

Bonini, Matthew

From: Jensen, Travis
Sent: Monday, December 23, 2024 11:49 AM
To: Blumenkopf, Bryan; Yap, Alex S.
Cc: Arjomand, Mehran; Lang, Jason; Brausa, Adam R.; Bonini, Matthew; Lang, Jason
Subject: RE: IPR2024-00228, -229, -230, and PGR2024-00011

Bryan,

Petitioner's position is clear—there was a single, common deposition for all 5 proceedings that was to apply in each proceeding. On the basis of the parties' agreement to this approach, Petitioner made no objections (or other indications) at Mr. Welch's deposition or in its Objections to Patent Owner's response that any testimony given at the deposition was on a proceeding-by-proceeding basis. But the concern is not about Petitioner's position. The issue arose with respect to Patent Owner's position. Using leading questions, you elicited redirect testimony from Dr. Houh as follows:

Q. When you testified about the '643 proceeding and Mr. Welch's declaration in that proceeding, was that testimony directed to all five proceedings?

MR. JENSEN: Object to form and scope, leading.

A. I think it was directed towards just the '643 because that's what we were looking at.

BY MR. BLUMENKOPF: Q. Would it be accurate to apply that testimony to proceedings other than the '643 proceeding?

MR. JENSEN: Object to form and scope, leading.

A. No. I think -- because there are some issues specific to the '643.

2024/12/19 Tr., 332:18-33:6. This plainly raised a concern about Patent Owner's position regarding cross-use.

The portion of Mr. Welch's declaration (¶¶192-193) used to question Dr. Houh's was identical in each proceeding. *See* Ex. 1013, ¶1 ("Because of the similarities in my opinion regarding the Challenged Patents, my declarations from §§I-XII are identical."). In view of your questioning above, I sought clarification from you at the deposition. The exchange below followed testimony from Dr. Houh where he said his testimony about "50 pages of identical declaration testimony" could differ across proceedings because a particular declaration was used to ask the questions. *Id.* 353:18-354:5.

MR. JENSEN: And I'm just trying to get this on the record because, you know, we had an understanding. And if you have a changed understanding or a different understanding, then, you know, we will move to compel four more depositions of Dr. Houh, one on each of his declarations. I'm just trying to figure out if that's going to be necessary or not or if we can stipulate that his testimony that he gave today, you know, is admissible and applies in all five proceedings.

MR. BLUMENKOPF: Like I said, Counsel, we stand by the agreement. I'm not stipulating to anything right now.

Id., 347:22-348:9. In view of this, it appeared that Patent Owner wished to raise objections that testimony responsive to questions regarding one expert declaration may not apply to other IPR proceedings, even where the expert declarations contain identical language. Thank you for clarifying that is not the case. Enjoy the Holiday. Thanks, Travis

From: Blumenkopf, Bryan <BBlumen@mofo.com>
Sent: Sunday, December 22, 2024 10:29 PM
To: Jensen, Travis <tjensen@orrick.com>; Yap, Alex S. <AYap@mofo.com>

Cc: Arjomand, Mehran <MArjomand@mofo.com>; Lang, Jason <jlang@orrick.com>; Brausa, Adam R. <ABrausa@mofo.com>; Bonini, Matthew <mbonini@orrick.com>; Lang, Jason <jlang@orrick.com>
Subject: RE: IPR2024-00228, -229, -230, and PGR2024-00011

[EXTERNAL]

Travis,

Thank you for your response. We of course wish to avoid the Board's involvement in this matter. However, I'm still unclear on your position. As I stated, Patent Owner understands that Petitioner may use the Houh transcript in all five proceedings. Contrary to your draft email to the Board, I never "indicated that testimony responsive to questions regarding one expert declaration would not apply to the other IPR proceedings, even where the expert declarations contain identical language." Patent Owner does not intend to seek to exclude testimony in a proceeding solely on the basis that the testimony was focused on a different proceeding. But as I indicated in my email from Thursday evening, Patent Owner reserves its rights to address Petitioner's reliance on any particular portion of Dr. Houh's testimony, in any particular proceeding, as that need may arise. We understand Petitioner to have similarly reserved its rights. Is it your position that the parties agreed otherwise?

