

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

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

IN RE PATENT OF:	)	
	)	U.S. PATENT NO. 9,986,303
	)	PROCEEDING NO. IPR2024-00327
	)	
	)	U.S. PATENT NO. 10,218,995
	)	PROCEEDING NO. IPR2024-00372
	)	
	)	U.S. PATENT NO. 8,090,025
	)	PROCEEDING NO. IPR2024-00374
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO.,	)	
LTD.,	)	HON. REPKO
PETITIONER,	)	HON. ENGELS
V.	)	HON. GERSTENBLITH
	)	
ADVANCED CODING	)	
TECHNOLOGIES, LLC	)	
	)	
Patent Owner.	)	

CERTIFIED COPY

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
TUESDAY, MAY 21, 2024

REPORTED BY: TAMARA HOUSTON, CA CSR 7244, RPR, CCRR 140
REFERENCE NUMBER 39843-0168IP1, 39843-0171IP1, 39843-0172IP1

THE SULLIVAN GROUP OF COURT REPORTERS

1 APPEARANCES:

2

3 FOR THE PETITIONER:

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

FISH & RICHARDSON

BY: NICHOLAS STEPHENS, ESQ.

JEREMY J. MONALDO, ESQ.

WON S. YOON, ESQ.

RISHI GUPTA, ESQ.

1000 Maine Avenue SW

Suite 1000

Washington, DC 20024

(202) 783-5070

bradley@fr.com

FOR THE PATENT OWNER:

FABRICANT LLP

BY: PETER LAMBRIANAKOS, ESQ.

411 Theodore Fremd Avenue

Suite 206 South,

Rye, New York 10580

(646) 797-4353

plambrianakos@fabricantllp.com

--000--

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

I N D E X

MAY 21, 2024

CHRONOLOGICAL AND ALPHABETICAL INDEX OF WITNESSES

NONE

EXHIBITS

NONE

1 **PROCEEDINGS VIA TELEPHONE; TUESDAY, MAY 21, 2024**

2 **--000--**

3 **JUDGE REPKO:** This is conference call for
4 **IPR2024-327, 372, 374. Judge Repko from the Patent**
5 **Trial Appeal Board, and I'm joined by Judges**
6 **Gerstenblith and Engels.**

7 **Let's begin with the appearances.**

8 **Who do we have on the call for Petitioner?**

9 **UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:** Hi, Your Honor -- go
10 **ahead. I'm sorry.**

11 **MR. STEPHENS:** Yes. This is -- this is
12 **Nicholaus Stephens on the phone for -- from Fish &**
13 **Richardson on behalf of Petitioner Samsung. I'm joined**
14 **by my colleagues Jeremy Monaldo, Won Yoon, and**
15 **Rishi Gupta.**

16 **THE COURT:** Is Mr. Gupta authorized here? Is
17 **he --**

18 **MR. STEPHENS:** Yes, he is.

19 **THE COURT:** You're breaking up.

20 **You said that Mr. Gupta is one of the**
21 **attorneys for Petitioner; is that correct?**

22 **MR. STEPHENS:** Rishi Gupta is an attorney for
23 **Samsung.**

24 **THE COURT:** Okay. And then, Mr. Stephens,
25 **you'll be running the call -- or we'll be directing all**

1 questions to you, then?

2 MR. STEPHENS: Thank you. I will be
3 addressing the issues related to IPRs 2024-00327 and
4 00372. And then my colleague, Jeremy Monaldo, would be
5 addressing the third case.

6 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you for that.
7 Do you have a court reporter on the line?

8 MR. STEPHENS: We do.

9 THE COURT: Thank you.

10 MR. GUPTA: This is Rishi Gupta. I was gonna
11 ask -- I was gonna ask -- the court reporter had asked
12 for the spelling of the judges' names, and I was going
13 to try to get that for her.

14 But I don't have it in my file, so I was going
15 to see if we could put that on the record, at least for
16 the court reporter.

17 THE COURT: Sure.

18 MR. GUPTA: Thank you.

19 JUDGE REPKO: Yes.

20 Judge Gerstenblith's name is
21 G-E-R-S-T-E-N-B-L-I-T-H; Judge Engels is E-N-G-E-L-S;
22 and then I'm Judge Repko, R-E-P-K-O.

23 All right. And just a -- how soon can you
24 file the transcript after the call?

25 COURT REPORTER: Your Honor, this is

1 Tamara Houston -- oh, go ahead, Counsel.

2 MR. STEPHENS: Thank you. I'm sure you could
3 fill in a lot better than I. I was going to -- we
4 would, of course, file it as soon as the final
5 transcript is available.

6 COURT REPORTER: Your Honor, this is --

7 MR. STEPHENS: Ms. Houston, I believe, maybe,
8 we ordered for a one-day turnaround on the final
9 transcript.

10 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

11 Who do we have on the call for Patent Owner?

12 MR. LAMBRIANAKOS: Good afternoon, Your Honor.

13 This is Peter Lambrianakos on behalf of the
14 patent owner.

15 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. All right.

16 Well, the purpose of this call is to discuss
17 Petitioner's request to submit a reply to Patent Owner's
18 preliminary response in the three IPRs.

19 From the email, it looks like Patent Owner's
20 request in each case seems to be different, and each
21 case seems to have its own set of issues. So I'd like
22 to take each case one at a time and give each party a
23 chance to respond to the other party's case before we
24 move on to the next one. We'll pause the call
25 momentarily to discuss your arguments with the other

1 judges on the panel.

2 In your email, you noted the number of pages,
3 three, proposed to reply, and we would also like to
4 know, you know, what you think the date should be, as
5 well, if we would decide to grant the request.

6 So we'll proceed in numerical order, and we'll
7 start with the 327 case. So I'll ask that --
8 Petitioner's Counsel, please explain why there is good
9 cause to file a reply here, keeping in mind we don't
10 need to get into the merits of the parties' arguments,
11 and our focus should be on that good-cause standing.

12 With that, Petitioner's Counsel, Mr. Stephens,
13 proceed.

14 MR. STEPHENS: Thank you, Your Honor.

15 In the preliminary response, Patent Owner
16 argues that the Petition should be denied because the
17 prior art allegedly fails to disclose reconstructing
18 video image coding data from the basic video image
19 coding data in the supplementary video image coding
20 data, and this was a limitation that's recited in both
21 Claims 1 and 2 challenged in the Petition.

22 The preliminary response criticizes the
23 Petition for not addressing a construction of the
24 reconstructing limitation that the parties agreed to in
25 co-pending litigation in the Eastern District of Texas.

1 Our request is five pages to reply to Patent
2 Owner's arguments in this regard, and in the reply, we
3 would plan to address how the analysis in the Petition
4 and the cited prior art satisfies the parties'
5 agreed-upon construction from the litigation and,
6 relatedly, reasons that Patent Owners' application of
7 that construction in relation to basic and supplementary
8 video image coding data are inconsistent with certain
9 teachings in the '303 patent itself.

10 We respectfully submit that good cause exists
11 for a reply here because the construction referenced in
12 the POPR only arose after the Petition was filed. I'm
13 not personally a member of Samsung's litigation team,
14 but we have consulted with the litigation team to better
15 understand the history of this construction that was
16 agreed to in the ED Texas proceeding.

17 And, from my understanding, I do believe that
18 the timeline of events related to claim construction in
19 the litigation showed that Samsung could not have
20 reasonably addressed that construction at the time the
21 Petition was filed. But with -- I guess I could briefly
22 walk through the timeline of events in the litigation.

23 On January 5th, earlier this year, Samsung
24 filed its Petition for inter partes review of the '303
25 patent in this proceeding. Shortly thereafter, on

1 January 9th, the parties exchanged terms for
2 construction. And notably, Samsung, like Patent Owner,
3 indicated that there were no terms that required
4 construction for the 3- -- '303 patent.

5 About a month later, on February 6th, the
6 parties exchanged preliminary constructions, at which
7 time Samsung indicated, along with the patent owner,
8 that plain meaning should apply to the reconstructing
9 limitation.

10 It wasn't until March 5th, which is when the
11 parties filed a joint claim construction statement with
12 the Court, which is a statement that Patent Owner has
13 cited -- I believe it's Exhibit 273 in the IPR where we
14 see the agreed-to construction of the reconstructing
15 limitation, which, again, is referenced in the
16 preliminary response.

17 But I can't speak to specifics as to why the
18 parties agreed to this construction. I would note that
19 there was another defendant involved in the litigation
20 who had proposed constructions for the '303 patent. But
21 we believe the circumstances here are similar to those
22 in IPR 2024-00062 involving another patent in the same
23 litigation between the parties where the Board, last
24 month, authorized pre-institution briefing to address
25 another construction that arose in the litigation after

1 the Petition was filed, and we respectfully would
2 request similar relief here.

3 I'm sure if the Board authorized, Petitioner
4 would not oppose a sur-reply correspondingly to the
5 reply from the patent owner.

6 THE COURT: Just to kind of clarify, so the
7 Petition offered no constructions, only plain and
8 ordinary meaning.

9 So are you going to discuss the plain and
10 ordinary meaning in your reply? Is that your proposal?

11 MR. STEPHENS: Our proposal would be to
12 address how the prior art satisfies the construction the
13 parties agreed to in the litigation.

14 THE COURT: Okay. The construction, as the
15 parties agreed to -- is that consistent with the
16 construction with which you said in the Petition, or is
17 this sort of a new theory?

18 MR. STEPHENS: We would not be advancing any
19 new theories. It's the -- the preliminary response
20 indicated that reconstructing requires a rearranging,
21 for example, and we would like to show that that's
22 consistent with the arguments in the mappings, the
23 theories that were advanced in the Petition.

