UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

----------x

ARM LIMITED, :

Petitioner, :

-vs- : IPR2024-00566

ICPILLAR, LLC, : Patent 9,367,657

Patent Owner. :

----------x

ARM LIMITED, :

Petitioner, :

-vs- : IPR2024-00476

ICPILLAR, LLC, : Patent 8,924,899

Patent Owner. :

----------x

Hearing Via Zoom

Friday, May 31, 2024

3:09 p.m.

Job No.: 1153900

Pages 1 - 33

Reported by: Tammy S. Newton

1 A P P E A R A N C E S
2 BEFORE: JUDGE KAISER
3 JUDGE PRICE
4
5 ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:
6 KEVIN ANDERSON, ESQUIRE
7 PATRICK MCPHERSON, ESQUIRE
8 Duane Morris
9 901 New York Avenue, N.W.
10 Suite 700 East
11 Washington, D.C. 20001
12 (202) 776-5213
13 kpanderson@duanemorris.com
14
15 ON BEHALF OF RESPONDENT:
16 KENNETH WEATHERWAX, ESQUIRE
17 ROBERT PISTONE, ESQUIRE
18 Lowenstein & Weatherwax
19 1016 Pico Boulevard
20 Monica, California 90405
21 (310) 307-4503
22 weatherwax@lowensteinweatherwax.com

1 * * *
2 Friday, May 31, 2024; 3:09 p.m.
3 P R O C E E D I N G S
4 * * *
5 JUDGE KAISER: So far we're been
6 discussing one of the issues in the dispute,
7 which is a Sotera stipulation. So generally
8 speaking, Petitioner is seeking to file a reply
9 to the preliminary response. Patent Owner is
10 generally opposed to that.
11 There was a proposal for Patent Owner
12 for a three-page reply. It's limited to just the
13 definitive issue, specifically the Sotera
14 stipulation that Petitioner would be able to make
15 and the effect it has on the arguments.
16 So I guess let's talk about that
17 first. Mr. Anderson?
18 MR. ANDERSON: Yes.
19 JUDGE KAISER: What's your thought
20 on -- let's assume that for the moment that we're
21 not going to allow any reply on the other issues
22 that you e-mailed us about. Would you be opposed

1 to briefing from both sides of some small like
2 three pages on that issue?
3 MR. ANDERSON: We were not planning to
4 brief the Sotera stipulation. I think the Board
5 knows the effect that it has. We were planning
6 to submit it, and that's a factor for the Board
7 to consider under kind of I think the Board's
8 well-known law there. So I don't -- we were not
9 planning to brief that issue.
10 MR. WEATHERWAX: May I respond, Your
11 Honor?
12 JUDGE KAISER: Sure.
13 MR. WEATHERWAX: I would just note
14 that I'm not -- I don't think the Board is of
15 such unanimity that it's actually a pending
16 request for director review right now on the
17 limits of timing for Sotera stipulations. So I
18 think it's a very briefable issue. I would be
19 happy to give you the case number, if you want.
20 JUDGE KAISER: Yeah. Go ahead.
21 MR. WEATHERWAX: I will give it to you
22 in one minute as soon as I get -- sorry. I just

1 don't have it at hand in my notes, but I have it
2 in my e-mails. I'll get it.
3 It's the ResMed case. The number of
4 that is IPR 2023-00565. I apologize for the
5 delay.
6 JUDGE KAISER: Say that again. IPR?
7 MR. WEATHERWAX: IPR 2023-00565. The
8 request for director review I think was filed
9 just like 10 days ago, so it hasn't been acted
10 upon.
11 It's not exactly on point because it
12 has to do with interpreting the board's or the
13 director's precedential NXP decision, late Sotera
14 stipulations. But the facts are different from
15 here because it had to do with the remand from
16 the director on another issue, but it's sort
17 of -- it's raising the issue of what the limits
18 are on the later Sotera stipulations.
19 JUDGE KAISER: I see. Okay. I think
20 we have what we need on that issue.
21 Let's move on to the remaining issue,
22 which is -- so my understanding from Petitioner's

1 e-mail is that they would like to file not only a
2 reply to the preliminary response that discusses
3 the testimonial evidence the Patent Owner put
4 into the record but also add some additional
5 testimonial evidence of their own, which I have
6 to say is, at least in a vacuum, a pretty tall
7 order.
8 So I'll ask Mr. Anderson to sort of
9 explain where you're coming from on those
10 requests.
11 MR. ANDERSON: Yes, Your Honor. And
12 so just a specific ask to be clear is there's two
13 IPRs here. I believe the issues are identical,
14 so it would be the same submission captioned
15 different in the two IPRs but the ask would be a
16 10-page brief, along with an expert deck of
17 comparable size and the reason being --
18 JUDGE KAISER: When you say -- I'm
19 sorry. When you say "comparable size," you mean
20 comparable to the brief?
21 MR. ANDERSON: I'm sorry. Yes, 10
22 pages, just to be clear, yes, and probably not

1 even that much. So I can commit to no more than
2 10 pages, and that would be true for the brief.
3 It probably wouldn't be that long.
4 But the reason being is that we think
5 in both -- for both references, there's -- our
6 expert believes that their expert's
7 interpretation is incorrect in the face of kind
8 of express statements, one being in paragraph 83
9 of Banerjee where it says I take -- I do all this
10 work to get a compiled operating system and then
11 I instantiate the compiled operating system into
12 the device. Our expert believes that's plainly
13 an outputting software.
14 The other reference in column 11 at
15 lines 19 to 21 expressly says that the output of
16 the tool is machine code for the programmer. So
17 our expert would like to put in a declaration
18 explaining that a POSITA in view of all of the --
19 all of the passages in there would view that as
20 outputting of software, including that when the
21 tools in each of these two references generate
22 device drivers, and there's no dispute that they

1 do, but those device drivers are tailored to the
2 hardware and output -- that's the point of
3 tailoring the hardware and the device drivers
4 together.
5 And there's passages in column 7 of
6 the Rompaey reference, column 27, that
7 specifically say that device drivers are an
8 output of the tool. And so our expert just -- we
9 look at what their expert said, and he is
10 interpreting these references in a fashion that
11 is contrary to their purpose, contrary to the
12 statements in those references that say expressly
13 on code designing hardware and software and that
14 it puts an output. And this is particularly true
15 in light of the patent specification, the
16 challenged patent specification that doesn't use
17 the term outputting in the specification with
18 respect to software. So it's just using it in a
19 way -- I think he uses the word providing, to be
20 fair. But it uses it in a -- in a just normal
21 way. There's nothing extra required there.
22 So we don't -- we don't think there's