BRYAN BLUMENKOPF

Associate | Morrison & Foerster LLP

707 Wilshire Boulevard | Los Angeles, CA 90017-3543

Desk: +1 (213) 892-5269

Mobile: +1 (213) 344-8451

bblumen@mofo.com

From: Jensen, Travis <tjensen@orrick.com>

Sent: Friday, December 20, 2024 12:58 PM

To: Blumenkopf, Bryan <BBlumen@mofo.com>; Yap, Alex S. <AYap@mofo.com>

Cc: Arjomand, Mehran <MArjomand@mofo.com>; Lang, Jason <jlang@orrick.com>; Brausa, Adam R. <ABrausa@mofo.com>; Bonini, Matthew <mbonini@orrick.com>; Lang, Jason <jlang@orrick.com>

Subject: RE: IPR2024-00228, -229, -230, and PGR2024-00011

External Email

Bryan,

Thank you for the note below. While your email is a productive first step, it does not address key issues and is not consistent with how you and Dr. Houh proceeded at the end of the deposition, or with how the parties proceeded at Mr. Welch's deposition (which you did not attend). A consolidated deposition was duly noticed for all five proceedings pursuant to the parties' agreement on the express basis of the "very substantial overlap in the IPRs." At the Welch deposition, Patent Owner's counsel elected to use the '420 declaration from IPR2024-00228 as the baseline for questioning. See Welch Tr. 43:4-94 ("Q. For the most part, I can tell you I'm going to spend our time, for efficiency purposes, on Exhibit 1013 from the 228 proceeding. A. Okay. Q. And that's with respect to the '420 patent. A. Mm-hmm."). And questioning throughout the deposition proceeded on that basis with no attempt by Petitioner to cabin any portion of the testimony to a particular IPR proceeding. To be clear, the issue is not whether Petitioner can perform the act of filing Dr. Houh's transcript in all five proceedings. The issue is whether Patent Owner intends to seek to exclude testimony on the basis that Petitioner focused questioning on one declaration. In view of yesterday's redirect and

recross examination of Dr. Houh, that appeared to be the case. It is unclear from your email below whether that remains Patent Owner's the case.

The first question Dr. Houh's was asked was whether he was testifying for all five proceedings, to which he said "yes." See 2024/12/18 Houh Rough Tr., 2:5-17 ("Do you understand, Dr. Houh, that you're here today to be deposed in connection with each of [IPR2024-00228, IPR2024-00229, IPR2024-00230, IPR2024-00495, and PGR2024-00011]? A. Yes."). Instead of using the '420 declaration as Patent Owner did at the Welch deposition as the baseline for questioning, Petitioner used the '643 declaration as the baseline for questioning, but provided Dr. Houh with a copy of his declarations (and Mr. Welch's declarations) from all five proceedings. Nevertheless, you proceeded to elicit testimony from Dr. Houh on redirect that when he answered questions "about Mr. Welch's declaration in the '643 proceeding," that his testimony "was directed towards just the '643 because that's what we were looking at." See 2024/12/19 Houh Rough Tr., 105:17-106:1. Yet, when I asked Dr. Houh about paragraphs 192-193 in the Welch declaration, I noted that they are identical in all of Mr. Welch's declarations and gave Dr. Houh the option of looking at any declaration he wanted. See *id.*, 19:13-19 ("Q. Let's go to Mr. Welch's declaration in paragraphs 192 and 193. A. Of which matter? Q. Any of them. You can pick whatever one you would like. I'm sharing the one from the '643 declaration, but they're all the same in the parts I'm going to ask you about.").

Dr. Houh also periodically confirmed that the portions of his declaration he was asked about were substantively identical in all five proceedings, differing only occasionally in paragraph numbering. See, e.g., 2024/12/18 Houh Rough Tr., 71:5-13. But, just as at Mr. Welch's deposition, for efficiency purposes, we did not waste everyone's time reconfirming that each and every question from a particular declaration would pertain to all five proceedings. Indeed, the whole point of having a consolidated deposition was to avoid such an exercise. As such, for at least these reasons, Petitioner believes it is appropriate to use the entirety of Dr. Houh's deposition transcript in all five proceedings. Your email below is unclear whether Patent Owner still has a different view. Your hypothetical about a "prior art combination presented only in the '643 petition" misses the point entirely, especially considering that no questions were asked about such a combination. In fact, no questions were asked about any combination other than Chang and Chang II. Conversely, for example, all of Dr. Houh's declarations addressed Petitioner's crossbar *and* multiplexer implementations, even if Petitioner only relied on one of them for a given IPR. Thus, it is fair to include testimony about such topics in all five proceedings. It is unclear what you are trying to accomplish by dissecting the deposition. Petitioner did no such thing with Mr. Welch's deposition per the parties' agreement. In summary, if Patent Owner insists on seeking to exclude portions of Dr. Houh's testimony on the basis that a particular declaration (as opposed to a substantially similar declaration) was used to elicit testimony which makes the testimony irrelevant to an IPR on related patents (all from the same family sharing a common specification and substantially overlapping claim language), please let us know so we can contact the Board. Best regards, Travis