24 THE COURT: Okay. So let me give Patent Owner
25 an opportunity to respond if you don't have anything

1 further on that.

2 Are you -- is there something you wanted to
3 add to that, Petitioner? Mr. Stephens?

4 MR. STEPHENS: Nothing further from us. Of
5 course, we're happy to take any questions from Your
6 Honors.

7 THE COURT: So the construction -- I guess, if
8 panel members want to kind of clarify, are these
9 constructions the plain and ordinary meaning that you're
10 proposing to put in your reply?

11 MR. STEPHENS: I believe we are -- we are
12 addressing the construction that was referenced in the
13 preliminary response. I believe that construction is
14 consistent with the plain and ordinary meaning. I don't
15 know that it was characterized that way in the
16 litigation. It may or may not have been. I just -- I'm
17 not aware.

18 But, regardless, the theories that we would be
19 advancing are the same as those in the Petition, and
20 we're not attempting to, you know, advance something
21 materially different from what was in the Petition.

22 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

23 So with that, Counsel for Patent Owner, I'd
24 like to hear your response to that.

25 MR. LAMBRIANAKOS: Thank you, Your Honor.

1 Our view here is that what Samsung seems to do
2 is to present a new argument based on the agreed
3 construction as to how the prior art meets the -- the
4 reconstructing limitation.

5 The reconstructing limitation that -- that was
6 addressed by the agreed construction is one which has a
7 construction based on the disclosure in the
8 specification. In other words, the construction is not
9 a plain and ordinary meaning construction, but it is one
10 which relies, under Phillips, on the multiple areas of
11 disclosure that the reconstruction, which is claimed, is
12 one which involves rearranging the video image coding
13 data rather than changing or adding the data, which is
14 what the prior art discloses.

15 And so the only way for Samsung to address the
16 construction, which was agreed by the parties in
17 litigation, is to present a new argument as to how the
18 references show not just a reconstruction as they
19 interpreted it in the Petition, but what shows a
20 rearrangement as disclosed in the portions of the
21 specifications that were ultimately relied upon in the
22 agreed constructions.

23 So we don't -- we don't view this as an
24 attempt by Samsung simply to address plain and ordinary
25 meaning to maintain the same position that it took in

1 its Petition, but to pivot on its argument with respect
2 to this limitation to take into account the agreed
3 construction.

4 Now, they argue that they didn't propose this
5 term for construction on January 5th, which was four
6 days before they filed -- I'm sorry -- on January 9th,
7 which was four days after they filed the Petition, but
8 their co-defendant with whom, from all we can tell,
9 they've been cooperating with throughout the case until
10 LG settled, you know, did propose it. And, you know,
11 based on the fact that, you know, that other defense
12 counsel proposed that term, and based on what they
13 should have understood from the intrinsic record as
14 potentially being limited in some way by the
15 specification, it was incumbent upon them to take that
16 into account in formulating the arguments in their
17 Petition and to present an argument either in lieu of or
18 as a backup argument to what they proposed in the
19 Petition.

20 Instead, they just went with the plain and
21 ordinary meaning, and they went with a -- with an
22 understanding of the claim term that is inconsistent
23 with the intrinsic record.

24 And, so, you know, our view is that this is an
25 attempt to pivot, to change arguments, to -- to respond

1 to a plain construction position, which they should have
2 anticipated in exercise of normal diligence in reviewing
3 the intrinsic record. And that's why we oppose.

4 THE COURT: Okay. I don't have any further
5 questions. I'm just going to check with my colleagues
6 to make sure that they don't.

7 I'm going to give Petitioner an opportunity to
8 respond to that.

9 MR. STEPHENS: Thank you, Your Honor. Just a
10 few quick --

11 THE COURT: Just a second. I'm going to give
12 you a chance to respond to that, but I'd like to confer
13 with my colleagues for a moment just to make sure they
14 don't have any further questions.

15 Thank you.

16 MR. STEPHENS: Thank you.

17 (Pause on the record.)

18 THE COURT: No further questions for Patent
19 Owner at this time.

20 Petitioner, I'll give you a chance to respond
21 here.

22 Go ahead.

23 MR. STEPHENS: Thank you. I'd just like to
24 quickly revisit the timeline from the litigation.

25 There was, I think, a suggestion from Patent

1 Owner's Counsel that there may have been -- that we
2 should have been aware -- Samsung should have been aware
3 of a construction that another defendant in the
4 litigation might raise.

5 Again, we filed the Petition on January 5th.
6 Four days later, on January 9th, we identified no terms
7 for construction. And then a month later, on
8 February 6th, Samsung continued to advance, expressly,
9 plain meaning in the litigation.

10 So, you know, at the time the Petition was
11 filed and thereafter, we continue to believe that plain
12 meaning was the proper understanding of this term in the
13 litigation and in the IPR.

14 And, secondly, I would say there's no attempt
15 to pivot here. We do want to address this construction
16 that was referenced. It's the basis of Patent Owner's
17 arguments in the preliminary response since we could not
18 have foreseen it or addressed it in the Petition at the
19 time it was filed. You know, part of the reason that we
20 do want to address the construction is because of some,
21 you know, misstatements or mischaracterizations, in our
22 view, of the '303 patent that informs Patent Owner's
23 application of that construction. And so we'd like to
24 point those out to the Board so that we can show how the
25 prior art satisfied under either plain meaning or the

1 construction that was referenced in the POPR.

2 THE COURT: Well, just -- specifically, are
3 you proposing that the Board adopt the constructions
4 that you're prepared to discuss in your reply?

5 MR. STEPHENS: We don't think it's necessary.
6 Again, we cited in the Petition, the Wellman case, which
7 stands for the -- as I'm sure Your Honors know, the
8 proposition that trends only needs to be construed to
9 the extent there's a controversy, but we don't believe
10 that construction is necessary. It's the Patent Owner
11 who raised it in the preliminary response, and we'd just
12 like an opportunity to address that.

13 THE COURT: You adopted that construction in
14 district court; the one you're prepared to discuss in
15 your reply?

16 MR. STEPHENS: The parties agreed to that
17 construction in the district court, that's correct.

18 THE COURT: Okay. And It's your position that
19 here we don't need to construe that term because it's
20 not going to be at-issue with respect to the art?

21 MR. STEPHENS: That's correct, Your Honor.

22 THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to confer with my
23 colleagues quickly to see if they have any further
24 questions for you before I move on to Patent Owner.

25 (Pause on the record.)

1 THE COURT: Can you just elaborate a little
2 bit more on why you believe that it's not an issue here?
3 That -- you know, the construction. Because if I
4 understood you correctly, you said that, you know, we
5 don't need to construe it. You want to discuss it in
6 your reply, but we don't need to construe it because
7 it's not an issue.

8 But can you kind of elaborate on that a little
9 bit more for me, specifically, why you don't think it's
10 an issue?

11 MR. STEPHENS: Well, yes, Your Honor.

12 The -- in the POPR, the Board -- the Patent
13 Owner references the construction that the parties
14 agreed to in the litigation, and on that basis, they
15 argued -- they attempt to distinguish the prior art.

16 In applying that construction, they make
17 certain assertions about what it means, for example, to
18 rearrange basic and supplementary video image cutting
19 data, "rearranging" being the term in the construction,
20 and they make certain assertions about what constitutes
21 basic and supplementary video image coding data that's
22 referenced to the to the '303 specification.

23 We believe there are embodiments that are
24 described in the '303 patent that are inconsistent with
25 the patent owner's application of that construction, and

1 so we would like to ensure that the construction is, you
2 know -- to the extent it's applied, properly applied.
3 In that respect, we would show how the prior art, the
4 same embodiment, the same mappings that we had in the
5 Petition would meet that construction both under plain
6 meaning and, I guess, you know, more importantly, under
7 the construction that was agreed to in the litigation
8 under a proper understanding of reconstructing and
9 rearranging.

10 THE COURT: I want to drill down a little bit
11 more. You're asking for briefing on this, and it does
12 sound like it is at-issue. It's -- you know, you're
13 asking for briefing that was discussed in the Patent
14 Owner response. It kind of suggests that you are -- you
15 do believe that it is at-issue, right? I think I just
16 -- I heard you say that we don't need to construe it at
17 all.

18 So I guess I just want to know what kind of
19 struggles there --

20 MR. STEPHENS: I'll clarify. It is at-issue
21 insofar as whether the plain -- plain meaning is adopted
22 or the argument in the preliminary or the construction
23 of the preliminary response is adopted.

24 Then Patent Owner's arguments, we believe, are
25 inconsistent with the specification of the '303 patent.

1 So I think it -- what I intended to say was it not being
2 at issue was that prior art satisfies either plain
3 meaning understanding or the construction advanced in
4 the preliminary response, and yet we would like to
5 address what we see as mischaracterizations of the '303
6 patent and the construction in the reply to the POPR.

7 You know, I can give specific examples if that
8 would be helpful.

9 THE COURT: Mm-hmm. I guess you're -- you
10 agree with the district court construction, or are you
11 saying that it's incorrect?

12 And if you don't agree with it, then why?

13 MR. STEPHENS: We do not agree with Patent
14 Owner's characterization or application of that
15 construction. And so I think that's where the dispute
16 is.

17 We, of course, agree to that construction --

18 THE COURT: I just want to ask -- so the -- I
19 didn't ask whether you agreed with the Patent Owner's
20 characterization; I wanted to know if you agree with the
21 district court -- the construction of the district court
22 and whether this construction should apply here
23 specifically.

24 MR. STEPHENS: We do. Yes, Your Honor. We
25 would have no problem with the Board applying that

1 construction here. We would just, you know, like it to
2 be applied how we -- how we believe it's proper. We
3 don't disagree with that.

4 THE COURT: You do not disagree with it.
5 Okay.

6 Just a moment.

7 (Pause on the record.)

