	12:7 13:24,25	13:12,16,17	13:4,7,12,17
16:8,13	14:1,9,13	expected 8:23	15:14
disclosed 9:9	15:20 16:5,8	expert 9:21	found 7:21
12:10 15:12	16:13,19 18:21	10:1 12:8	four 4:8,10
discloses 9:17	e	17:13 20:17	fremd 2:8
9:23 12:2 14:1	e 4:4,9,22 10:4	explain 17:22	full 13:16 15:10
18:21 20:15	easily 18:13	extent 12:21	15:13 22:14
disclosure 9:13	easy 4:25	14:11	fully 13:17
9:14,23 10:20	electronics 1:4	f	g
12:7 16:6	1:4 3:9 22:4,4	fabricant 2:7	give 19:12
disclosures 6:25 9:19	enable 15:25	failed 19:3	given 19:7
disconnect 3:11	encompass 13:17		go 4:19,24 6:16
			9:1 10:24 15:8
			15:16 16:20
			17:1,4 19:21

20:9 going 5:18 good 3:6,22 granted 4:16 5:11 ground 11:1 grounds 11:6 guidance 5:9	iii 2:12 3:8 imply 20:12,13 inaudible 9:23 includes 9:20 11:9,10 including 12:8 inclusive 11:9 incorporate 7:3 incorporated 6:11,20 7:7,18 8:20 initial 15:9 institution 18:2 interpretation 16:11 18:8,9 18:11 19:8 20:16 interpreting 15:22 inventor 6:23 6:23 involves 18:19 ipr 3:8 ipr2024-00002 1:6 22:6 issue 4:10 6:6 6:17 7:8,23 8:3 8:5,9,12,18,22 9:4,10 11:25 12:12 13:23,24 15:9,20 16:10 16:11,12 17:8 17:14 20:2,15 20:18	issues 4:21 6:1 6:4 10:10 12:9 12:14,15,15,17 item 10:3,4,5 10:24,25 11:2 11:5 13:20,21 13:22 15:16,17 15:18,19 18:4 items 4:6 5:1	law 5:7 8:18 lee 2:11 3:7 left 16:6 lied 20:11 light 5:3 likely 5:7 limitation 9:11 9:23 19:3 little 6:18 11:8 llc 1:7 3:10 22:7 llp 2:2,7 located 18:3 long 5:21 longer 14:17 loosely 20:4 los 2:5 22:12 louse 9:19 10:14,23 11:3 12:7
h		j	
haber 2:4 3:20 hang 20:21 happen 7:2 happy 4:23 harsh 20:5 head 19:5 hear 3:7 7:13 14:17 heard 10:11 history 7:21 honor 3:16,22 4:2,13,20 5:6 6:5,22 17:7 19:14 20:12 hope 2:4 horvath 2:11 3:7 14:24 hoteling 6:9,11 6:12,19,21 7:3 7:17,18,19		jameson 2:11 3:6 john 2:11,12 3:7,8 judge 2:11 3:6 3:7,8 14:24 judges 14:17	
		k	
		keep 12:14 kind 9:8 14:3 15:23 know 5:9,20 7:25 8:6,6 11:9 13:6 15:8 17:25 20:14	
		l	
		laid 18:16 lambrianakos 2:8 3:22,23 4:2 5:6,13 7:15 17:7 language 11:9 14:4	m
i			made 12:1 14:14 15:6,6 16:17 17:10,16 18:21 mail 4:4,9,22 10:4 main 15:3 make 8:21 10:1 12:9 13:14 15:10 19:20 20:19 makes 12:6 making 15:23 16:8
idea 13:11 identifying 17:19			

[matrix - petition]