From: Blumenkopf, Bryan <BBlumen@mofo.com>

Sent: Thursday, December 19, 2024 5:55 PM

To: Jensen, Travis <tjensen@orrick.com>; Yap, Alex S. <AYap@mofo.com>

Cc: Arjomand, Mehran <MArjomand@mofo.com>; Lang, Jason <jlang@orrick.com>; Brausa, Adam R. <ABrausa@mofo.com>; Bonini, Matthew <mbonini@orrick.com>; Lang, Jason <jlang@orrick.com>

Subject: RE: IPR2024-00228, -229, -230, and PGR2024-00011

[EXTERNAL]

Travis,

This may be a simple misunderstanding. In this consolidated deposition, Dr. Houh provided testimony for the five proceedings covering four patents. Petitioner is free to submit the entire deposition transcript in each of the five proceedings, and to rely on the transcript as appropriate for each of the proceedings. This is consistent with the parties' treatment of Eric Welch's deposition, in which Mr. Welch's deposition transcript was submitted and cited to by Patent Owner in its response for each of the proceedings.

But for clarity, Patent Owner reserves the right to address Petitioner's reliance on any particular portion of Dr. Houh's testimony for any particular proceeding, including for relevance. For example, Patent Owner reserves the right to address that testimony directed to an issue specific to the '643 patent may not be relevant to proceedings other than the '643 proceeding. For example, certainly you would agree that Mr. Houh's testimony relating to a prior art combination presented only in the '643 petition may not be relevant to the proceedings that do not raise that prior art combination. This again is parallel to the parties' treatment of Mr. Welch's deposition testimony. It is also consistent with Dr. Houh's testimony today that it would not necessarily be accurate to apply his testimony on the '643 patent to the other proceedings.

If this is consistent with Petitioner's understanding, we believe we can avoid an unnecessary call to the Board on this issue.

BRYAN BLUMENKOPF

Associate | Morrison & Foerster LLP

707 Wilshire Boulevard | Los Angeles, CA 90017-3543

Desk: +1 (213) 892-5269

Mobile: +1 (213) 344-8451

bblumen@mofo.com

From: Jensen, Travis <tjensen@orrick.com>

Sent: Thursday, December 19, 2024 4:18 PM

To: Blumenkopf, Bryan <BBlumen@mofo.com>; Yap, Alex S. <AYap@mofo.com>

Cc: Arjomand, Mehran <MArjomand@mofo.com>; Lang, Jason <jlang@orrick.com>; Brausa, Adam R. <ABrausa@mofo.com>; Bonini, Matthew <mbonini@orrick.com>; Lang, Jason <jlang@orrick.com>

Subject: RE: IPR2024-00228, -229, -230, and PGR2024-00011

External Email

Bryan,

Please see the email below that we intend to send to the Board. If you can agree that Dr. Houh's testimony regarding common portions of his declarations can be used in each proceeding there is no need for a motion. Thanks, Travis

###

Trials:

Petitioner requests authorization in the five above-identified proceeding (IPR2024-00228, IPR2024-00229, IPR2024-00230, PGR2024-00011, and IPR2024-00495) to file a 5-page motion to compel cross examination of Patent Owner's expert declarant (Dr. Henry Houh). The parties previously reached an agreement to conduct one 10.5 hour cross examination of each parties' expert for common usage in each of the 5 IPRs based on the "very substantial overlap in the IPRs" which challenged patents from the same family sharing a common specification. Dr. Houh had all 5 expert declarations available to him during his deposition and was frequently invited to look at whichever one he would like to answer the questions. At the conclusion of the Dr. Houh's deposition, Patent Owner's counsel indicated that testimony responsive to questions regarding one expert declaration would not apply to the other IPR proceedings, even where the expert declarations contain identical language.

Patent Owner indicated that it opposes Petitioner's motion.

The parties are available for a call at the Board's convenience.

Respectfully submitted, Travis

From: Blumenkopf, Bryan <BBlumen@mofo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2024 4:53 AM
To: Jensen, Travis <tjensen@orrick.com>; Yap, Alex S. <AYap@mofo.com>
Cc: Arjomand, Mehran <MArjomand@mofo.com>; Lang, Jason <jlang@orrick.com>; Brausa, Adam R. <ABrausa@mofo.com>; Bonini, Matthew <mbonini@orrick.com>
Subject: RE: IPR2024-00228, -229, -230, and PGR2024-00011

[EXTERNAL]

Travis,

Building security has asked for the names of the people who will be at tomorrow's deposition. Can you please provide that information today? Please also let us know if they have any preferences for lunch.