8 THE COURT: Okay. Patent Owner, I'm going to
9 give you a chance to respond to that before we kind of
10 wrap things up, so go ahead.

11 MR. LAMBRIANAKOS: Well, I note our -- our --
12 I note the fact that, you know -- that Samsung agrees
13 with the construction that Samsung agreed to in the
14 district court is a positive thing. But I note that
15 that construction was foreseeable at the time that this
16 was filed, based on the intrinsic record, and that the
17 only purpose for a reply, at this point, since the
18 Petition does not discuss rearrangement -- it only
19 discusses a reconstruction by combination of data --
20 that, in order for Samsung to address this agreed
21 construction, it will have to present new arguments. It
22 won't be able to rely on the arguments that were in the
23 Petition since they don't discuss rearrangement.

24 And so, you know, we don't believe that
25 there's good cause to basically have a do-over of a

1 portion of the Petition based on a foreseeable
2 construction.

3 THE COURT: Thank you.

4 Well, how -- how was the construction
5 foreseeable, in your view?

6 MR. LAMBRIANAKOS: It's foreseeable because,
7 you know, in conducting claim construction, and
8 particularly in preparing an IPR petition, since it's
9 the burden of the Petitioner to state how this claim
10 should be construed, one would assume that that would
11 include scouring the intrinsic record, determining what
12 the support is for the claim limitation. And if the
13 support indicates that the term "reconstructing" was
14 meant by the inventor to be a rearrangement or
15 rearranging, then, you know -- with the knowledge that a
16 petition is supposed to be -- contain all of the
17 arguments associated with the validity challenge and
18 include all claim construction arguments, that Samsung
19 would have said, "Well, you know, looks like this
20 may" -- "may be narrower than a broad claim of meaning
21 situation, and so let's propose that, in the
22 alternative, if rearranging is required, here's how the
23 prior art references disclosed rearranging."

24 You're talking about attorneys who are in the
25 same law firm as the attorneys who are representing

1 Samsung in the litigation. Presumably, those lawyers
2 were looking over this -- you know, the record for some
3 time before proposing plain and ordinary meaning in the
4 district court. You know, many times, that's proposed
5 early on with the knowledge that, ultimately, that
6 position is going to be different, and, you know...

7 So there should -- there should have been
8 sufficient knowledge on behalf of Samsung across its
9 teams that the -- that the patent -- the '303 patent
10 very likely would require a
11 narrower-than-plain-and-ordinary interpretation or
12 construction of the reconstructing term.

13 So we think it's foreseeable when, you know --
14 when you have a claim construction or a claim term that
15 has significant specification evidence that bears on how
16 it ought to be understood by a person of ordinary skill.

17 THE COURT: Thank you.

18 I'm going to confer with my colleagues. Just
19 a moment.

20 (Pause on the record.)

21 THE COURT: Okay. So the panel has no further
22 questions at this time about the 327 case. So we'll
23 take the matter under advisement and issue an order in
24 due course.

25 And so let's move on to the 372 case.

1 Mr. Stephens, if you can explain why there's
2 good cause to file a reply in the 372 case.

3 MR. STEPHENS: Thank you, Your Honor.

4 We are requesting leave to file a two-page
5 reply to the preliminary response in this proceeding to
6 respond to certain statements that patent owner made in
7 its preliminary response regarding the prior art in its
8 arguments for Claim Elements 2.4, 2.5.22, and 2.6.

9 We believe good cause exists because Patent
10 Owner's statement are inconsistent with portions of the
11 references that were cited in the Petition but,
12 nonetheless, not addressed in the POPR, and it was
13 unforeseeable that Patent Owner would overlook these
14 teachings or advanced positions contrary to those
15 teachings without addressing them in their arguments.

16 Our goal with this request is simply to
17 clarify the record and bring pertinent facts from the
18 Petition in the prior art to the Board's attention,
19 which we hope would be helpful in Your Honors'
20 deliberations on institution. We believe the record
21 would benefit from limited briefing on these issues.

22 And, again, we're not opposed to a sur-reply
23 of the same length from Patent Owner.

24 THE COURT: So is there any new developments
25 in this case that happened after the Petition that

1 necessitates a reply? Something that went on in
2 District Court or a new case issued or something?

3 MR. STEPHENS: I don't think the issues here
4 turn on any constructions or developments in the
5 litigation. I think the -- what we believe was
6 unforeseeable was that the arguments in the preliminary
7 response didn't address some pertinent teachings in the
8 prior art, and we'd like to identify those for
9 Your Honors.

10 THE COURT: Okay. Is -- you basically
11 disagree with their arguments, essentially; is that a
12 fair characterization?

13 MR. STEPHENS: It's not so much that we
14 would -- we do disagree with the arguments, but I think
15 the nature of it is not a disagreement over the
16 characterization of the teachings, but rather that the
17 arguments advanced in the preliminary response were
18 incomplete. And so while we wouldn't disagree with the
19 portions cited in the preliminary response, we think
20 there are other relevant factors to consider.

21 THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to pause to
22 discuss with my colleagues just momentarily, see if they
23 have any further questions, and I'll give Patent Owners
24 a chance to respond to that.

25 Thanks.

1 (Pause on the record.)

2 THE COURT: We have no further questions,
3 Mr. Stephens, at this time.

4 Patent Owner, I just want to give you a chance
5 to respond with regard...

6 MR. LAMBRIANAKOS: Thank you, Your Honor.

7 We view this request as -- as a desire to put
8 in a garden-variety reply looking to shore up arguments
9 and -- to address the weaknesses in the arguments that
10 we pointed out in our POPR. You know, we contend that
11 they misapplied the references. We pointed that out.

12 And, you know, they basically are telling us
13 that they didn't foresee what we would say, which, to
14 us, means simply that they didn't foresee that there
15 were certain weaknesses in their own arguments. That is
16 not the kind of unforeseeability that gives rise to good
17 cause.

18 So, you know, our belief is that if -- if a
19 reply is appropriate in this case, then it's appropriate
20 in virtually every case where, you know, the POPR points
21 to weaknesses in the application of references to the --
22 to the claim.

23 So we don't believe that good cause is
24 approached here by this request, and we think it should
25 be denied.

1 THE COURT: Thank you.

2 Give Petitioner a chance to respond to that.

3 Mr. Stephens?

4 MR. STEPHENS: Thank you, Your Honors.

5 We -- our view is that the POPR did not point
6 to weaknesses in the Petition. The POPR, instead,
7 advanced arguments that were inconsistent with certain
8 teachings in the references, and we believe that was
9 unforeseeable. And, for that reason, we think a short
10 reply is warranted here.

11 THE COURT: Okay. I'm just -- in terms of
12 timing, too, I didn't hear your timing for the first one
13 in the 327 case and for this one.

14 For each of those, I mean, what's a -- how
15 quickly should we be turning these around in terms of
16 once the orders issue or we rule on this? How many days
17 do you need to prepare the reply?

18 MR. STEPHENS: Petitioner would be prepared to
19 file replies within a week of the Board's authorization.

20 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. I don't have
21 any further questions from the panel on that.

22 Patent Owner, is a week good for you, as well?
23 For the -- give a week for each party for each -- the
24 327 and the 372.

25 Do you have anything further to add?

1 MR. LAMBRIANAKOS: Nothing further to add. I
2 think one week for each would be sufficient for Patent
3 Owner.

4 THE COURT: Okay. Just give me a moment.
5 (Pause on the record.)

6 THE COURT: All right. Let's move on to the
7 last IPR here, this 374 case.

8 Mr. Maldonado, you can speak for Petitioner
9 and explain why you believe a -- good cause for a reply
10 in this case.

11 MR. MONALDO: Thank you, Your Honor.

12 And I'll also start by clarifying that we're
13 seeking a seven-page brief that we could file within one
14 week, and that brief would address three issues under
15 our proposal.

16 The first issue relates to the construction of
17 the term "border motion vector data." Similar to the
18 reconstructing limitation in the '303 patent, the
19 construction of this term arose in the litigation after
20 the Petition was filed. We'd like briefing to explain
21 why the analysis in the Petition and the cited prior art
22 satisfies the construction of this term that was
23 advanced in the preliminary response.

24 THE COURT: Before you go on, is this -- I'd
25 just like to make sure we hit the same issues you did in

1 the other one, including that are kind of relevant to
2 the panel. We'd like to know if you agree with that
3 construction and whether we should apply here.

4 So go ahead. Proceed.

5 MR. MONALDO: Thank you, Your Honor.

6 I think our position is exactly the same as
7 what Mr. Stephens mentioned. We don't believe a connect
8 construction is actually necessary because we don't
9 think that the prior art's disclosure turns on
10 construction. We think it's sufficiently narrowed to
11 address both the plain and ordinary meaning of the term,
12 as well as the construction that was agreed to in the
13 litigation, and we specifically just want a brief to
14 explain why.

15 We do agree with the construction. It was
16 advanced in the litigation, but we also think the prior
17 art renders that construction obvious, and, therefore,
18 Your Honors would not necessarily need to resolve the
19 construction to resolve the dispute.

20 In terms of --

21 THE COURT: Thank you.

22 MR. MONALDO: So, essentially, I think -- you
23 know, I don't want to repeat the positions that
24 Mr. Stephens raised. I think the good cause here is,
25 you know, largely the same as the good cause in the '303

1 construction.

2 I would add one point as to foreseeability.
3 I'll note that in Patent Owner's initial proposal in the
4 litigation, both for the reconstructing limitation in
5 the '303 patent and then this limitation in the '025
6 patent, the Patent Owner proposed plain and ordinary
7 meaning. So, at that time, the construction was not
8 foreseeable or necessary to Patent Owner, and the
9 construction only developed after a complex negotiation
10 amongst three parties of the litigation that didn't
11 resolve until months after the Petition was filed.