1 a POSITA that would not -- that would look at
2 this and conclude that it's not outputting
3 software, and our expert is prepared to explain
4 that.
5 JUDGE KAISER: Okay. So I think we
6 have a couple of issues bundled there. So one is
7 Patent Owner's expert declared saying something
8 that you believe is factually incorrect or not
9 supported by the record, and then I guess the
10 other is sort of what's the actual correct
11 interpretation of the prior art references. And
12 those are, I think, subtly different things.
13 So I mean, on the latter point, how do
14 you interpret the references in a way that -- how
15 do you interpret them correctly, I guess. Is
16 that information that's already in the petition,
17 and if it's missing from the petition, why is it?
18 MR. ANDERSON: Sure. There is -- so
19 part of it is not addressed in the petition
20 because when you look at these references and
21 each of them says expressly that it's outputting
22 or it's instantiating software into the device,

1 that we would not have expected this sort of
2 creative argument.
3 And I think the other thing is that
4 their expert is taking the position that for
5 software such as device drivers, the reference is
6 created and then they tailor the hardware to it,
7 and it says they output it, but he says no, you
8 just ignore that. And I don't -- I don't think
9 we could have anticipated in advance that their
10 expert would say that one skilled in the art
11 would ignore kind of express statements in the
12 patent.
13 JUDGE KAISER: Okay. So let me ask
14 you a question here. Is -- and I have to
15 apologize. At such an early stage, I have not
16 spent much time with the record. So I -- I'm
17 working at more of a disadvantage than I normally
18 would have.
19 Is the difference between the two
20 experts' opinions a matter of interpreting the
21 claim terms differently, or is it something else?
22 MR. ANDERSON: I don't -- I'm not --

1 I'm not 100 percent certain. Their expert --
2 it's the plain meaning of outputting the
3 software. Outputting being the key term. And I
4 think the reference as fairly and expressly
5 described outputting the software, their expert
6 says no, they don't. Where it says output, it
7 means output to go into simulation or something.
8 I don't even know. He just basically says it
9 doesn't say there's outputting.
10 So I -- it's not as though each side
11 had a claims construction -- express claims
12 construction of this term. Frankly, we didn't
13 think outputting needs a claim construction there
14 in this context because both references are
15 expressly intended for the purpose of generating
16 hardware and tailored software for devices. And
17 both of them have these statements that expressly
18 say we're outputting or we're instantiating it
19 into the device.
20 So I don't know what their
21 interpretation is. But if their interpretation
22 means that output has some special meaning, then

1 I guess we would have a disagreement.
2 JUDGE KAISER: Okay. I guess I have
3 one other question for you, which is the -- is
4 there a reason that we need your expert to come
5 back and give opinion testimony on this, or is
6 this something that could just be pointed out in
7 a brief? You know, Patent Owner's expert says X;
8 the reference says Y. Those two are
9 incompatible.
10 MR. ANDERSON: I would say in general
11 it can be pointed out in a brief. The one area
12 where the Board may benefit from an expert's
13 explanation is that the references describe in
14 particular tailoring software known as device
15 drivers to the specific hardware that is -- that
16 is being designed, and I think the expert can
17 explain why when one tailors hardware to specific
18 device drivers, those device drivers would be
19 understood to be output because that tailored
20 hardware would not work without the device
21 drivers to which it was tailored.
22 I think that's the one area --

1 otherwise, I think it would just be incorrect
2 statements that we can adequately brief out
3 without our expert declaration. Even that issue,
4 we can, but I think you would benefit from the
5 expert on that.
6 JUDGE KAISER: Okay. I guess one
7 other question. So there's an issue here that
8 there's parallel litigation here. Where are we
9 on the parallel litigation? Has there been a
10 Markman order yet?
11 MR. ANDERSON: There is a Markman
12 hearing and an order earlier this year. I think
13 one or -- I don't know if either party submitted
14 it. My understanding is effectively Judge
15 Albright construed everything under the plain
16 ordinary meaning of that with no particular
17 construction. The parties are in the middle of
18 discovery now. I believe discovery ends in
19 September under the current schedule.
20 JUDGE KAISER: Okay. All right.
21 Well, Mr. Weatherwax, do you have
22 comments on this issue?

1 MR. WEATHERWAX: I have several, Your
2 Honor. I would have to say what you did not hear
3 a single thing was good cause. They did not even
4 mention or address anything about it until you
5 pressed them as to why there might be good cause.
6 And in summary, not only do they not need an
7 expert for what they just argued to you, they
8 don't need a brief.
9 They just said what they're going to
10 say, and you're fully, perfectly capable of
11 deciding whether they're right, what the
12 references would say to an ordinary artisan or
13 whatever.
14 So I'd say at least three things.
15 First, we never heard any of this before. In the
16 meet and confer, they wouldn't even mention good
17 cause. We asked them why they turned down the
18 compromise. The only answer they give is that it
19 was less than they wanted. So no discussion of
20 any of this whatsoever. There is no basis of
21 good cause for letting them have basically a sort
22 of a second mini petition with sort of a second

1 Dr. Houh declaration all before any decision on
2 whether to institute.
3 We think this is the easier part of
4 their request to deny because the Board routinely
5 holds that requests for merits briefing like this
6 at this stage isn't the sort of dispute between
7 the petition and the POPR that satisfies good
8 cause. That's even if they're not asking for
9 evidence to be submitted.
10 I would just point you to two --
11 there's lots of cases, but I can just point you
12 to two recent ones: IPR 2021-1468, paper 10,
13 which says, "The Board routinely determines
14 whether a party mischaracterizes the asserted
15 references or the other party's arguments about
16 the need for additional briefing." That's just a
17 quote.
18 And then there's more recent one in
19 IPR 2024-214 and 215, paper 15. And that has a
20 lot more to say.
21 But more specifically, it sounds to me
22 like the purpose of having the call was to set

1 forth all these arguments to put them in your
2 mind.
3 The fact is they're mischaracterizing
4 what the POPR and our expert said. Did they call
5 it a crazy or creative argument? It was hard for
6 me to hear. I take a bit of exception to that.
7 We addressed the device driver issue multiple
8 times in the POPR, quoting our expert. You can
9 look, for example, on pages 15, 30 to 31, 41 to
10 42.
11 And the real issue here, I think, we
12 made clear in the POPR is not really the word
13 "output," but the stuff that comes after it.
14 Software programming commands, and there's a lot
15 of very specific things about them that they must
16 do, which we say is nowhere to be found in the
17 reference.
18 And if you'll look at the reference,
19 as we point out, I think, very -- we certainly
20 made clear enough, the references, like most
21 documents in this space, use the term "software"
22 pretty loosely. They use it to refer to things