Thank you,

BRYAN BLUMENKOPF

Associate | Morrison & Foerster LLP

707 Wilshire Boulevard | Los Angeles, CA 90017-3543

Desk: +1 (213) 892-5269

Mobile: +1 (213) 344-8451

bblumen@mofo.com

From: Jensen, Travis <tjensen@orrick.com>
Sent: Sunday, December 15, 2024 5:13 PM
To: Blumenkopf, Bryan <BBlumen@mofo.com>; Yap, Alex S. <AYap@mofo.com>
Cc: Arjomand, Mehran <MArjomand@mofo.com>; Lang, Jason <jlang@orrick.com>; Brausa, Adam R. <ABrausa@mofo.com>; Bonini, Matthew <mbonini@orrick.com>
Subject: RE: IPR2024-00228, -229, -230, and PGR2024-00011

External Email

Counsel,

We are sending an ftp link with the exhibits for Dr. Houh's remote deposition on Dec. 18-19. We plan to use screen share, but wanted to make sure the witness had a local electronic copy available as well. Please ensure Dr. Houh has a computer monitor adequate for viewing documents and provide him the electronic exhibits before the deposition. If you and/or the witness prefer hard copies, you are welcome to print whatever you would like. With that in mind, the exhibits we anticipate likely to be referenced most often are the challenged patents, Dr. Houh's declarations, and the Chang and Chang II references. Of course, we reserve the right to question Dr. Houh on any exhibit. Thanks, Travis

From: Jensen, Travis
Sent: Tuesday, December 3, 2024 8:00 AM
To: Blumenkopf, Bryan <BBlumen@mofo.com>; Yap, Alex S. <AYap@mofo.com>

Cc: Arjomand, Mehran <MArjomand@mofo.com>; Lang, Jason <jlang@orrick.com>; Brausa, Adam R. <ABrausa@mofo.com>

Subject: RE: IPR2024-00228, -229, -230, and PGR2024-00011

Hi Bryan,

We will proceed with this deposition remotely on Dec. 18-19. Thanks, Travis

From: Jensen, Travis

Sent: Wednesday, November 27, 2024 5:01 PM

To: Blumenkopf, Bryan <BBlumen@mofo.com>; Yap, Alex S. <AYap@mofo.com>

Cc: Arjomand, Mehran <MArjomand@mofo.com>; Lang, Jason <jlang@orrick.com>; Brausa, Adam R. <ABrausa@mofo.com>

Subject: RE: IPR2024-00228, -229, -230, and PGR2024-00011

Bryan – given the Boston location, we may need to proceed with a remote deposition. But please hold those dates and I'll get back to you. Thanks, Travis

From: Blumenkopf, Bryan <BBlumen@mofo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, November 27, 2024 4:58 PM

To: Jensen, Travis <tjensen@orrick.com>; Yap, Alex S. <AYap@mofo.com>

Cc: Arjomand, Mehran <MArjomand@mofo.com>; Lang, Jason <jlang@orrick.com>; Brausa, Adam R. <ABrausa@mofo.com>

Subject: RE: IPR2024-00228, -229, -230, and PGR2024-00011

[EXTERNAL]

Travis,

Dr. Houh is available for a two-day deposition on December 18-19 at MoFo's Boston office. This will be a consolidated deposition covering the five proceedings (IPR2024-00228, IPR2024-00229, IPR2024-00230, IPR2024-00495, and PGR2024-00011). Can you confirm these dates will work for your team?

BRYAN BLUMENKOPF

Associate | Morrison & Foerster LLP

707 Wilshire Boulevard | Los Angeles, CA 90017-3543

Desk: +1 (213) 892-5269

Mobile: +1 (213) 344-8451

bblumen@mofo.com

From: Blumenkopf, Bryan

Sent: Tuesday, November 26, 2024 9:20 PM

To: 'Jensen, Travis' <tjensen@orrick.com>; Yap, Alex S. <AYap@mofo.com>

Cc: Arjomand, Mehran <MArjomand@mofo.com>; Lang, Jason <jlang@orrick.com>; Brausa, Adam R. <ABrausa@mofo.com>

Subject: RE: IPR2024-00228, -229, -230, and PGR2024-00011

Travis,

We will confirm with Dr. Houh and circle back. Please plan for the deposition to be held at MoFo's Boston office.

Thank you,

BRYAN BLUMENKOPF

Associate | Morrison & Foerster LLP

707 Wilshire Boulevard | Los Angeles, CA 90017-3543

Desk: +1 (213) 892-5269

Mobile: +1 (213) 344-8451

bblumen@mofo.com

From: Jensen, Travis <tjensen@orrick.com>

Sent: Tuesday, November 26, 2024 6:14 PM

To: Blumenkopf, Bryan <BBlumen@mofo.com>; Yap, Alex S. <AYap@mofo.com>

Cc: Arjomand, Mehran <MArjomand@mofo.com>; Lang, Jason <jlang@orrick.com>; Brausa, Adam R. <ABrausa@mofo.com>