12 So just to reiterate, we don't think the
13 construction was foreseeable, and, as a consequence, we
14 think there's good cause to address it in a reply.

15 Unless Your Honor has any more questions on
16 that issue, I could turn to the second issue in our --
17 our request.

18 THE COURT: Are the district court
19 constructions as basically to the plain and ordinary
20 meaning? Is that -- in this -- for the border motion
21 vector data?

22 MR. MONALDO: No. There was an agreed-to
23 construction in the district court for that term. I
24 don't have it at my fingertips, but it is not the plain
25 and ordinary meaning, Your Honor.

1 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

2 MR. MONALDO: All right. Great.

3 So our second request relates to the
4 construction of the term "satisfies Poisson's Equation."
5 That's not in the claims of the '025 patent. In the
6 preliminary response, Patent Owner construes this term
7 to mean "without mathematically solving Poisson's
8 Equation with a huge amount of calculation."

9 We view this construction as being
10 inconsistent with constructions advanced in the
11 litigation and also inconsistent with the '025 patent,
12 which discloses an embodiment that calculates a solution
13 to Poisson's Equation. We'd like briefing to address
14 this construction and point the Board to the relevant
15 disclosure in the '025 patent that confirms that Patent
16 Owner's construction is incorrect. We don't believe
17 this construction was foreseeable. It wasn't raised at
18 all in the litigation.

19 And the reason we don't think it was
20 foreseeable is because there's examples in the patent
21 that specifically contradict it, and, therefore, we did
22 not perceive this as being something that was
23 foreseeable and, as such, good cause would be available
24 to address this construction in a reply.

25 If Your Honors have any questions on that

1 issue, I'm happy to take them, but otherwise would turn
2 to the third aspect of our request.

3 THE COURT: All right. I don't have any
4 further questions.

5 MR. MONALDO: So our third request relates to
6 Patent Owner's 325(d) argument.

7 In the preliminary response, you'll see that
8 Patent Owner argues that the Saito reference that's used
9 in the Petition is substantially similar to the Yamatani
10 reference cited in an IDF during prosecution. We'd like
11 briefing to address these arguments and to explain why
12 the prosecution history does not indicate that the
13 examiner considered the disclosure in the Yamatani
14 reference in the same way the Saito reference is being
15 used in the Petition.

16 Specifically, the Saito reference is being
17 used in combination with Walla and Shirani, two
18 references that were not considered at all during
19 prosecution. Also, if you take a look at the
20 prosecution history, the '025 patent was allowed with an
21 examiner's amendment in the first action allowance, and
22 the amended claim language did not reference Poisson's
23 Equation. Although, the examiner listed the Poisson's
24 Equation limitation and the reasons for allowance, the
25 examiner listed almost the entire claim, and there is no

1 indication in the record that the examiner actually
2 considered disclosure from Yamatani relative to
3 Poisson's Equation and found Yamatani's disclosure
4 deficient.

5 It's these types of points we'd like to
6 address in the requested briefing, and we believe good
7 cause exists to address them because we could not
8 anticipate or foresee the discretionary denial arguments
9 raised by Patent Owner.

10 THE COURT: Essentially, though, do your
11 arguments depend on new case that came after the
12 Petition, or are you basically going to argue it still
13 under the same framework you did when you filed the
14 Petition?

15 MR. MONALDO: I'm not aware of any new case
16 that came after the Petition, Your Honor. It would be
17 the same framework -- or same legal framework. The
18 arguments that Patent Owner advanced and how they're
19 comparing the Yamatani reference to the Saito reference,
20 these are two different papers. We don't believe that
21 was foreseeable, and that we should have an opportunity
22 to address that argument given it implicates
23 discretionary considerations.

24 THE COURT: Which you did address
25 discretionary denial in the Petition, though, right? I

1 think there was, like, two or three pages on that.

2 MR. MONALDO: We did, Your Honor. Yes.

3 THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to just confer
4 with my colleagues briefly before I give Patent Owner a
5 chance to respond.

6 (Pause on the record.)

7 THE COURT: There's no further questions from
8 the panel on that.

9 Patent Owner, would you like to respond to
10 Petitioner?

11 MR. LAMBRIANAKOS: Yes, Your Honor, I would.
12 Thank you.

13 With respect to the first issue, which is the
14 border motion vector data construction, the timeline
15 here is -- is really important.

16 So this Petition was filed on the 8th of
17 January, and on the 9th of January, Samsung proposed
18 that "border motion vector data" should be construed,
19 did not propose that plain and ordinary meaning should
20 apply.

21 So at the time that this Petition was
22 submitted, Samsung knew that plain and ordinary meaning
23 was not appropriate for this claim term, and yet that is
24 the petition [sic] that they took in the Petition --
25 that is the position they took in the Petition.

1 They proposed the construction ultimately.
2 There was an agreement. The agreement was actually to
3 the construction that Patent Owner and Plaintiff
4 proposed in the litigation.

5 And so the idea that -- that the agreed
6 construction was not foreseeable on January 8th when
7 Samsung knew that it was not going to propose plain and
8 ordinary meaning in the litigation on January 9th does
9 not hold water, in our view.

10 The Poisson's Equation issue -- both parties
11 proposed that the "satisfies Poisson's Equation" term
12 should be construed. Again, Samsung proposed that claim
13 term the day after it -- the day after this Petition was
14 submitted. There -- that claim term remained in
15 dispute. It was argued in court last week in the
16 district court on that issue. And so whatever --
17 whatever the result of that argument is, it won't be
18 plain and ordinary meaning. It won't be consistent
19 with -- consistent with the plain and ordinary meaning.
20 In fact, at some point, Samsung argued that the term was
21 indefinite in the district court.

22 So, certainly, the constructions that we set
23 out or constructions like them should have been
24 anticipated. It should have been considered. Samsung
25 should at least have set out its own positions on what

1 these terms mean since they knew plain and ordinary
2 meaning should not apply, but yet they submitted a
3 Petition presumably thinking that if anything were to
4 change, they could simply come back to the Board and ask
5 for a reply. But that's not unforeseeable. In fact, it
6 seems more like strategy than unforeseeability.

7 So for those two matters, Your Honor, we don't
8 believe there's good cause for additional argument.

9 With respect to the discretionary denial
10 issue, you know, our position is that the reference that
11 is relied on, the Saito reference, is one which simply
12 cites to the same Saito reference, which is in the
13 specification which was considered already by the patent
14 office. It cites to a portion of the Saito reference,
15 which is in the -- in the specification for, you know --
16 it cites for a portion which is expressly relied on in
17 the specification.

18 And so this is an attempt, you know, to -- to,
19 you know, address an issue which should have been
20 addressed up front. They knew that they were relying on
21 Saito. They knew that Saito, that they were relying on,
22 referenced that -- that which was in the specification.
23 And so any arguments that they had for why 325(d)
24 shouldn't apply should have been addressed in the
25 Petition. There's -- nothing has arisen since that time

1 which gives rise to good cause for another paper.

2 So for those reasons, Your Honor, we oppose a
3 reply with respect to Petition '374.

4 THE COURT: Thank you. I'm going to consult
5 with my other panel members to see if they have any
6 questions, and I'll move on to see if Petitioner has a
7 response.

8 (Pause on the record.)

9 THE COURT: We have no further questions for
10 Patent Owner.

11 Petitioner, would you like to respond to that
12 in particular? I think the panel is interested in the
13 timing of it all, as Patent Owner's Counsel points out,
14 and just kind of see in terms of -- you know, the
15 Petition says "plain and ordinary meaning" and the
16 district court construction is not plain and ordinary
17 meaning, can you kind of address that, as well?

18 MR. MONALDO: Yeah. Thank you, Your Honor.

19 I'll start by just saying, in terms of the
20 timing, we did list this term as one that could be
21 construed to preserve our rights in the litigation.
22 That did occur shortly after the Petition was filed.

23 But I'll also note that the parties, over
24 about a month -- about a month after the Petition was
25 filed, exchanged constructions. I don't think anybody

1 proposed the construction that was ultimately agreed to
2 at that time. And, in fact, Patent Owner proposed plain
3 and ordinary meaning itself at that instant in time.
4 That response, the way I understand it -- I wasn't
5 involved in negotiations, but I understand it was a
6 response in negotiation of what these terms should mean:
7 A proposal by Samsung, a proposal by GE, a modified
8 proposal by Patent Owner, and, ultimately, this
9 construction was resolved and agreed to by the parties
10 in a manner that was not plain and ordinary meaning.

11 We don't think that was foreseeable at all
12 because it was, you know, not foreseeable until -- it
13 wasn't foreseeable in February a month after the
14 Petition was filed. Given all of the disputes amongst
15 the parties, it wasn't resolved until later on into
16 March after there had been, I think, several rounds of
17 discussion and negotiation.

18 So we don't think that was foreseeable, and we
19 don't think the timing is something that we could have
20 been able to address in our Petition given -- given the
21 bar date and the need to get the Petition on file.

22 As to the construction that satisfies
23 Poisson's Equation, I'll simply reiterate that Patent
24 Owner mentions that there are multiple constructions,
25 but none of those construction litigation was the one

1 that was advanced in the preliminary response, so we'd
2 like briefing to explain how that's inconsistent and how
3 it's inconsistent with the examples in the
4 specification.

5 As Counsel mentioned, there was a claim
6 construction hearing last week, and the preliminary
7 construction of the term "Poisson's Equation" was simply
8 that for -- for Poisson's Equation be true, which is
9 essentially the plain and ordinary meaning of the term.
10 And we think that is the correct construction, and we'd
11 like to advance why in our briefing.