1 that are used to create software, for example.
2 So they're just playing games with the
3 word "software" we would say. But again, I don't
4 want to review it -- the arguments we already set
5 forth with great care in the POPR. If they
6 wanted to cite these things and say these things,
7 these paragraphs they cite to you, nothing
8 stopped them from doing that. This is entirely
9 foreseeable that we would interpret the reference
10 and that we would think that they didn't
11 interpret it the same way.
12 And it's up to you to decide the
13 merits, but there's a reason that there isn't
14 another round offered after the POPR under the
15 rules as a right. And we think that this is a
16 paradigmatic instance of an issue where you don't
17 have good cause.
18 We would also point out that we tend
19 to agree that the two IPRs are identical on this
20 point, and we would also point out that yes,
21 there's been a Markman hearing going to
22 discovery, and it's all set forth in the POPR,

1 meaning it's expected that the District Court
2 will be finished with the trial about half a
3 year, almost five or six months, depending on
4 which petition you're talking about before there
5 would be any final written decision expected in
6 this case. But again, I've already talked about
7 that in the POPR.
8 So in summary, we think this is an
9 easy situation where it would routinely be denied
10 under the other cases that have addressed merits
11 briefing requested at this stage, let alone
12 another round of expert declarations.
13 JUDGE KAISER: It sounds to me like
14 there's -- maybe dispute is the wrong word but --
15 disagreement or misunderstanding between the two
16 experts as to what software is intended to mean.
17 Am I -- am I right about that?
18 MR. WEATHERWAX: I would say that if
19 you look at their expert evidence, like the
20 arguments they made, it's very spare. There
21 really aren't a lot. And that's not something
22 that they have a right to do, to just put in a

1 little placeholder and wait to see what we say.
2 So I don't think that really there
3 is -- they can't say that we have unexpectedly
4 disagreed with some sort of specific argument
5 they've made. We think they ignored much of what
6 the reference said and we said so. There's
7 nothing unusual about that. There's nothing
8 unforeseeable about it whatsoever.
9 So we don't understand why that's good
10 cause to give them of the right to file a
11 targeted second round of expert declarations
12 here. It's already surprising enough that they
13 would basically use the call to argue to you like
14 a brief, not like a good cause brief, but just
15 like a merits brief that you should rule in their
16 favor.
17 We certainly don't think there's any
18 good cause for giving them the right to file a
19 brief on it. I mean, the fact is I can't think
20 of how unusual would it be that their expert says
21 that they can disagree with something our expert
22 says. I don't understand the argument that

1 that's unforeseeable.
2 JUDGE KAISER: Right. Okay. I think
3 I understand both parties' positions here. Let
4 me go offline here for just a moment and discuss
5 this with the rest of the panel, and I'll be back
6 in just a few minutes. If you would all hold the
7 line, please.
8 MR. WEATHERWAX: Thank you.
9 * * *
10 (Whereupon, a recess was taken
11 from 3:34 p.m. to 3:45 p.m.)
12 * * *
13 JUDGE KAISER: All right, everyone.
14 Thank you for holding.
15 Do we still have someone here for
16 Petitioner?
17 Mr. Anderson, do we still have you on
18 the line?
19 MR. ANDERSON: I'm sorry, Your Honor.
20 I was on mute. Yes, this is Kevin Anderson. I'm
21 still here. Yes.
22 JUDGE KAISER: Okay. Somebody still

1 here for Patent Owner, Mr. Weatherwax?
2 MR. WEATHERWAX: That's right. I'm
3 still here. This is Mr. Weatherwax.
4 JUDGE KAISER: Okay. We still have a
5 court reporter?
6 COURT REPORTER: Yes, we do.
7 JUDGE KAISER: Thank you very much. I
8 apologize for the delay.
9 So the panel have discussed it. I
10 think we agree with Patent Owner that on the --
11 the substantive issues, that Petitioner hasn't
12 really shown good cause to file a reply at this
13 point, but we also think that there is perhaps a
14 claim construction issue here that it would be
15 potentially helpful for the parties to address.
16 As everyone on the call knows, claim
17 construction is an issue of law that's incumbent
18 on us to decide correctly, and we would
19 appreciate the assistance the parties could give
20 us in getting it right.
21 And so for that reason, we're going to
22 go ahead and authorize a preliminary reply and a

1 preliminary surreply. That should address all
2 three of the issues in Petitioner's e-mails to
3 the Board about both cases.
4 So that is, first of all, the Sotera
5 stipulation, the stipulation itself, should be
6 filed as an exhibit, and then Petitioner should
7 in its reply make whatever argument it wishes to
8 make about why in light of whatever language it
9 stipulates to that new specific issue in these
10 cases and Patent Owner's surreply should make
11 whatever argument it wishes to make about why
12 that isn't the case.
13 And then on the merits issues, we're
14 not going to allow additional evidence to come
15 into the record, but to the extent Petitioner
16 wants to point out, given the evidence that's
17 currently of record, what the proper construction
18 of software or any other claim term in that
19 disputed limitation is and what the -- what the
20 record evidence is that has been addressed by
21 either experts so far that supports that claim
22 construction and we would appreciate having the

1 same thing from Patent Owner in the surreply. We
2 think that might be helpful.
3 The preliminary reply and the
4 preliminary surreply should each be limited to 10
5 pages. And the preliminary reply should come in
6 10 calendar days from today, and the preliminary
7 surreply should come in 10 calendar days
8 following, whenever the reply gets filed.
9 We'll issue an order probably next
10 week to the facts, but there's no reason anyone
11 needs to wait for the order. You can go ahead
12 and get started writing what you've got to write.
13 Are there any questions on what I have
14 just gone through? I'll ask Petitioner first.
15 MR. ANDERSON: Yes, Your Honor. Just
16 to clarify on the merits portion of it, my
17 understanding is that you want a discussion of
18 what the disputed claim term means and then a
19 discussion of the existing but not new record
20 evidence of meeting that construction. Is that
21 correct?
22 JUDGE KAISER: Yes. Let me -- let me