Subject: RE: IPR2024-00228, -229, -230, and PGR2024-00011

External Email

Counsel,

Further to the email below, we'd like to get Dr. Houh's deposition scheduled. Can you provide his availability the week of Dec. 16-20? Also let us know which of MoFo's bay area offices to use for the notice. Thanks, Travis

From: Blumenkopf, Bryan <BBlumen@mofo.com>

Sent: Thursday, September 5, 2024 4:54 PM

To: Jensen, Travis <tjensen@orrick.com>; Yap, Alex S. <AYap@mofo.com>

Cc: Arjomand, Mehran <MArjomand@mofo.com>; Lang, Jason <jlang@orrick.com>; Brausa, Adam R. <ABrausa@mofo.com>

Subject: RE: IPR2024-00228, -229, -230, and PGR2024-00011

[EXTERNAL]

Travis,

This proposal is acceptable. We will get the stips on file, and we will plan to notice a consolidated deposition for Mr. Welch on Oct. 10-11 covering these five proceedings. Please advise which of Orrick's bay area offices we should use for the notice. For Dr. Houh, please plan on a similarly consolidated deposition at Morrison and Foerster's offices.

Thank you,

BRYAN BLUMENKOPF

Associate | Morrison & Foerster LLP

707 Wilshire Boulevard | Los Angeles, CA 90017-3543

Desk: +1 (213) 892-5269

Mobile: +1 (213) 344-8451

bblumen@mofo.com

From: Jensen, Travis <tjensen@orrick.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 3, 2024 5:24 PM
To: Yap, Alex S. <AYap@mofo.com>; Blumenkopf, Bryan <BBlumen@mofo.com>
Cc: Arjomand, Mehran <MArjomand@mofo.com>; Lang, Jason <jlang@orrick.com>; Brausa, Adam R. <ABrausa@mofo.com>
Subject: RE: IPR2024-00228, -229, -230, and PGR2024-00011

External Email

Hi Alex,

We are not opposed to in-person depositions, provided that Aptiv's expert will also be made available for deposition in person if requested. In terms of location, Mr. Welch will be available in one of Orrick's bay area offices. On a deposition related note, is Aptiv amenable to deposing Mr. Welch on IPR2024-00495 at the same time (i.e., the other claims of the '420 patent that will already be covered in the deposition)? We think this would be more efficient for everyone involved. Of course, we would reciprocate when deposing Aptiv's expert (i.e., a consolidated deposition for all 5 IPRs). Let me know if you'd like to discuss this. Thanks, Travis

From: Yap, Alex S. <AYap@mofo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 3, 2024 2:05 PM
To: Jensen, Travis <tjensen@orrick.com>; Blumenkopf, Bryan <BBlumen@mofo.com>
Cc: Arjomand, Mehran <MArjomand@mofo.com>; Lang, Jason <jlang@orrick.com>; Brausa, Adam R. <ABrausa@mofo.com>
Subject: RE: IPR2024-00228, -229, -230, and PGR2024-00011

[EXTERNAL]

Hi Travis,

Thanks. These will be in person at our SF office. We will file the stipulations regarding the modified schedules and deposition notices later today or tomorrow.

Regards,

Alex

From: Jensen, Travis <tjensen@orrick.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 3, 2024 12:06 PM
To: Yap, Alex S. <AYap@mofo.com>; Blumenkopf, Bryan <BBlumen@mofo.com>
Cc: Arjomand, Mehran <MArjomand@mofo.com>; Lang, Jason <jlang@orrick.com>
Subject: RE: IPR2024-00228, -229, -230, and PGR2024-00011

External Email

Hi Alex,

Thanks for the update. Yes, let's hold Oct. 10-11 for Mr. Welch's deposition. Did you have a preference for in-person (Mr. Welch is located in the bay area) or virtual? Thanks, Travis

From: Yap, Alex S. <AYap@mofo.com>

Sent: Tuesday, September 3, 2024 12:41 PM

To: Jensen, Travis <tjensen@orrick.com>; Blumenkopf, Bryan <BBlumen@mofo.com>

Cc: Arjomand, Mehran <MArjomand@mofo.com>; Lang, Jason <jlang@orrick.com>

Subject: RE: IPR2024-00228, -229, -230, and PGR2024-00011

[EXTERNAL]

Travis,

10/10-11 has just cleared for us. Can we confirm these dates?

Regards,

Alex

From: Yap, Alex S.

Sent: Friday, August 30, 2024 10:59 AM

To: Jensen, Travis <tjensen@orrick.com>; Blumenkopf, Bryan <BBlumen@mofo.com>

Cc: Arjomand, Mehran <MArjomand@mofo.com>; Lang, Jason <jlang@orrick.com>

Subject: RE: IPR2024-00228, -229, -230, and PGR2024-00011

Travis,

Sorry about this but a hearing just got scheduled on 10/16. Is 10/14-15 OK for Mr. Welch?