12 And then --

13 THE COURT: On that point -- just before you
14 move on with the equations -- I mean, let's say we
15 could, you know, figure out whether that's inconsistent
16 and figure out whether it's a mischaracterization
17 ourselves.

18 Is there any specific reason that we should
19 grant briefing on the -- other reason that makes you
20 think that it satisfies -- we should construe satisfies
21 Poisson's Equation? I mean, if it's just
22 inconsistencies and mischaracterizations, that could be
23 something that the Board could resolve itself and
24 doesn't need briefing on.

25 MR. MONALDO: I think we'd like briefing

1 because Patent Owner has had the opportunity to provide
2 briefing and identify portions of the '025 patent that
3 it believes supports the construction advanced in its
4 preliminary response.

5 We didn't have an opportunity to reply to
6 that, and so we believe there's other portions of
7 disclosure that are inconsistent and would -- would
8 appreciate the Board -- the opportunity to point those
9 portions of specification out to Your Honors to make
10 your life easier in identifying why the construction is
11 inappropriate.

12 THE COURT: Okay.

13 And on the border motion vector data, I mean,
14 are you going to say in the briefing something to the
15 effect of what is the plain and ordinary meaning and if
16 there is a plain and ordinary meaning, in your view?

17 MR. MONALDO: Yes, Your Honor. Our plan is to
18 stick with what's in the Petition. We're not going to
19 turn to different embodiments, not to make new arguments
20 or anything like that. Just offer explanation about
21 what was set forth in the Petition and why that
22 satisfies both the plain and ordinary meaning and the
23 construction that was agreed to in the litigation.

24 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. I don't have
25 further questions on that.

1 Go on to the last issue.

2 MR. MONALDO: The last issue I'll say while we
3 did address 325(d) in our Petition, we addressed in a
4 way that simply noted that none of the references that
5 were included in our Petition were actually cited or
6 considered during prosecution. The Saito reference was
7 not one of the references that was considered during
8 prosecution. It wasn't listed on the face of the
9 patent. Patent Owner has, in its preliminary response,
10 tried to equate that reference to the Yamatani
11 reference, and so we specifically --

12 THE COURT: You don't need to get into the
13 merits of that. Yeah. I mean, regardless of what the
14 merits of the arguments are, these are arguments that
15 you advanced in the Petition, correct? Like, you've
16 kind of explained what was going on with respect to
17 325(d). You went through the two-factor analysis.

18 I mean, is there anything further that you're
19 going to add to that, without getting into the merits of
20 those arguments, in this briefing?

21 MR. MONALDO: Yes, Your Honor. And it's the
22 specific pointing to this Yamatani reference in its
23 consideration and the prosecution.

24 We did not perceive the argument that that
25 reference is substantially similar to the one that we

1 use in the Petition, and, as a consequence, we are going
2 to talk about that reference in particular in a way that
3 we didn't do in the Petition.

4 THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to pause here to
5 see if my colleagues have any further questions, and
6 I'll see if Patent Owner wants to respond to that.

7 (Pause on the record.)

8 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. The panel has
9 no further questions for Petitioner's Counsel at this
10 time.

11 We're going give Patent Owner a chance to
12 respond to what they just heard, and then we're going to
13 wrap up.

14 So Patent Owner, feel free. If you have
15 anything further, go ahead.

16 MR. LAMBRIANAKOS: Thank you, Your Honor.

17 I just want to point out here that the focus
18 on whether it was foreseeable that these two terms,
19 "border motion vector data" and "satisfying Poisson's
20 Equation," would be construed, according to the plain
21 and ordinary meaning or not, focuses on the Petitioner.

22 The Petitioner has stated its position as of
23 the 8th of January in this -- in this tribunal that
24 those terms should be entitled to the plain and ordinary
25 meaning, and that's how validity should be assessed in

1 this case.

2 But, clearly, that position was one which they
3 were not wedded to because in the district court at
4 virtually the same time, they said the opposite. They
5 said that those terms should be construed.

6 And so, you know, obviously the policy is
7 against having differing constructions for the same
8 terms for the same patents in different proceedings; a
9 broader one for invalidity purposes, and a narrower one
10 for infringement purposes.

11 Samsung knew the risk of taking two different
12 positions. They didn't -- they didn't hedge that
13 position at all. They didn't allow for any additional
14 argument or provide additional argument, should their
15 litigation position ultimately be adopted by the Court
16 or agreed to by the parties in the litigation.

17 They made that choice. That was a calculation
18 that was made at the time. No question. And now we're
19 here being told that somehow -- based on the Plaintiff's
20 position of plain and ordinary meaning, or -- or in the
21 case of Poisson's Equation, that it might be construed
22 differently -- somehow bears on the question of whether
23 Samsung should have -- should have foreseen that a
24 different, narrower construction would have been --
25 would have been adopted.

1 You know, even if they didn't know exactly
2 what the district court was going to do, certainly they
3 were going to be a major driver in whatever that
4 construction was going to be, and they could have
5 addressed it, even if it weren't exactly the
6 construction that were adopted, something that is
7 similar and that takes into account the same intrinsic
8 record that's considered in the district court.

9 And so our position is that, you know, this --
10 rather than being unforeseeable, this is exactly what
11 one would have foreseen in Samsung's position, given the
12 timing of the events around the time of the filing of
13 this Petition.

14 We don't think that that is good cause. We
15 don't think that good cause means very much if it means
16 that, you know, you get a back-up position later on
17 should things not work out in the way that you had
18 hoped.

19 So, in our view, good cause is not met with
20 respect to the first two items.

21 I don't have any further argument with respect
22 to the 325(d) issue.

23 THE COURT: Thank you. I'm going to confer
24 with my colleagues, and then I'll get back to you to see
25 if we have any further questions.

1 (Pause on the record.)

2 THE COURT: All right. So with respect to
3 both '372 and '374, we're going to take the matter under
4 advisement and issue an order in due course. So unless
5 there are any questions from the parties, we're going to
6 wrap up this call.

7 I have just one last question about the '374
8 case for Petitioner's Counsel, Mr. Maldonado.

9 How many weeks or how many -- is a week fine
10 for this, as well, in terms of the response period after
11 we issue the order? If we do grant a reply, is a week
12 sufficient?

13 MR. MANALDO: Yes, Your Honor. A week should
14 be sufficient.

15 THE COURT: Patent Owner, is that acceptable,
16 too? Do you object to that if we were to grant briefing
17 on it?

18 MR. LAMBRIANAKOS: We would agree to a week
19 sur-reply.

20 THE COURT: Thank you.

21 With that, this call is concluded. Thank you.

22 (Whereupon the proceedings concluded at
23 12:02 p.m.)

24 --000--


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

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

IN RE PATENT OF:	)	
	)	U.S. PATENT NO. 9,986,303
	)	PROCEEDING NO. IPR-2024-00327
	)	
	)	U.S. PATENT NO. 10,218,995
	)	PROCEEDING NO. IPR-2024-00372
	)	
	)	U.S. PATENT NO. 8,090,025
	)	PROCEEDING NO. IPR-2024-00374
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO.,	)	
LTD.,	)	HON. REPKO
PETITIONER,	)	HON. ENGELS
V.	)	HON. GERSTENBLITH
	)	
ADVANCED CODING	)	
TECHNOLOGIES, LLC	)	
	)	
Patent Owner.	)	

I, Tamara Houston, CSR No. 7244, RPR, CCRR 140, do hereby certify that I did correctly report the proceedings contained herein and that the foregoing pages 1 through 45 inclusive, comprise a full, true, and correct transcript of the proceedings taken in the matter of the above entitled cause on Tuesday, May 21, 2024.


TAMARA HOUSTON, CSR NO. 7244
CCRR, RPR

THE SULLIVAN GROUP OF COURT REPORTERS

-	22:9 27:18 28:25 29:5	address 8:3 9:24 10:12 12:15,24 15:15,20 16:12 19:5 20:20 24:7 25:9 27:14 28:11 29:14 30:13,24 31:11 32:6,7,22,24 35:19 36:17 37:20 40:3	ahead 4:10 6:1 14:22 20:10 28:4 41:15
--o0o-- 4:2 44:24	325(d) 31:6 35:23 40:3,17 43:22	addressed 8:20 12:6 15:18 23:12 35:20,24 40:3 43:5	allegedly 7:17
0	327 7:7 22:22 26:13,24	addressing 5:3,5 7:23 11:12 23:15	allowance 31:21,24
00372 5:4	372 4:4 22:25 23:2 26:24 44:3	adopt 16:3	allowed 31:20
025 29:5 30:5,11,15 31:20 39:2	374 4:4 27:7 36:3 44:3,7	adopted 16:13 18:21,23 42:15, 25 43:6	alternative 21:22
1	5	advance 11:20 15:8 38:11	amended 31:22
1 7:21	5th 8:23 9:10 13:5 15:5	advanced 10:23 19:3 23:14 24:17 26:7 27:23 28:16 30:10 32:18 38:1 39:3 40:15	amendment 31:21
12:02 44:23	6	advancing 10:18 11:19	amount 30:8
2	6th 9:5 15:8	advisement 22:23 44:4	analysis 8:3 27:21 40:17
2 7:21	8	afternoon 6:12	anticipate 32:8
2.4 23:8	8th 33:16 34:6 41:23	agree 19:10,12,13,17,20 28:2, 15 44:18	anticipated 14:2 34:24
2.5.22 23:8	9	agreed 7:24 8:16 9:18 10:13,15 12:2,6,16,22 13:2 16:16 17:14 18:7 19:19 20:13, 20 28:12 34:5 37:1,9 39:23 42:16	Appeal 4:5
2.6 23:8	9th 9:1 13:6 15:6 33:17 34:8	agreed-to 9:14 29:22	appearances 4:7
2024 4:1	A	agreed-upon 8:5	application 8:6 15:23 17:25 19:14 25:21
2024-00062 9:22	acceptable 44:15	agreement 34:2	applied 18:2 20:2
2024-00327 5:3	account 13:2,16 43:7	agrees 20:12	apply 9:8 19:22 28:3 33:20 35:2,24
21 4:1	action 31:21		applying 17:16 19:25
273 9:13	add 11:3 26:25 27:1 29:2 40:19		approached 25:24
3	adding 12:13		areas 12:10
3- 9:4	additional 35:8 42:13,14		argue 13:4 32:12
303 8:9,24 9:4,20 15:22 17:22,24 18:25 19:5			argued 17:15 34:15,20