1 clarify that a little bit. I think that's
2 generally correct. But we don't envision this as
3 a place to go off on a tangent that's wildly
4 different from what's in the petition.
5 I think to the extent that the
6 disagreement between Petitioner's expert and
7 Patent Owner's expert shows that there is a
8 disagreement between them about what the scope of
9 that claim limitation is, it would be helpful to
10 clarify what you think the scope should be and
11 why the evidence that has already been pointed to
12 the prior art teaches that limitation thus
13 construed. And the same for Patent Owner side as
14 well.
15 So I -- I don't know -- I mean, I
16 think that the origin of the dispute is in a
17 disagreement between the parties and their
18 respective experts over sort of what the scope of
19 this term is, which sounds to me like a claims
20 construction issue. And I don't know that
21 everybody would necessarily view it that way.
22 They might view it as a burden of proof issue or

1 as a what the prior art teaches issue or
2 something else.
3 But to the extent that that dispute
4 can be, as I theorized, chalked up to a
5 misunderstanding between the experts of what --
6 sorry, misunderstanding is the wrong word, but a
7 dispute between the experts as to what the scope
8 of the term is, we would appreciate having that
9 clarified for us.
10 MR. ANDERSON: Okay, Your Honor. Yes,
11 I understand.
12 And just on the scope, just so I don't
13 do something wrong, the scope, of course, can
14 include citation to the intrinsic record of the
15 challenged patent.
16 Do I understand the scope?
17 JUDGE KAISER: Yes.
18 MR. ANDERSON: Okay.
19 JUDGE KAISER: Yes. I think that's
20 right. There's a little bit of a fine line here
21 in that, you know, typically we expect the
22 petition to front the issues that there is a

1 likely dispute over claim construction. It
2 probably should address all the rival claim
3 constructions that might be argued.
4 But you know, to the extent that this
5 one seems to have been in a little bit because it
6 doesn't appear to have come up or been resolved
7 in any way by the District Court, we think it
8 would be helpful to have at least a little more
9 argument on why each side is correct.
10 MR. ANDERSON: Okay, great. Thank
11 you, Your Honor. This is for Petitioner. I
12 don't have any further questions.
13 JUDGE KAISER: Okay. And Mr.
14 Weatherwax, any questions from your side?
15 MR. WEATHERWAX: Yes, Your Honor, I
16 do. I'll ask them one at a time.
17 First, will this mean that the -- both
18 parties will be allowed to cite evidence that
19 wasn't previously cited in the existing papers?
20 JUDGE KAISER: Yes. I think to the
21 extent that it's in the existing papers, it can
22 be cited in this brief.

1 I'll caution both sides that, you
2 know, the arguments shouldn't be radically new.
3 You know, I understand there's obviously going to
4 be some new argument here just because there
5 isn't really a claims construction argument in
6 either of the petition or the preliminary
7 response at this point.
8 And so we'll be on the lookout for
9 things that are -- that are cited that are --
10 that constitutes new argument as opposed to
11 clarifying the dispute that has been brought up
12 by the evidence that's already been cited.
13 MR. WEATHERWAX: Well, Your Honor,
14 okay. Understood. I think that's going to be
15 much more new citation from Petitioner than
16 Patent Owner because Patent Owner has much longer
17 briefing on this limitation. There's only one
18 disputed limitation, and you've just --
19 JUDGE KAISER: I think -- as I said,
20 we're going to have -- sorry. Go ahead.
21 MR. WEATHERWAX: Sorry. I didn't mean
22 to interrupt you, Your Honor.

1 JUDGE KAISER: I understand.
2 MR. WEATHERWAX: Next question is are
3 they -- so I understand that the arguments can be
4 on the claim construction of that limitation.
5 But would it also -- are you also ordering that
6 Petitioner can argue that the limitation is not
7 met?
8 JUDGE KAISER: I don't think that's a
9 new argument. I'm sorry. Petitioner can argue
10 that it's not met or Patent Owner can argue it's
11 not met?
12 MR. WEATHERWAX: Excuse me. I
13 apologize. I said it in a way that made no
14 sense.
15 Will Petitioner be able to argue not
16 just that it should be construed to have a
17 certain scope but that it is met for purposes of
18 obviousness? I mean, obviously that's not a new
19 argument. They're arguing it's met. But you
20 know, the basis of their argument could change.
21 And it seems to me that, if I don't
22 misunderstand that, those are two different ways

1 to argue. One way is to say that it should be
2 construed a certain way, and the other way is to
3 basically add to their arguments that it's met.
4 I guess the same would be in parallel true on our
5 side the other way.
6 JUDGE KAISER: Right. So I understand
7 your question --
8 MR. WEATHERWAX: My confusion stems
9 from the basis of your order that you said. You
10 said they didn't show good cause for this, but
11 then there's also a claim construction issue that
12 would be useful.
13 So I'm just trying to understand are
14 you saying then, therefore, they should be
15 arguing it as a claim construction issue? I'm
16 not trying to use --
17 JUDGE KAISER: I don't know that it's
18 helpful at all or will be helpful at all once we
19 get Petitioner's briefing for us all to get back
20 on the phone and have an argument about how it's
21 beyond the scope of what we ordered. And so I
22 hesitate to get in to try to micromanage what the

1 scope of it ought to be.
2 Our concern is that there may be a
3 twofold claims construction issue here that has
4 only been revealed by the fact that the experts
5 have such widely differing views about what
6 software seems to mean and whether this
7 particular piece of prior art or I guess a couple
8 pieces of prior art teaches something that can
9 fairly be called software in the context of this
10 patent claim.
11 And so yes, I think it's most helpful
12 to have both parties point us to this is what
13 software means, but I think it's potentially also
14 helpful to have both parties say this either is
15 or isn't in this piece of prior art because, you
16 know, the meaning of software is as we've told
17 you, and whether the prior art is the same as
18 that or different from that, depending on which
19 side you're on.
20 So I don't think I'm going to try to
21 limit what's argued in the briefs beyond saying
22 that to the extent that it's not just a

1 clarification of what software means and whether
2 that is actually in these pieces of prior art or
3 not but is instead some new argument that goes
4 beyond what Petitioner argued, we'll be watching
5 for that.
6 MR. WEATHERWAX: Thank you for the
7 explanation, Your Honor.
8 JUDGE KAISER: Okay. So as I said,
9 we'll issue an order that sets all of this out in
10 terms of what's authorized and deadlines and page
11 limits.
12 Before we leave, let me remind Patent
13 Owner, you retained a court reporter. So if you
14 would please file a transcript of this call once
15 you have it as an exhibit in the case, we'd
16 appreciate that.
17 MR. WEATHERWAX: Understood and will
18 do, Your Honor.
19 JUDGE KAISER: And then is there any
20 other -- are there any other issues we need to
21 touch on before we adjourn?
22 I'll ask Petitioner first.