matrix 9:12 17:12 matter 8:14 10:8 18:8 matters 17:6 mean 20:3,6,12 meaning 18:12 18:19,23 means 16:1 meant 20:13,13 meets 19:2 mentioning 4:9 minute 14:17 14:23,25,25 15:1 19:12 misidentifica... 7:8 misrepresent... 20:5 misrepresented 19:23,25 20:3 20:9,11 missed 14:24 misunderstan... 7:5 morning 3:6,22 motion 16:14 move 6:3 7:11 8:14 mpp 6:15 8:19 multiple 13:19 13:19 14:6,10 14:11 15:25 16:3,6,8,9,13 16:14,20 17:1	20:17 myers 2:2 3:17	odd 6:18 office 1:1 22:1 official 1:24 22:10 oh 6:1 15:18 okay 3:25 4:3 5:15,23 6:5 7:11,11 8:13 9:1 14:23 16:18 17:4,4 19:21 20:21,21 omitted 20:1 open 10:21,21 12:11 opportunity 8:12,25 oppose 7:13 opposes 4:19 7:15 order 18:9 ordinary 18:12 overlooked 10:2 20:1,20 owner 1:8 2:7 3:14,21,24 4:1 4:18,18 5:3 6:8 7:1,13,15 8:23 9:12 12:22,24 13:1 14:10 15:7,22 16:1,4 16:7 17:5 18:10 19:23 20:18 22:8 owner's 6:7 9:6 14:3	p
	n		pages 22:13 papers 6:16 8:12 12:13 particular 6:2 parties 3:12 7:6 20:7,22 past 14:2 18:17 18:20,24 patent 1:1,2,8 2:7 3:14,21,23 3:25 4:18,18 5:3 6:6,8,23 7:1,13,15,23 8:23 9:6,12 12:22,24 13:1 13:25 14:3,9 15:7,22,25 16:4,7 17:5 18:10 19:23 20:18 22:1,2,8 patents 6:24,24 7:3 perfectly 17:17 permission 4:17 17:9 peter 2:8 3:23 petition 6:7 7:17 8:4,10,24 9:8,25 12:2,6 14:8,14 15:5 15:11 16:13,16 16:21 17:18 19:6,9
	name 7:7 named 6:21 names 10:12 narrow 9:8 14:3 narrower 14:12 necessarily 16:24 necessary 12:21 17:15 18:9 need 5:16 8:2 8:21 17:20 18:14 new 2:9 15:4 20:2 note 16:6 notice 20:25		
	o		
	o'melveny 2:2 3:17 obvious 9:22 18:18 obviously 7:21 occupies 9:12 12:19 occupy 9:15 10:22 11:22 12:12,25 13:8 17:11		

[petition's - rye]

petition's 9:24 petitioner 1:5 2:2 3:13,14,17 4:7,16,19 5:4 5:17 7:16 8:16 9:14,16,18 17:2,6,8,10,13 17:15 18:2,7 19:1,4,16,17 22:5 petitioner's 4:5 14:25 pftr 16:7 places 15:5 plain 18:18 plan 4:15 please 3:11,15 point 9:24 12:2 12:5,9 14:4,7 14:14 15:3,5,7 15:19 16:12,16 16:20 17:15,24 18:3 19:20,22 19:25 pointed 9:19 12:15 15:11 16:21 20:15 points 14:14 15:6 19:11 popr 20:19 portions 9:25 position 8:13 16:16 possibility 11:12,12,14,15	possible 19:14 pre 18:2 precedent 6:15 8:19 18:1 preliminary 4:6,7,17 7:14 9:6 present 2:11 previously 6:10 primary 10:15 10:15 prior 9:7 pro 1:24 problem 5:22 proceedings 1:12 3:2 21:2 22:15 processing 18:16 processor 15:24 prosecution 6:13 7:21 pto 7:20 putting 8:8 <tr> <td data-bbox="492 1354 795 1409" style="text-align: center;">q</td><td data-bbox="492 1409 795 1839"> question 8:1 13:24 questions 19:11 quick 19:20 20:25 quite 8:18 10:7 </td></tr>	q	question 8:1 13:24 questions 19:11 quick 19:20 20:25 quite 8:18 10:7
q	question 8:1 13:24 questions 19:11 quick 19:20 20:25 quite 8:18 10:7		

 r **raise** 20:2 **raised** 8:5 10:16 **read** 20:10 **readily** 7:20 19:8 **reading** 17:18 **reads** 20:7 **really** 12:1,9 19:23 **reason** 7:16 8:23 17:15,25 18:5 **recite** 13:25 **reference** 6:9 6:11,12,19,20 6:20 7:3,4,17 7:19 8:20,20 9:7,19 10:14 10:15,15,23 12:7,8,23 13:24 **reference's** 15:12 **references** 7:7 9:7,25 11:3,3 12:10 **relies** 7:18 9:14 **relog** 14:18 **rely** 7:4 9:21 **remote** 1:11 22:14 **repeat** 17:9 18:2 | **reply** 4:6,7,17 7:14 17:10,21 18:2,5,8,14 19:10 **reporter** 1:24 3:12 22:11 **reporter's** 1:11 **requesting** 4:5 **require** 15:25 16:25 **requires** 14:12 16:24 18:23 20:16 **respect** 17:7 18:4,6 **respond** 4:23 5:20 11:20,21 12:1 17:5 19:15,19 20:18 **response** 8:8 9:6 **rest** 6:1 **review** 7:21 **reviewed** 7:22 **rewind** 15:1 **rid** 4:25 **right** 5:15 7:9 10:12 11:5,6 13:20 17:4 18:25 **roll** 3:13 **rule** 18:1 **ruled** 5:8 **rye** 2:9 |