THE SULLIVAN GROUP OF COURT REPORTERS

argues 7:16 31:8 argument 12:2,17 13:1,17,18 18:22 31:6 32:22 34:17 35:8 40:24 42:14 43:21 arguments 6:25 7:10 8:2 10:22 13:16,25 15:17 18:24 20:21,22 21:17,18 23:8, 15 24:6,11,14,17 25:8, 9,15 26:7 31:11 32:8, 11,18 35:23 39:19 40:14,20 arisen 35:25 arose 8:12 9:25 27:19 art 7:17 8:4 10:12 12:3,14 15:25 16:20 17:15 18:3 19:2 21:23 23:7,18 24:8 27:21 28:17 art's 28:9 aspect 31:2 assertions 17:17,20 assessed 41:25 assume 21:10 at-issue 16:20 18:12,15,20 attempt 12:24 13:25 15:14 17:15 35:18 attempting 11:20 attention 23:18 attorney 4:22 attorneys 4:21 21:24,25	authorization 26:19 authorized 4:16 9:24 10:3 aware 11:17 15:2 32:15 B back 35:4 43:24 back-up 43:16 backup 13:18 bar 37:21 based 12:2,7 13:11,12 20:16 21:1 42:19 basic 7:18 8:7 17:18,21 basically 20:25 24:10 25:12 29:19 32:12 basis 15:16 17:14 bears 22:15 42:22 begin 4:7 behalf 4:13 6:13 22:8 belief 25:18 believes 39:3 benefit 23:21 bit 17:2,9 18:10 Board 4:5 9:23 10:3 15:24 16:3 17:12 19:25 30:14 35:4 38:23 39:8	Board's 23:18 26:19 border 27:17 29:20 33:14,18 39:13 41:19 breaking 4:19 briefing 9:24 18:11,13 23:21 27:20 30:13 31:11 32:6 38:2,11,19,24,25 39:2, 14 40:20 44:16 briefly 8:21 33:4 bring 23:17 broad 21:20 broader 42:9 burden 21:9 C calculates 30:12 calculation 30:8 42:17 call 4:3,8,25 5:24 6:11,16, 24 44:6,21 case 5:5 6:20,21,22,23 7:7 13:9 16:6 22:22,25 23:2,25 24:2 25:19,20 26:13 27:7,10 32:11,15 42:1,21 44:8 challenge 21:17 challenged 7:21 chance 6:23 14:12,20 20:9 24:24 25:4 26:2 33:5 41:11 change	13:25 35:4 changing 12:13 characterization 19:14,20 24:12,16 characterized 11:15 check 14:5 choice 42:17 circumstances 9:21 cited 8:4 9:13 16:6 23:11 24:19 27:21 31:10 40:5 cites 35:12,14,16 claim 8:18 9:11 13:22 21:7,9, 12,18,20 22:14 23:8 25:22 31:22,25 33:23 34:12,14 38:5 claimed 12:11 claims 7:21 30:5 clarify 10:6 11:8 18:20 23:17 clarifying 27:12 co-defendant 13:8 co-pending 7:25 coding 7:18,19 8:8 12:12 17:21 colleague 5:4 colleagues 4:14 14:5,13 16:23 22:18 24:22 33:4 41:5 43:24 combination 20:19 31:17
---	---	---	---

THE SULLIVAN GROUP OF COURT REPORTERS

comparing 32:19 complex 29:9 concluded 44:21,22 conducting 21:7 confer 14:12 16:22 22:18 33:3 43:23 conference 4:3 confirms 30:15 connect 28:7 consequence 29:13 41:1 consideration 40:23 considerations 32:23 considered 31:13,18 32:2 34:24 35:13 40:6,7 43:8 consistent 10:15,22 11:14 34:18, 19 constitutes 17:20 construction 7:23 8:5,7,11,15,18,20 9:2,4,11,14,18,25 10:12,14,16 11:7,12,13 12:3,6,7,8,9,16 13:3,5 14:1 15:3,7,15,20,23 16:1,10,13,17 17:3,13, 16,19,25 18:1,5,7,22 19:3,6,10,15,17,21,22 20:1,13,15,21 21:2,4,7, 18 22:12,14 27:16,19, 22 28:3,8,10,12,15,17, 19 29:1,7,9,13,23 30:4, 9,14,16,17,24 33:14 34:1,3,6 36:16 37:1,9, 22,25 38:6,7,10 39:3, 10,23 42:24 43:4,6	constructions 9:6,20 10:7 11:9 12:22 16:3 24:4 29:19 30:10 34:22,23 36:25 37:24 42:7 construe 16:19 17:5,6 18:16 38:20 construed 16:8 21:10 33:18 34:12 36:21 41:20 42:5,21 construes 30:6 consult 36:4 consulted 8:14 contend 25:10 continue 15:11 continued 15:8 contradict 30:21 contrary 23:14 controversy 16:9 cooperating 13:9 correct 4:21 16:17,21 38:10 40:15 correctly 17:4 correspondingly 10:4 counsel 6:1 7:8,12 11:23 13:12 15:1 36:13 38:5 41:9 44:8 court 4:16,19,24 5:6,7,9,11, 16,17,25 6:6,10,15 9:12 10:6,14,24 11:7,22	14:4,11,18 16:2,13,14, 17,18,22 17:1 18:10 19:9,10,18,21 20:4,8,14 21:3 22:4,17,21 23:24 24:2,10,21 25:2 26:1, 11,20 27:4,6,24 28:21 29:18,23 30:1 31:3 32:10,24 33:3,7 34:15, 16,21 36:4,9,16 38:13 39:12,24 40:12 41:4,8 42:3,15 43:2,8,23 44:2, 15,20 criticizes 7:22 cutting 17:18 D data 7:18,19,20 8:8 12:13 17:19,21 20:19 27:17 29:21 33:14,18 39:13 41:19 date 7:4 37:21 day 34:13 days 13:6,7 15:6 26:16 decide 7:5 defendant 9:19 15:3 defense 13:11 deficient 32:4 deliberations 23:20 denial 32:8,25 35:9 denied 7:16 25:25 depend 32:11 desire 25:7	determining 21:11 developed 29:9 developments 23:24 24:4 differently 42:22 differing 42:7 diligence 14:2 directing 4:25 disagree 20:3,4 24:11,14,18 disagreement 24:15 disclose 7:17 disclosed 12:20 21:23 discloses 12:14 30:12 disclosure 12:7,11 28:9 30:15 31:13 32:2,3 39:7 discretionary 32:8,23,25 35:9 discuss 6:16,25 10:9 16:4,14 17:5 20:18,23 24:22 discussed 18:13 discusses 20:19 discussion 37:17 dispute 19:15 28:19 34:15 disputes 37:14 distinguish 17:15
---	--	--	---

THE SULLIVAN GROUP OF COURT REPORTERS

district 7:25 16:14,17 19:10,21 20:14 22:4 24:2 29:18, 23 34:16,21 36:16 42:3 43:2,8 do-over 20:25 drill 18:10 driver 43:3 due 22:24 44:4 E E-N-G-E-L-S 5:21 earlier 8:23 early 22:5 easier 39:10 Eastern 7:25 ED 8:16 effect 39:15 elaborate 17:1,8 Elements 23:8 email 6:19 7:2 embodiment 18:4 30:12 embodiments 17:23 39:19 Engels 4:6 5:21 ensure 18:1 entire 31:25	entitled 41:24 equate 40:10 Equation 30:4,8,13 31:23,24 32:3 34:10,11 37:23 38:7,8, 21 41:20 42:21 equations 38:14 essentially 24:11 28:22 32:10 38:9 events 8:18,22 43:12 evidence 22:15 examiner 31:13,23,25 32:1 examiner's 31:21 examples 19:7 30:20 38:3 exchanged 9:1,6 36:25 exercise 14:2 Exhibit 9:13 exists 8:10 23:9 32:7 explain 7:8 23:1 27:9,20 28:14 31:11 38:2 explained 40:16 explanation 39:20 expressly 15:8 35:16 extent 16:9 18:2 F face 40:8	fact 13:11 20:12 34:20 35:5 37:2 factors 24:20 facts 23:17 fails 7:17 fair 24:12 February 9:5 15:8 37:13 feel 41:14 figure 38:15,16 file 5:14,24 6:4 7:9 23:2,4 26:19 27:13 37:21 filed 8:12,21,24 9:11 10:1 13:6,7 15:5,11,19 20:16 27:20 29:11 32:13 33:16 36:22,25 37:14 filing 43:12 fill 6:3 final 6:4,8 fine 44:9 fingertips 29:24 firm 21:25 Fish 4:12 focus 7:11 41:17 focuses 41:21 foresee 25:13,14 32:8	foreseeability 29:2 foreseeable 20:15 21:1,5,6 22:13 29:8,13 30:17,20,23 32:21 34:6 37:11,12,13, 18 41:18 foreseen 15:18 42:23 43:11 formulating 13:16 found 32:3 framework 32:13,17 free 41:14 front 35:20 G G-E-R-S-T-E-N-B-L-I-T-H 5:21 garden-variety 25:8 GE 37:7 Gerstenblith 4:6 Gerstenblith's 5:20 give 6:22 10:24 14:7,11,20 19:7 20:9 24:23 25:4 26:2,23 27:4 33:4 41:11 goal 23:16 good 6:12 7:8 8:10 20:25 23:2,9 25:16,23 26:22 27:9 28:24,25 29:14 30:23 32:6 35:8 36:1 43:14,15,19 good-cause 7:11
---	---	--	--