1 MR. ANDERSON: No, Your Honor. Thank
2 you very much.
3 JUDGE KAISER: Patent Owner?
4 MR. WEATHERWAX: No, Your Honor.
5 Thank you.
6 JUDGE KAISER: Okay. Well, thank you
7 very much for joining me on a Friday afternoon,
8 and we are adjourned. Have a good weekend,
9 everyone.
10 (Whereupon, the hearing concluded at 4:01 p.m.)
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

1 CERTIFICATE OF SHORTHAND REPORTER - NOTARY PUBLIC
2 I, Tammy S. Newton, the officer before
3 whom the foregoing proceedings was taken, do
4 hereby certify that the foregoing transcript is a
5 true and correct record of the proceedings; that
6 said proceedings were taken by me
7 stenographically and thereafter reduced to
8 typewriting under my supervision; and that I am
9 neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by
10 any of the parties to this case and have no
11 interest, financial or otherwise, in its outcome.
12 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set
13 my hand and affixed my notarial seal this 3rd day
14 of June, 2024.
15 My commission expires:
16 3/05/2026
17
18 _____
19 Notary Public in and for the
20 State of Maryland
21
22

A

able 3:14 28:15
acted 5:9
actual 9:10
add 6:4 29:3
additional 6:4 15:16 22:14
address 14:4 21:15 22:1 26:2
addressed 9:19 16:7 18:10 22:20
adequately 13:2
adjourn 31:21
adjourned 32:8
advance 10:9
affixed 33:13
afternoon 32:7
ago 5:9
agree 17:19 21:10
ahead 4:20 21:22 23:11 27:20
Albright 13:15
allow 3:21 22:14
allowed 26:18
Anderson 2:6 3:17,18 4:3 6:8 6:11,21 9:18 10:22 12:10 13:11 20:17 20:19,20 23:15 25:10,18 26:10 32:1
answer 14:18
anticipated 10:9
apologize 5:4 10:15 21:8 28:13
APPEAL 1:2
appear 26:6
appreciate 21:19 22:22 25:8 31:16
area 12:11,22
argue 19:13 28:6,9,10,15 29:1
argued 14:7 26:3 30:21 31:4
arguing 28:19 29:15
argument 10:2 16:5 19:4,22 22:7,11 26:9 27:4,5 27:10 28:9,19,20 29:20 31:3
arguments 3:15 15:15 16:1 17:4 18:20 27:2 28:3 29:3
ARM 1:4,10
art 9:11 10:10 24:12 25:1 30:7,8,15,17 31:2
artisan 14:12
asked 14:17
asking 15:8
asserted 15:14
assistance 21:19
assume 3:20
authorize 21:22
authorized 31:10
Avenue 2:9

B

back 12:5 20:5 29:19
Banerjee 7:9
basically 11:8 14:21 19:13 29:3
basis 14:20 28:20 29:9
BEHALF 2:5,15
believe 6:13 9:8 13:18
believes 7:6,12
benefit 12:12 13:4
beyond 29:21 30:21 31:4
bit 16:6 24:1 25:20 26:5
Board 1:2 4:4,6,14 12:12 15:4,13 22:3
board's 4:7 5:12
Boulevard 2:19
brief 4:4,9 6:16,20 7:2 12:7,11 13:2 14:8 19:14,14,15,19 26:22
briefable 4:18
briefing 4:1 15:5,16 18:11 27:17 29:19
briefs 30:21
brought 27:11
bundled 9:6
burden 24:22

C

C 2:1 3:3
calendar 23:6,7
California 2:20
call 15:22 16:4 19:13 21:16 31:14
called 30:9
capable 14:10
captioned 6:14
care 17:5
case 4:19 5:3 18:6 22:12 31:15 33:10
cases 15:11 18:10 22:3,10
cause 14:3,5,17,21 15:8 17:17 19:10,14,18 21:12 29:10
caution 27:1
certain 11:1 28:17 29:2
certainly

16:19 19:17
CERTIFICATE
33:1
certify
33:4
chalked
25:4
challenged
8:16 25:15
change
28:20
citation
25:14 27:15
cite
17:6,7 26:18
cited
26:19,22 27:9,12
claim
10:21 11:13 21:14,16 22:18,21 23:18 24:9 26:1,2 28:4 29:11 29:15 30:10
claims
11:11,11 24:19 27:5 30:3
clarification
31:1
clarified
25:9
clarify
23:16 24:1,10
clarifying
27:11
clear
6:12,22 16:12,20
code
7:16 8:13
column
7:14 8:5,6
come
12:4 22:14 23:5,7 26:6
comes
16:13
coming
6:9
commands
16:14
comments
13:22
commission
33:15
commit
7:1
comparable
6:17,19,20
compiled
7:10,11
compromise
14:18
concern
30:2
conclude
9:2
concluded
32:10
confer
14:16
confusion
29:8
consider
4:7
constitutes
27:10
construction
11:11,12,13 13:17 21:14,17 22:17,22 23:20 24:20 26:1 27:5 28:4 29:11,15 30:3
constructions
26:3
construed
13:15 24:13 28:16 29:2
context
11:14 30:9
contrary
8:11,11
correct
9:10 23:21 24:2 26:9 33:5
correctly
9:15 21:18
counsel
33:9
couple
9:6 30:7
course
25:13
court
18:1 21:5,6 26:7 31:13
crazy
16:5
create
17:1
created
10:6
creative
10:2 16:5
current
13:19
currently
22:17