[samsung - three]

s samsung 1:4,4 3:9,17 22:4,4 saying 6:19 12:14 16:8,18 20:10 says 11:23 15:24,24 17:10 17:13 18:15 screen 12:25 13:16,18 15:10 15:13,13 scroll 10:17 12:10,11 14:2 14:6,11 15:25 16:2,3,5,9 17:11 18:17,20 18:24 scrolled 10:9,9 10:21 11:11,11 11:13,16,16 12:17,18 13:2 13:4,12,17 15:13 scrolling 12:2,3 13:23 15:9,20 15:21 16:5,14 18:19 20:17 second 9:4 10:15 16:12 secondary 7:4 see 3:13 5:15 7:5 14:2 17:25 20:8	seems 16:1 sense 6:25 separate 9:19 several 14:1,2 18:17,20,23 short 5:21 show 9:3 14:8 16:19 shows 11:24 12:6 side 13:16 signature 22:21 similar 10:16 10:23 simply 7:24 13:7 17:21,24 18:2,12,14 single 14:5,6 16:2,2 18:22 19:2 situation 17:21 slyde 1:7 3:9 22:7 solve 7:12 solved 14:23 somebody 20:6 soon 20:24 sorry 15:18 sotera 5:4 sounds 6:18 11:21 12:16 13:10,13 17:8 18:7 south 2:4,9	specifically 10:19 18:16 st 2:12 3:8 start 5:25 6:2 starting 3:14 state 22:11 stated 7:16 18:5 states 1:1 9:20 22:1 stipulation 5:4 street 2:4 stuff 13:19 sub 12:15,15,17 subject 8:14 substantially 9:15,17 10:11 11:24 13:8 suggesting 16:1 18:10 suggests 9:13 suite 2:9 summary 14:25 superior 22:11 support 6:15 sure 10:1 15:2 20:19 swipe 14:5 symptom 4:10 t t 1:24 take 3:13 15:12 taken 22:15 takes 9:8	talk 5:16 12:16 12:20 13:6 talking 15:15 15:16 technical 6:3 9:2 13:21 14:20,22 17:5 teckla 1:24 22:10,21 tell 4:16 8:2 tempore 1:24 term 18:15 testimony 9:21 12:8 20:17 thank 3:16,21 4:20 6:5 9:1,4 19:12,13 20:21 20:22,24 theodore 2:8 thing 10:6 11:23 12:20 13:8 things 11:10 think 4:6 5:19 5:21 8:8,18 12:22,22,24,25 13:10,24 14:7 14:9,24 15:2 16:4,7,10,23 17:1 third 11:15 18:6 three 11:20 13:21,22 15:16 15:18,19
---	--	--	--

[tim - zeros]

tim 2:3 3:20 time 4:24 8:3 15:21 18:22 19:2,9,19 times 16:6 today 3:19 4:22 touch 16:2 20:16 touches 14:10 towards 4:9 trademark 1:1 22:1 transcript 1:12 3:2 20:23 22:14 trial 1:2 22:2 true 22:14 try 20:24 trying 11:19 15:4 18:7 20:2 turn 4:17 two 4:8 7:6,12 8:14 9:2 13:20 15:17 17:5,8 18:4 19:11 type 4:10	understood 5:22,23 18:13 united 1:1 22:1 unrelated 6:24 used 20:4	widgets 10:21 10:21 12:3 windows 14:11 word 20:5 words 18:13,19 18:25 20:4
	v	
	versus 3:9 view 5:9 9:8 14:4 17:17 vs 1:6 22:6	y
		yeah 11:16 13:10 york 2:9
	w	z
	wait 14:17,23 waive 5:13,16 waiving 5:17 want 5:13,21 6:16 8:15 10:6 10:13,19 11:20 12:1,5,9,12,16 12:20 13:6,11 13:14,15 14:7 14:13 15:4,10 15:16,19 16:16 16:20,22 19:18 19:18,20,24,24 20:19 wanted 8:24 9:10,24 11:21 19:22 wants 4:7 17:6 way 15:21 18:13 widget 9:11 15:10	zeros 4:8
u		
under 5:5,7,18 6:8 20:16 understand 3:11 4:3 5:10 6:8 8:13 13:20 18:14 understanding 8:1		