THE SULLIVAN GROUP OF COURT REPORTERS

grant 7:5 38:19 44:11,16 Great 30:2 guess 8:21 11:7 18:6,18 19:9 Gupta 4:15,16,20,22 5:10,18 H happened 23:25 happy 11:5 31:1 hear 11:24 26:12 heard 18:16 41:12 hearing 38:6 hedge 42:12 helpful 19:8 23:19 history 8:15 31:12,20 hit 27:25 hold 34:9 Honor 4:9 5:25 6:6,12 7:14 11:25 14:9 16:21 17:11 19:24 23:3 25:6 27:11 28:5 29:15,25 32:16 33:2,11 35:7 36:2,18 39:17 40:21 41:16 44:13 Honors 11:6 16:7 24:9 26:4 28:18 30:25 39:9 Honors' 23:19 hope 23:19	hoped 43:18 Houston 6:1,7 huge 30:8 I idea 34:5 identified 15:6 identify 24:8 39:2 identifying 39:10 IDF 31:10 image 7:18,19 8:8 12:12 17:18,21 implicates 32:22 important 33:15 importantly 18:6 inappropriate 39:11 include 21:11,18 included 40:5 including 28:1 incomplete 24:18 inconsistencies 38:22 inconsistent 8:8 13:22 17:24 18:25 23:10 26:7 30:10,11 38:2,3,15 39:7 incorrect 19:11 30:16	incumbent 13:15 indefinite 34:21 indication 32:1 informs 15:22 infringement 42:10 initial 29:3 instant 37:3 institution 23:20 intended 19:1 inter 8:24 interested 36:12 interpretation 22:11 interpreted 12:19 intrinsic 13:13,23 14:3 20:16 21:11 43:7 invalidity 42:9 inventor 21:14 involved 9:19 37:5 involves 12:12 involving 9:22 IPR 9:13,22 15:13 21:8 27:7 IPR2024-327 4:4 IPRS	5:3 6:18 issue 17:2,7,10 19:2 22:23 26:16 27:16 29:16 31:1 33:13 34:10,16 35:10, 19 40:1,2 43:22 44:4,11 issued 24:2 issues 5:3 6:21 23:21 24:3 27:14,25 items 43:20 J January 8:23 9:1 13:5,6 15:5,6 33:17 34:6,8 41:23 Jeremy 4:14 5:4 joined 4:5,13 joint 9:11 Judge 4:3,4 5:19,20,21,22 judges 4:5 7:1 judges' 5:12 K keeping 7:9 kind 10:6 11:8 17:8 18:14,18 20:9 25:16 28:1 36:14, 17 40:16 knew 33:22 34:7 35:1,20,21 42:11 kno-w 16:7 knowledge 21:15 22:5,8
--	--	---	---

THE SULLIVAN GROUP OF COURT REPORTERS

L	M	meets	move
Lambrianakos 6:12,13 11:25 20:11 21:6 25:6 27:1 33:11 41:16 44:18	made 23:6 42:17,18	12:3	6:24 16:24 22:25 27:6 36:6 38:14
language 31:22	maintain 12:25	member 8:13	multiple 12:10 37:24
largely 28:25	major 43:3	members 11:8 36:5	N
law 21:25	make 14:6,13 17:16,20 27:25 39:9,19	mentioned 28:7 38:5	names 5:12
lawyers 22:1	makes 38:19	mentions 37:24	narrowed 28:10
leave 23:4	Maldonado 27:8 44:8	merits 7:10 40:13,14,19	narrower 21:20 42:9,24
legal 32:17	MANALDO 44:13	met 43:19	narrower-than-plain- and-ordinary 22:11
length 23:23	manner 37:10	mind 7:9	nature 24:15
LG 13:10	mappings 10:22 18:4	misapplied 25:11	necessarily 28:18
lieu 13:17	March 9:10 37:16	mischaracterization 38:16	necessitates 24:1
life 39:10	materially 11:21	mischaracterizations 15:21 19:5 38:22	negotiation 29:9 37:6,17
limitation 7:20,24 9:9,15 12:4,5 13:2 21:12 27:18 29:4,5 31:24	mathematically 30:7	misstatements 15:21	negotiations 37:5
limited 13:14 23:21	matter 22:23 44:3	Mm-hmm 19:9	Nicholaus 4:12
list 36:20	matters 35:7	modified 37:7	nonetheless 23:12
listed 31:23,25 40:8	meaning 9:8 10:8,10 11:9,14 12:9,25 13:21 15:9,12, 25 18:6,21 19:3 21:20 22:3 28:11 29:7,20,25 33:19,22 34:8,18,19 35:2 36:15,17 37:3,10 38:9 39:15,16,22 41:21, 25 42:20	moment 14:13 20:6 22:19 27:4	normal 14:2
litigation 7:25 8:5,13,14,19,22 9:19,23,25 10:13 11:16 12:17 14:24 15:4,9,13 17:14 18:7 22:1 24:5 27:19 28:13,16 29:4,10 30:11,18 34:4,8 36:21 37:25 39:23 42:15,16	means 17:17 25:14 43:15	momentarily 6:25 24:22	notably 9:2
lot 6:3	meant 21:14	Monaldo 4:14 5:4 27:11 28:5,22 29:22 30:2 31:5 32:15 33:2 36:18 38:25 39:17 40:2,21	note 9:18 20:11,12,14 29:3 36:23
	meet 18:5	month 9:5,24 15:7 36:24 37:13	noted 7:2 40:4
		months 29:11	number 7:2
		motion 27:17 29:20 33:14,18 39:13 41:19	numerical 7:6

THE SULLIVAN GROUP OF COURT REPORTERS

O	31:8 32:9,18 33:4,9 34:3 36:10 37:2,8,24 39:1 40:9 41:6,11,14 44:15	16:10,24 17:12,24,25 18:13,24,25 19:6,13,19 20:8 22:9 23:6,9,13,23 24:23 25:4 26:22 27:2, 18 29:3,5,6,8 30:5,6,11, 15,20 31:6,8,20 32:9,18 33:4,9 34:3 35:13 36:10,13 37:2,8,23 39:1,2 40:9 41:6,11,14 44:15	12:10 phone 4:12 pivot 13:1,25 15:15
object 44:16	owner's 6:17,19 8:2 15:1,16,22 17:25 18:24 19:14,19 23:10 29:3 30:16 31:6 36:13	patents 42:8	plain 9:8 10:7,9 11:9,14 12:9, 24 13:20 14:1 15:9,11, 25 18:5,21 19:2 22:3 28:11 29:6,19,24 33:19, 22 34:7,18,19 35:1 36:15,16 37:2,10 38:9 39:15,16,22 41:20,24 42:20
obvious 28:17	Owners 24:23	pause 6:24 14:17 16:25 20:7 22:20 24:21 25:1 27:5 33:6 36:8 41:4,7 44:1	Plaintiff 34:3
occur 36:22	Owners' 8:6	perceive 30:22 40:24	Plaintiff's 42:19
offer 39:20	P	period 44:10	plan 8:3 39:17
offered 10:7	p.m. 44:23	person 22:16	point 15:24 20:17 26:5 29:2 30:14 34:20 38:13 39:8 41:17
office 35:14	pages 7:2 8:1 33:1	personally 8:13	pointed 25:10,11
one-day 6:8	panel 7:1 11:8 22:21 26:21 28:2 33:8 36:5,12 41:8	pertinent 23:17 24:7	pointing 40:22
opportunity 10:25 14:7 16:12 32:21 39:1,5,8	paper 36:1	Peter 6:13	points 25:20 32:5 36:13
oppose 10:4 14:3 36:2	papers 32:20	petition 7:16,21,23 8:3,12,21,24 10:1,7,16,23 11:19,21 12:19 13:1,7,17,19 15:5,10,18 16:6 18:5 20:18,23 21:1,8,16 23:11,18,25 26:6 27:20, 21 29:11 31:9,15 32:12, 14,16,25 33:16,21,24, 25 34:13 35:3,25 36:3, 15,22,24 37:14,20,21 39:18,21 40:3,5,15 41:1,3 43:13	Poisson's 30:4,7,13 31:22,23 32:3 34:10,11 37:23 38:7,8, 21 41:19 42:21
opposed 23:22	part 15:19	Petitioner 4:8,13,21 10:3 11:3 14:7,20 21:9 26:2,18 27:8 33:10 36:6,11 41:21,22	policy 42:6
opposite 42:4	partes 8:24	Petitioner's 6:17 7:8,12 41:9 44:8	POPR 8:12 16:1 17:12 19:6 23:12 25:10,20 26:5,6
order 7:6 20:20 22:23 44:4,11	parties 7:24 9:1,6,11,18,23 10:13,15 12:16 16:16 17:13 29:10 34:10 36:23 37:9,15 42:16 44:5	Phillips	portion 21:1 35:14,16
ordered 6:8	parties' 7:10 8:4		portions 12:20 23:10 24:19 39:2, 6,9
orders 26:16	party 6:22 26:23		position 12:25 14:1 16:18 22:6 28:6 33:25 35:10 41:22
ordinary 10:8,10 11:9,14 12:9,24 13:21 22:3,16 28:11 29:6,19,25 33:19,22 34:8,18,19 35:1 36:15, 16 37:3,10 38:9 39:15, 16,22 41:21,24 42:20	party's 6:23		
overlook 23:13	patent 4:4 6:11,14,17,19 7:15 8:1,6,9,25 9:2,4,7,12, 20,22 10:5,24 11:23 14:18,25 15:16,22		
owner 6:11,14 7:15 9:2,7,12 10:5,24 11:23 14:19 16:10,24 17:13 18:14 20:8 23:6,13,23 25:4 26:22 27:3 29:6,8 30:6			