D

D
3:3
day
33:13
days
5:9 23:6,7
deadlines
31:10
decide
17:12 21:18
deciding
14:11
decision
5:13 15:1 18:5
deck
6:16
declaration
7:17 13:3 15:1
declarations
18:12 19:11
declared
9:7
definitive
3:13
delay
5:5 21:8
denied
18:9
deny
15:4
depending
18:3 30:18
describe
12:13
described
11:5
designed
12:16
designing
8:13
determines
15:13
device
7:12,22 8:1,3,7 9:22 10:5 11:19 12:14,18 12:18,20 16:7
devices
11:16
difference
10:19
different
5:14 6:15 9:12 24:4 28:22 30:18
differently
10:21
differing
30:5
director
4:16 5:8,16
director's
5:13
disadvantage
10:17
disagree
19:21
disagreed
19:4

disagreement
12:1 18:15 24:6,8,17
discovery
13:18,18 17:22
discuss
20:4
discussed
21:9
discusses
6:2
discussing
3:6
discussion
14:19 23:17,19
dispute
3:6 7:22 15:6 18:14 24:16 25:3,7 26:1 27:11
disputed
22:19 23:18 27:18
District
18:1 26:7
documents
16:21
doing
17:8
Dr
15:1
driver
16:7
drivers
7:22 8:1,3,7 10:5 12:15,18,18,21
Duane
2:8
D.C
2:11

E

E
2:1,1 3:3,3
earlier
13:12
early
10:15
easier
15:3
East
2:10
easy
18:9
effect
3:15 4:5
effectively
13:14
either
13:13 22:21 27:6 30:14
employed
33:9
ends
13:18
entirely
17:8
envision
24:2
ESQUIRE
2:6,7,16,17
everybody
24:21
evidence
6:3,5 15:9 18:19 22:14,16,20 23:20 24:11 26:18 27:12
exactly
5:11
example
16:9 17:1
exception
16:6
Excuse
28:12
exhibit
22:6 31:15
existing
23:19 26:19,21
expect
25:21
expected
10:1 18:1,5
expert
6:16 7:6,12,17 8:8,9 9:3,7 10:4,10 11:1,5 12:4,7,16 13:3,5 14:7 16:4,8 18:12 18:19 19:11,20,21 24:6,7
experts
10:20 18:16 22:21 24:18 25:5,7 30:4
expert's
7:6 12:12
expires
33:15
explain
6:9 9:3 12:17
explaining
7:18
explanation
12:13 31:7
express
7:8 10:11 11:11
expressly
7:15 8:12 9:21 11:4 11:15,17
extent
22:15 24:5 25:3 26:4 26:21 30:22
extra
8:21
e-mail
6:1
e-mailed
3:22
e-mails
5:2 22:2

F

face
7:7
fact
16:3 19:19 30:4
factor
4:6
facts
5:14 23:10
factually
9:8
fair
8:20
fairly
11:4 30:9
far
3:5 22:21
fashion
8:10
favor
19:16
file
3:8 6:1 19:10,18 21:12 31:14
filed
5:8 22:6 23:8
final
18:5
financial
33:11
fine
25:20
finished
18:2
first
3:17 14:15 22:4 23:14 26:17 31:22
five
18:3
following
23:8
foregoing
33:3,4
foreseeable
17:9
forth
16:1 17:5,22
found
16:16
Frankly
11:12
Friday
1:18 3:2 32:7
front
25:22
fully
14:10

further
26:12

G

G
3:3
games
17:2
general
12:10
generally
3:7,10 24:2
generate
7:21
generating
11:15
getting
21:20
give
4:19,21 12:5 14:18 19:10 21:19
given
22:16
giving
19:18
go
4:20 11:7 20:4 21:22 23:11 24:3 27:20
goes
31:3
going
3:21 14:9 17:21 21:21 22:14 27:3,14 27:20 30:20
good
14:3,5,16,21 15:7 17:17 19:9,14,18 21:12 29:10 32:8
great
17:5 26:10
guess
3:16 9:9,15 12:1,2 13:6 29:4 30:7

H

half
18:2
hand
5:1 33:13
happy
4:19
hard
16:5
hardware
8:2,3,13 10:6 11:16 12:15,17,20
hear
14:2 16:6
heard
14:15
hearing
1:17 13:12 17:21 32:10
helpful
21:15 23:2 24:9 26:8 29:18,18 30:11,14
hereunto
33:12
hesitate
29:22
hold
20:6
holding
20:14
holds
15:5
Honor
4:11 6:11 14:2 20:19 23:15 25:10 26:11 26:15 27:13,22 31:7 31:18 32:1,4
Houh
15:1

I

ICPILLAR
1:7,13
identical
6:13 17:19
ignore
10:8,11
ignored
19:5
include
25:14
including
7:20
incompatible
12:9
incorrect
7:7 9:8 13:1
incumbent
21:17
information
9:16
instance
17:16
instantiate
7:11
instantiating
9:22 11:18
institute
15:2
intended
11:15 18:16
interest
33:11
interpret
9:14,15 17:9,11
interpretation
7:7 9:11 11:21,21
interpreting
5:12 8:10 10:20
interrupt
27:22
intrinsic
25:14
IPR
5:4,6,7 15:12,19
IPRs
6:13,15 17:19
IPR2024-00476
1:12
IPR2024-00566
1:6
issue
3:13 4:2,9,18 5:16,17 5:20,21 13:3,7,22 16:7,11 17:16 21:14 21:17 22:9 23:9 24:20,22 25:1 29:11 29:15 30:3 31:9
issues
3:6,21 6:13 9:6 21:11 22:2,13 25:22 31:20

J

Job
1:20
joining
32:7
Judge
2:2,3 3:5,19 4:12,20 5:6,19 6:18 9:5 10:13 12:2 13:6,14 13:20 18:13 20:2,13 20:22 21:4,7 23:22 25:17,19 26:13,20 27:19 28:1,8 29:6 29:17 31:8,19 32:3 32:6
June
33:14

K

KAISER
2:2 3:5,19 4:12,20 5:6,19 6:18 9:5 10:13 12:2 13:6,20 18:13 20:2,13,22 21:4,7 23:22 25:17 25:19 26:13,20 27:19 28:1,8 29:6 29:17 31:8,19 32:3 32:6
KENNETH
2:16
Kevin
2:6 20:20
key
11:3
kind
4:7 7:7 10:11
know

11:8,20 12:7 13:13 24:15,20 25:21 26:4 27:2,3 28:20 29:17 30:16
known 12:14
knows 4:5 21:16
kpanderson@dua... 2:13

L

language 22:8
late 5:13
law 4:8 21:17
leave 31:12
letting 14:21
let's 3:16,20 5:21
light 8:15 22:8
limit 30:21
limitation 22:19 24:9,12 27:17 27:18 28:4,6
limited 1:4,10 3:12 23:4
limits 4:17 5:17 31:11
line 20:7,18 25:20
lines 7:15
litigation 13:8,9
little 19:1 24:1 25:20 26:5 26:8
LLC 1:7,13
long 7:3
longer 27:16
look 8:9 9:1,20 16:9,18 18:19
lookout 27:8
loosely 16:22
lot 15:20 16:14 18:21
lots 15:11
Lowenstein 2:18