Regard,

Alex

From: Jensen, Travis <tjensen@orrick.com>

Sent: Friday, August 30, 2024 6:17 AM

To: Yap, Alex S. <AYap@mofo.com>; Blumenkopf, Bryan <BBlumen@mofo.com>

Cc: Arjomand, Mehran <MArjomand@mofo.com>; Lang, Jason <jlang@orrick.com>

Subject: RE: IPR2024-00228, -229, -230, and PGR2024-00011

External Email

Alex,

Thanks for the update. Oct. 15-16 would work on our end. Please let us know the depo dates as soon as possible. Thanks, Travis

From: Yap, Alex S. <AYap@mofo.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 29, 2024 2:28 PM
To: Jensen, Travis <tjensen@orrick.com>; Blumenkopf, Bryan <BBlumen@mofo.com>
Cc: Arjomand, Mehran <MArjomand@mofo.com>; Lang, Jason <jlang@orrick.com>
Subject: RE: IPR2024-00228, -229, -230, and PGR2024-00011

[EXTERNAL]

Travis,

We are still waiting on whether 10/10-11 would work for us.

Alternatively, would 10/14-15 or 15-16 work for Dr. Welch?

Regards,

Alex

From: Yap, Alex S.
Sent: Tuesday, August 27, 2024 9:05 PM
To: 'Jensen, Travis' <tjensen@orrick.com>; Blumenkopf, Bryan <BBlumen@mofo.com>
Cc: Arjomand, Mehran <MArjomand@mofo.com>; Lang, Jason <jlang@orrick.com>
Subject: RE: IPR2024-00228, -229, -230, and PGR2024-00011

Travis,

We are still looking into the dates and hope to get back to you soon.

Regards,

Alex

From: Jensen, Travis <tjensen@orrick.com>
Sent: Monday, August 26, 2024 9:32 AM
To: Blumenkopf, Bryan <BBlumen@mofo.com>; Yap, Alex S. <AYap@mofo.com>
Cc: Arjomand, Mehran <MArjomand@mofo.com>; Lang, Jason <jlang@orrick.com>
Subject: RE: IPR2024-00228, -229, -230, and PGR2024-00011

External Email

Hi Bryan,

Since our last discussion, we learned that Mr. Welch's availability for deposition will be limited due to some medical matters. I don't think this should change anything about the proposed schedule, but wanted to check whether Oct. 3-4 or Oct. 10-11 would work on your end to depose Mr. Welch before we file any papers with the Board. Will either of those sets of dates work? If so, you have our consent to file. If not, please propose some alternate deposition dates so we can determine if any other schedule changes are necessary. Thanks, Travis

From: Blumenkopf, Bryan <BBlumen@mofo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 21, 2024 1:44 PM
To: Jensen, Travis <tjensen@orrick.com>; Yap, Alex S. <AYap@mofo.com>
Cc: Arjomand, Mehran <MArjomand@mofo.com>; Lang, Jason <jlang@orrick.com>
Subject: RE: IPR2024-00228, -229, -230, and PGR2024-00011

[EXTERNAL]

Counsel,

Attached please find the stipulations for modifying the due dates, based on our discussions.

Thank you,

BRYAN BLUMENKOPF

Associate | Morrison & Foerster LLP
707 Wilshire Boulevard | Los Angeles, CA 90017-3543
Desk: +1 (213) 892-5269
Mobile: +1 (213) 344-8451
bblumen@mofo.com

From: Blumenkopf, Bryan
Sent: Wednesday, August 7, 2024 3:49 PM
To: 'Jensen, Travis' <tjensen@orrick.com>; Yap, Alex S. <AYap@mofo.com>
Cc: Arjomand, Mehran <MArjomand@mofo.com>; Lang, Jason <jlang@orrick.com>
Subject: RE: IPR2024-00228, -229, -230, and PGR2024-00011

Travis,

This proposal is acceptable. We will go ahead and prepare the stipulation to modify the due dates.

Thank you,

BRYAN BLUMENKOPF

Associate | Morrison & Foerster LLP
707 Wilshire Boulevard | Los Angeles, CA 90017-3543
Desk: +1 (213) 892-5269
Mobile: +1 (213) 344-8451
bblumen@mofo.com

From: Jensen, Travis <tjensen@orrick.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 6, 2024 9:02 AM
To: Blumenkopf, Bryan <BBlumen@mofo.com>; Yap, Alex S. <AYap@mofo.com>
Cc: Arjomand, Mehran <MArjomand@mofo.com>; Lang, Jason <jlang@orrick.com>
Subject: RE: IPR2024-00228, -229, -230, and PGR2024-00011