THE SULLIVAN GROUP OF COURT REPORTERS

42:2,13,15,20 43:9,11, 16	proposal 10:10,11 27:15 29:3 37:7,8	raised 16:11 28:24 30:17 32:9	relates 27:16 30:3 31:5
positions 23:14 28:23 34:25 42:12	propose 13:4,10 21:21 33:19 34:7	rearrange 17:18	relation 8:7
positive 20:14	proposed 7:3 9:20 13:12,18 22:4 29:6 33:17 34:1,4,11,12 37:1,2	rearrangement 12:20 20:18,23 21:14	relative 32:2
potentially 13:14	proposing 11:10 16:3 22:3	rearranging 10:20 12:12 17:19 18:9 21:15,22,23	relevant 24:20 28:1 30:14
pre-institution 9:24	proposition 16:8	reason 15:19 26:9 30:19 38:18, 19	relied 12:21 35:11,16
preliminary 6:18 7:15,22 9:6,16 10:19 11:13 15:17 16:11 18:22,23 19:4 23:5,7 24:6,17,19 27:23 30:6 31:7 38:1,6 39:4 40:9	prosecution 31:10,12,19,20 40:6,8, 23	reasons 8:6 31:24 36:2	relief 10:2
prepare 26:17	provide 39:1 42:14	recited 7:20	relies 12:10
prepared 16:4,14 26:18	purpose 6:16 20:17	reconstructing 7:17,24 9:8,14 10:20 12:4,5 18:8 21:13 22:12 27:18 29:4	rely 20:22
preparing 21:8	purposes 42:9,10	reconstruction 12:11,18 20:19	relying 35:20,21
present 12:2,17 13:17 20:21	put 5:15 11:10 25:7	record 5:15 13:13,23 14:3,17 16:25 20:7,16 21:11 22:2,20 23:17,20 25:1 27:5 32:1 33:6 36:8 41:7 43:8 44:1	remained 34:14
preserve 36:21	Q	reference 31:8,10,14,16,22 32:19 35:10,11,12,14 40:6,10, 11,22,25 41:2	renders 28:17
prior 7:17 8:4 10:12 12:3,14 15:25 17:15 18:3 19:2 21:23 23:7,18 24:8 27:21 28:9,16	question 42:18,22 44:7	referenced 8:11 9:15 11:12 15:16 16:1 17:22 35:22	repeat 28:23
problem 19:25	questions 5:1 11:5 14:5,14,18 16:24 22:22 24:23 25:2 26:21 29:15 30:25 31:4 33:7 36:6,9 39:25 41:5, 9 43:25 44:5	references 12:18 17:13 21:23 23:11 25:11,21 26:8 31:18 40:4,7	Repko 4:3,4 5:19,22
proceed 7:6,13 28:4	quick 14:10	regard 8:2 25:5	replies 26:19
proceeding 8:16,25 23:5	quickly 14:24 16:23 26:15	reiterate 29:12 37:23	reply 6:17 7:3,9 8:1,2,11 10:5,10 11:10 16:4,15 17:6 19:6 20:17 23:2,5 24:1 25:8,19 26:10,17 27:9 29:14 30:24 35:5 36:3 39:5 44:11
proceedings 4:1 42:8 44:22	R	related 5:3 8:18	reporter 5:7,11,16,25 6:6
proper 15:12 18:8 20:2	R-E-P-K-O 5:22	relatedly 8:6	representing 21:25
properly 18:2	raise 15:4		request 6:17,20 7:5 8:1 10:2 23:16 25:7,24 29:17 30:3 31:2,5
			requested 32:6

THE SULLIVAN GROUP OF COURT REPORTERS

requesting 23:4	risk 42:11	shortly 8:25 36:22	specifics 9:17
require 22:10	rounds 37:16	show 10:21 12:18 15:24 18:3	spelling 5:12
required 9:3 21:22	rule 26:16	showed 8:19	standing 7:11
requires 10:20	running 4:25	shows 12:19	stands 16:7
resolve 28:18,19 29:11 38:23	S	sic 33:24	start 7:7 27:12 36:19
resolved 37:9,15	Saito 31:8,14,16 32:19 35:11, 12,14,21 40:6	significant 22:15	state 21:9
respect 13:1 16:20 18:3 33:13 35:9 36:3 40:16 43:20, 21 44:2	Samsung 4:13,23 8:19,23 9:2,7 12:1,15,24 15:2,8 20:12,13,20 21:18 22:1, 8 33:17,22 34:7,12,20, 24 37:7 42:11,23	similar 9:21 10:2 27:17 31:9 40:25 43:7	stated 41:22
respectfully 8:10 10:1	Samsung's 8:13 43:11	simply 12:24 23:16 25:14 35:4, 11 37:23 38:7 40:4	statement 9:11,12 23:10
respond 6:23 10:25 13:25 14:8, 12,20 20:9 23:6 24:24 25:5 26:2 33:5,9 36:11 41:6,12	satisfied 15:25	situation 21:21	statements 23:6
response 6:18 7:15,22 9:16 10:19 11:13,24 15:17 16:11 18:14,23 19:4 23:5,7 24:7,17,19 27:23 30:6 31:7 36:7 37:4,6 38:1 39:4 40:9 44:10	satisfies 8:4 10:12 19:2 27:22 30:4 34:11 37:22 38:20 39:22	solution 30:12	Stephens 4:11,12,18,22,24 5:2,8 6:2,7 7:12,14 10:11,18 11:3,4,11 14:9,16,23 16:5,16,21 17:11 18:20 19:13,24 23:1,3 24:3,13 25:3 26:3,4,18 28:7,24
result 34:17	satisfying 41:19	solving 30:7	stick 39:18
review 8:24	scouring 21:11	sort 10:17	strategy 35:6
reviewing 14:2	seeking 27:13	sound 18:12	struggles 18:19
revisit 14:24	set 6:21 34:22,25 39:21	speak 9:17 27:8	submit 6:17 8:10
Richardson 4:13	settled 13:10	SPEAKER 4:9	submitted 33:22 34:14 35:2
rights 36:21	seven-page 27:13	specific 19:7 38:18 40:22	substantially 31:9 40:25
rise 25:16 36:1	Shirani 31:17	specifically 16:2 17:9 19:23 28:13 30:21 31:16 40:11	sufficient 22:8 27:2 44:12,14
Rishi 4:15,22 5:10	shore 25:8	specification 12:8 13:15 17:22 18:25 22:15 35:13,15,17,22 38:4 39:9	sufficiently 28:10
	short 26:9	specifications 12:21	suggestion 14:25
			suggests 18:14

THE SULLIVAN GROUP OF COURT REPORTERS

supplementary 7:19 8:7 17:18,21 support 21:12,13 supports 39:3 supposed 21:16 sur-reply 10:4 23:22 44:19 T takes 43:7 taking 42:11 talk 41:2 talking 21:24 Tamara 6:1 teachings 8:9 23:14,15 24:7,16 26:8 team 8:13,14 teams 22:9 TELEPHONE 4:1 telling 25:12 term 13:5,12,22 15:12 16:19 17:19 21:13 22:12,14 27:17,19,22 28:11 29:23 30:4,6 33:23 34:11,13,14,20 36:20 38:7,9 terms 9:1,3 15:6 26:11,15 28:20 35:1 36:14,19 37:6 41:18,24 42:5,8 44:10	Texas 7:25 8:16 theories 10:19,23 11:18 theory 10:17 thing 20:14 things 20:10 43:17 thinking 35:3 time 6:22 8:20 9:7 14:19 15:10,19 20:15 22:3,22 25:3 29:7 33:21 35:25 37:2,3 41:10 42:4,18 43:12 timeline 8:18,22 14:24 33:14 times 22:4 timing 26:12 36:13,20 37:19 43:12 told 42:19 transcript 5:24 6:5,9 trends 16:8 Trial 4:5 tribunal 41:23 true 38:8 TUESDAY 4:1 turn 24:4 29:16 31:1 39:19 turnaround 6:8 turning 26:15	turns 28:9 two-factor 40:17 two-page 23:4 types 32:5 U ultimately 12:21 22:5 34:1 37:1,8 42:15 understand 8:15 37:4,5 understanding 8:17 13:22 15:12 18:8 19:3 understood 13:13 17:4 22:16 unforeseeability 25:16 35:6 unforeseeable 23:13 24:6 26:9 35:5 43:10 UNIDENTIFIED 4:9 V validity 21:17 41:25 vector 27:17 29:21 33:14,18 39:13 41:19 video 7:18,19 8:8 12:12 17:18,21 view 12:1,23 13:24 15:22 21:5 25:7 26:5 30:9 34:9 39:16 43:19 virtually 25:20 42:4	W walk 8:22 Walla 31:17 wanted 11:2 19:20 warranted 26:10 water 34:9 weaknesses 25:9,15,21 26:6 wedded 42:3 week 26:19,22,23 27:2,14 34:15 38:6 44:9,11,13, 18 weeks 44:9 Wellman 16:6 Won 4:14 words 12:8 work 43:17 wrap 20:10 41:13 44:6 Y Yamatani 31:9,13 32:2,19 40:10, 22 Yamatani's 32:3 year 8:23 Yoon 4:14
---	--	---	--