M

machine 7:16
Markman 13:10,11 17:21
Maryland 33:20
matter 10:20
MCPHERSON 2:7
mean 6:19 9:13 18:16 19:19 24:15 26:17 27:21 28:18 30:6
meaning 11:2,22 13:16 18:1 30:16
means 11:7,22 23:18 30:13 31:1
meet 14:16
meeting 23:20
mention 14:4,16
merits 15:5 17:13 18:10 19:15 22:13 23:16
met 28:7,10,11,17,19 29:3
micromanage 29:22
middle 13:17
mind 16:2
mini 14:22
minute 4:22
minutes 20:6
mischaracterizes 15:14
mischaracterizing 16:3
missing 9:17
misunderstand 28:22
misunderstanding 18:15 25:5,6
moment 3:20 20:4
Monica 2:20
months 18:3
Morris 2:8
move 5:21
multiple 16:7
mute 20:20

N

N 2:1 3:3
necessarily 24:21
need 5:20 12:4 14:6,8 15:16 31:20
needs 11:13 23:11
neither 33:9
never 14:15
new 2:9 22:9 23:19 27:2,4 27:10,15 28:9,18 31:3
Newton 1:22 33:2
normal 8:20
normally 10:17
notarial 33:13
Notary 33:1,19
note 4:13
notes 5:1
number 4:19 5:3
NXP 5:13
N.W 2:9

O

O 3:3
obviously 27:3 28:18
obviousness 28:18
offered 17:14
OFFICE 1:1

officer
33:2
offline
20:4
okay
5:19 9:5 10:13 12:2 13:6,20 20:2,22 21:4 25:10,18 26:10 26:13 27:14 31:8 32:6
once
29:18 31:14
ones
15:12
operating
7:10,11
opinion
12:5
opinions
10:20
opposed
3:10,22 27:10
order
6:7 13:10,12 23:9,11 29:9 31:9
ordered
29:21
ordering
28:5
ordinary
13:16 14:12
origin
24:16
ought
30:1
outcome
33:11
output
7:15 8:2,8,14 10:7 11:6,7,22 12:19 16:13
outputting
7:13,20 8:17 9:2,21 11:2,3,5,9,13,18
Owner
1:8,14 3:9,11 6:3 21:1,10 23:1 24:13 27:16,16 28:10 31:13 32:3
Owner's
9:7 12:7 22:10 24:7

P

P
2:1,1 3:3
page
31:10
pages
1:21 4:2 6:22 7:2 16:9 23:5
panel
20:5 21:9
paper
15:12,19
papers
26:19,21
paradigmatic
17:16
paragraph
7:8
paragraphs
17:7
parallel
13:8,9 29:4
part
9:19 15:3
particular
12:14 13:16 30:7
particularly
8:14
parties
13:17 20:3 21:15,19 24:17 26:18 30:12 30:14 33:10
party
13:13 15:14
party's
15:15
passages
7:19 8:5
patent
1:1,2,7,8,13,14 3:9 3:11 6:3 8:15,16 9:7 10:12 12:7 21:1,10 22:10 23:1 24:7,13 25:15 27:16,16 28:10 30:10 31:12 32:3
PATRICK
2:7
pending
4:15
percent
11:1
perfectly
14:10
petition
9:16,17,19 14:22 15:7 18:4 24:4 25:22 27:6
Petitioner
1:5,11 2:5 3:8,14 20:16 21:11 22:6,15 23:14 26:11 27:15 28:6,9,15 31:4,22
Petitioner's
5:22 22:2 24:6 29:19
phone
29:20
Pico
2:19
piece
30:7,15
pieces
30:8 31:2
PISTONE
2:17
place
24:3
placeholder
19:1
plain
11:2 13:15
plainly
7:12
planning
4:3,5,9
playing
17:2
please
20:7 31:14
point
5:11 8:2 9:13 15:10 15:11 16:19 17:18 17:20,20 21:13 22:16 27:7 30:12
pointed
12:6,11 24:11
POPR
15:7 16:4,8,12 17:5 17:14,22 18:7
portion
23:16
POSITA
7:18 9:1
position
10:4
positions
20:3
potentially
21:15 30:13
precedential
5:13
preliminary
3:9 6:2 21:22 22:1 23:3,4,5,6 27:6
prepared
9:3
pressed
14:5
pretty
6:6 16:22
previously
26:19
PRICE
2:3
prior
9:11 24:12 25:1 30:7 30:8,15,17 31:2
probably
6:22 7:3 23:9 26:2
proceedings
33:3,5,6
programmer

7:16
programming
16:14
proof
24:22
proper
22:17
proposal
3:11
providing
8:19
Public
33:1,19
purpose
8:11 11:15 15:22
purposes
28:17
put
6:3 7:17 16:1 18:22
puts
8:14
p.m
1:19 3:2 20:11,11 32:10

Q

question
10:14 12:3 13:7 28:2 29:7
questions
23:13 26:12,14
quote
15:17
quoting
16:8

R

R
2:1 3:3
radically
27:2
raising
5:17
real
16:11
really
16:12 18:21 19:2 21:12 27:5
reason
6:17 7:4 12:4 17:13 21:21 23:10
recess
20:10
record
6:4 9:9 10:16 22:15 22:17,20 23:19 25:14 33:5
reduced
33:7
refer
16:22
reference
7:14 8:6 10:5 11:4 12:8 16:17,18 17:9 19:6
references
7:5,21 8:10,12 9:11 9:14,20 11:14 12:13 14:12 15:15 16:20
related
33:9
remaining
5:21
remand
5:15
remind
31:12
reply
3:8,12,21 6:2 21:12 21:22 22:7 23:3,5,8
Reported
1:22
reporter
21:5,6 31:13 33:1
request
4:16 5:8 15:4
requested
18:11
requests
6:10 15:5
required
8:21
ResMed
5:3
resolved
26:6
respect
8:18
respective
24:18
respond
4:10
RESPONDENT
2:15
response
3:9 6:2 27:7
rest
20:5
retained
31:13
revealed
30:4
review
4:16 5:8 17:4
right
4:16 13:20 14:11 17:15 18:17,22 19:10,18 20:2,13 21:2,20 25:20 29:6
rival
26:2
ROBERT
2:17
Rompaey
8:6
round
17:14 18:12 19:11
routinely
15:4,13 18:9
rule
19:15
rules
17:15