External Email

Counsel,

Thanks for the proposal. Given the very substantial overlap in the IPRs, Microchip thinks a total of 10.5 hours of cross (conducted on back-to-back days) for a common expert should suffice. We would also propose 2 hours for re-direct and 1.5 hours for recross (even though the regs allow more), to keep the total depo within 2 full days. In our experience, this has provided adequate time for all parties. If this is okay on your end, we can make your proposed schedule changes work. Thanks, Travis

From: Blumenkopf, Bryan <BBlumen@mofo.com>

Sent: Friday, August 2, 2024 5:22 PM

To: Yap, Alex S. <AYap@mofo.com>; Jensen, Travis <tjensen@orrick.com>

Cc: Arjomand, Mehran <MArjomand@mofo.com>; Lang, Jason <jlang@orrick.com>

Subject: RE: IPR2024-00228, -229, -230, and PGR2024-00011 more

[EXTERNAL]

Counsel:

Further to our discussion on Wednesday, Patent Owner proposes the following adjustments to the due dates in the IPR2024-00228, -00229, -00230, and PGR2024-00011 matters:

1. Patent Owner's Response: ~~October 7, 2024~~ October 23, 2024
2. Petitioner's Reply: ~~December 30, 2024~~ January 17, 2025
3. Patent Owner's Sur-reply: ~~February 10, 2025~~ February 27, 2025
4. All other deadlines unchanged

Additionally, Patent Owner proposes that the depositions of Petitioner's expert and Patent Owner's expert be limited to 14 hours on the record for cross-examination; 8 hours for redirect; and 4 hours for recross; with the testimony applicable across the four proceedings. This represents half of the total time that would ordinarily be allotted for four separate depositions.

Thank you for working with us to accommodate everyone's schedule over the next few months. Please let us know if the above proposal has your approval.

BRYAN BLUMENKOPF

Associate | Morrison & Foerster LLP

707 Wilshire Boulevard | Los Angeles, CA 90017-3543

Desk: +1 (213) 892-5269

Mobile: +1 (213) 344-8451

bblumen@mofo.com

From: Yap, Alex S. <AYap@mofo.com>

Sent: Tuesday, July 30, 2024 11:23 AM

To: Jensen, Travis <tjensen@orrick.com>
Cc: Arjomand, Mehran <MArjomand@mofo.com>; Blumenkopf, Bryan <BBlumen@mofo.com>; Lang, Jason <jiang@orrick.com>
Subject: RE: IPR2024-00228, -229, -230, and PGR2024-00011

Hi Travis,

You're correct, I was referring to the POR deadlines; sorry for the confusion. We would like to push the POR deadlines back by 2 weeks due to trials and hearings occurring around that time. We will, of course, extend your Reply deadlines and return the courtesy if you need additional time for your papers.

We will circulate an invite for 4 p.m. on Wednesday, July 31.

Best,

Alex

From: Jensen, Travis <tjensen@orrick.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 30, 2024 9:06 AM
To: Yap, Alex S. <AYap@mofo.com>
Cc: Arjomand, Mehran <MArjomand@mofo.com>; Blumenkopf, Bryan <BBlumen@mofo.com>; Lang, Jason <jiang@orrick.com>
Subject: RE: IPR2024-00228, -229, -230, and PGR2024-00011

External Email

Hi Alex,

How about tomorrow afternoon at 2pm PT (or later)? Please send a calendar invite if that works. I assume you're talking about POR deadlines, not POPR deadlines. Also, if you have any deadlines or dates in mind, it would be helpful to know them in advance. Thanks, Travis

From: Yap, Alex S. <AYap@mofo.com>
Sent: Monday, July 29, 2024 3:54 PM
To: Jensen, Travis <tjensen@orrick.com>
Cc: Arjomand, Mehran <MArjomand@mofo.com>; Blumenkopf, Bryan <BBlumen@mofo.com>
Subject: IPR2024-00228, -229, -230, and PGR2024-00011

[EXTERNAL]

Counsel,

Are you available for a short call sometime this week to discuss the POPR deadlines for the above proceedings? If so, can you let us know what days/times would work best for you? Thank you.

Best,

Alex

=====

This message may be confidential and privileged. Use or disclosure by anyone other than an intended addressee is prohibited. If you received this message in error, please delete it and advise the sender by reply email. Learn about Morrison & Foerster LLP's [Privacy Policy](#).

.

NOTICE TO RECIPIENT | This e-mail is meant for only the intended recipient of the transmission, and may be a communication privileged by law. If you received this e-mail in error, any review, use, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. Please notify us immediately of the error by return e-mail and please delete this message from your system. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

For more information about Orrick, please visit <http://www.orrick.com>.

In the course of our business relationship, we may collect, store and transfer information about you. Please see our privacy policy at <https://www.orrick.com/Privacy-Policy> to learn about how we use this information.