S

S
1:22 2:1 3:3 33:2
satisfies
15:7
saying
9:7 29:14 30:21
says
7:9,15 9:21 10:7,7 11:6,6,8 12:7,8 15:13 19:20,22
schedule
13:19
scope
24:8,10,18 25:7,12 25:13,16 28:17 29:21 30:1
seal
33:13
second
14:22,22 19:11
see
5:19 19:1
seeking
3:8
sense
28:14
September
13:19
set
15:22 17:4,22 33:12
sets
31:9
SHORTHAND
33:1
show
29:10
shown
21:12
shows
24:7
side
11:10 24:13 26:9,14 29:5 30:19
sides
4:1 27:1
simulation
11:7
single
14:3

situation
18:9
six
18:3
size
6:17,19
skilled
10:10
small
4:1
software
7:13,20 8:13,18 9:3 9:22 10:5 11:3,5,16 12:14 16:14,21 17:1 17:3 18:16 22:18 30:6,9,13,16 31:1
Somebody
20:22
soon
4:22
sorry
4:22 6:19,21 20:19 25:6 27:20,21 28:9
sort
5:16 6:8 9:10 10:1 14:21,22 15:6 19:4 24:18
Sotera
3:7,13 4:4,17 5:13,18 22:4
sounds
15:21 18:13 24:19
space
16:21
spare
18:20
speaking
3:8
special
11:22
specific
6:12 12:15,17 16:15 19:4 22:9
specifically
3:13 8:7 15:21
specification
8:15,16,17
spent
10:16
stage
10:15 15:6 18:11
started
23:12
State
33:20
statements
7:8 8:12 10:11 11:17 13:2
STATES
1:1
stems
29:8
stenographically
33:7
stipulates
22:9
stipulation
3:7,14 4:4 22:5,5
stipulations
4:17 5:14,18
stopped
17:8
stuff
16:13
submission
6:14
submit
4:6
submitted
13:13 15:9
substantive
21:11
subtly
9:12
Suite
2:10
summary
14:6 18:8
supervision
33:8
supported
9:9
supports
22:21
Sure
4:12 9:18
surprising
19:12
surreply
22:1,10 23:1,4,7
system
7:10,11

T

tailor
10:6
tailored
8:1 11:16 12:19,21
tailoring
8:3 12:14
tailors
12:17
take
7:9 16:6
taken
20:10 33:3,6
talk
3:16
talked
18:6
talking
18:4
tall
6:6
Tammy
1:22 33:2
tangent
24:3
targeted
19:11
teaches
24:12 25:1 30:8
tend
17:18
term
8:17 11:3,12 16:21 22:18 23:18 24:19 25:8
terms
10:21 31:10
testimonial
6:3,5
testimony
12:5
thank
20:8,14 21:7 26:10 31:6 32:1,5,6
theorized
25:4
thing
10:3 14:3 23:1
things
9:12 14:14 16:15,22 17:6,6 27:9
think
4:4,7,14,18 5:8,19 7:4 8:19,22 9:5,12 10:3,8 11:4,13 12:16,22 13:1,4,12 15:3 16:11,19 17:10 17:15 18:8 19:2,5 19:17,19 20:2 21:10 21:13 23:2 24:1,5 24:10,16 25:19 26:7 26:20 27:14,19 28:8 30:11,13,20
thought
3:19
three
4:2 14:14 22:2
three-page
3:12
time
10:16 26:16
times
16:8
timing
4:17
today
23:6
told
30:16
tool
7:16 8:8

tools
7:21
touch
31:21
TRADEMARK
1:1
transcript
31:14 33:4
trial
1:2 18:2
true
7:2 8:14 29:4 33:5
try
29:22 30:20
trying
29:13,16
turned
14:17
two
6:12,15 7:21 10:19 12:8 15:10,12 17:19 18:15 28:22
twofold
30:3
typewriting
33:8
typically
25:21

U

unanimity
4:15
understand
19:9,22 20:3 25:11 25:16 27:3 28:1,3 29:6,13
understanding
5:22 13:14 23:17
understood
12:19 27:14 31:17
unexpectedly
19:3
unforeseeable
19:8 20:1
UNITED
1:1
unusual
19:7,20
use
8:16 16:21,22 19:13 29:16
useful
29:12
uses
8:19,20

V

vacuum
6:6
view
7:18,19 24:21,22
views
30:5
vs
1:6,12

W

wait
19:1 23:11
want
4:19 17:4 23:17
wanted
14:19 17:6
wants
22:16
Washington
2:11
wasn't
26:19
watching
31:4
way
8:19,21 9:14 17:11 24:21 26:7 28:13 29:1,2,2,5
ways
28:22
Weatherwax
2:16,18 4:10,13,21 5:7 13:21 14:1 18:18 20:8 21:1,2,3 26:14,15 27:13,21 28:2,12 29:8 31:6 31:17 32:4
weatherwax@lowe...
2:22
week
23:10
weekend
32:8
well-known
4:8
we'll
23:9 27:8 31:4,9
we're
3:5,20 11:18,18 21:21 22:13 27:20
we've
30:16
whatsoever
14:20 19:8
WHEREOF
33:12
widely
30:5
wildly
24:3
wishes
22:7,11
WITNESS
33:12
word
8:19 16:12 17:3 18:14 25:6
work
7:10 12:20
working
10:17
wouldn't
7:3 14:16
write
23:12
writing
23:12
written
18:5
wrong
18:14 25:6,13

X

x
1:3,9,15 12:7

Y

Y
12:8
Yeah
4:20
year
13:12 18:3
York
2:9

Z

Zoom
1:17

1

1
1:21
10
5:9 6:21 7:2 15:12 23:4,6,7
10-page
6:16
100
11:1
1016
2:19
11
7:14
1153900
1:20
15
15:19 16:9
19
7:15

2

20001
2:11
202
2:12
2021-1468
15:12

2023-00565
5:4,7
2024
1:18 3:2 33:14
2024-214
15:19
21
7:15
215
15:19
27
8:6

3

3rd
33:13
3/05/2026
33:16
3:09
1:19 3:2
3:34
20:11
3:45
20:11
30
16:9
307-4503
2:21
31
1:18 3:2 16:9
310
2:21
33
1:21

4

4:01
32:10
41
16:9
42
16:10

7

7
8:5
700
2:10
776-5213
2:12

8

8,924,899
1:13
83
7:8

9

9,367,657
1:7
901
2:9
90405
2:20