=====

This message may be confidential and privileged. Use or disclosure by anyone other than an intended addressee is prohibited. If you received this message in error, please delete it and advise the sender by reply email. Learn about Morrison & Foerster LLP's [Privacy Policy](#).

.

NOTICE TO RECIPIENT | This e-mail is meant for only the intended recipient of the transmission, and may be a communication privileged by law. If you received this e-mail in error, any review, use, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. Please notify us immediately of the error by return e-mail and please delete this message from your system. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

For more information about Orrick, please visit <http://www.orrick.com>.

In the course of our business relationship, we may collect, store and transfer information about you. Please see our privacy policy at <https://www.orrick.com/Privacy-Policy> to learn about how we use this information.

=====

This message may be confidential and privileged. Use or disclosure by anyone other than an intended addressee is prohibited. If you received this message in error, please delete it and advise the sender by reply email. Learn about Morrison & Foerster LLP's [Privacy Policy](#).

.

NOTICE TO RECIPIENT | This e-mail is meant for only the intended recipient of the transmission, and may be a communication privileged by law. If you received this e-mail in error, any review, use, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. Please notify us immediately of the error by return e-mail and please delete this message from your system. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

For more information about Orrick, please visit <http://www.orrick.com>.

In the course of our business relationship, we may collect, store and transfer information about you. Please see our privacy policy at <https://www.orrick.com/Privacy-Policy> to learn about how we use this information.

=====

This message may be confidential and privileged. Use or disclosure by anyone other than an intended addressee is prohibited. If you received this message in error, please delete it and advise the sender by reply email. Learn about Morrison & Foerster LLP's [Privacy Policy](#).

.

NOTICE TO RECIPIENT | This e-mail is meant for only the intended recipient of the transmission, and may be a communication privileged by law. If you received this e-mail in error, any review, use, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. Please notify us immediately of the error by return e-mail and please delete this message from your system. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

For more information about Orrick, please visit <http://www.orrick.com>.

In the course of our business relationship, we may collect, store and transfer information about you. Please see our privacy policy at <https://www.orrick.com/Privacy-Policy> to learn about how we use this information.

=====

This message may be confidential and privileged. Use or disclosure by anyone other than an intended addressee is prohibited. If you received this message in error, please delete it and advise the sender by reply email. Learn about Morrison & Foerster LLP's [Privacy Policy](#).

.

NOTICE TO RECIPIENT | This e-mail is meant for only the intended recipient of the transmission, and may be a communication privileged by law. If you received this e-mail in error, any review, use, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. Please notify us immediately of the error by return e-mail and please delete this message from your system. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

For more information about Orrick, please visit <http://www.orrick.com>.

In the course of our business relationship, we may collect, store and transfer information about you. Please see our privacy policy at <https://www.orrick.com/Privacy-Policy> to learn about how we use this information.

=====

This message may be confidential and privileged. Use or disclosure by anyone other than an intended addressee is prohibited. If you received this message in error, please delete it and advise the sender by reply email. Learn about Morrison & Foerster LLP's [Privacy Policy](#).

.

NOTICE TO RECIPIENT | This e-mail is meant for only the intended recipient of the transmission, and may be a communication privileged by law. If you received this e-mail in error, any review, use, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. Please notify us immediately of the error by return e-mail and please delete this message from your system. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

For more information about Orrick, please visit <http://www.orrick.com>.

In the course of our business relationship, we may collect, store and transfer information about you. Please see our privacy policy at <https://www.orrick.com/Privacy-Policy> to learn about how we use this information.

=====

This message may be confidential and privileged. Use or disclosure by anyone other than an intended addressee is prohibited. If you received this message in error, please delete it and advise the sender by reply email. Learn about Morrison & Foerster LLP's [Privacy Policy](#).

.

NOTICE TO RECIPIENT | This e-mail is meant for only the intended recipient of the transmission, and may be a communication privileged by law. If you received this e-mail in error, any review, use, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. Please notify us immediately of the error by return e-mail and please delete this message from your system. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

For more information about Orrick, please visit <http://www.orrick.com>.

In the course of our business relationship, we may collect, store and transfer information about you. Please see our privacy policy at <https://www.orrick.com/Privacy-Policy> to learn about how we use this information.

=====

This message may be confidential and privileged. Use or disclosure by anyone other than an intended addressee is prohibited. If you received this message in error, please delete it and advise the sender by reply email. Learn about Morrison & Foerster LLP's [Privacy Policy](#).

.

NOTICE TO RECIPIENT | This e-mail is meant for only the intended recipient of the transmission, and may be a communication privileged by law. If you received this e-mail in error, any review, use, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. Please notify us immediately of the error by return e-mail and please delete this message from your system. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

For more information about Orrick, please visit <http://www.orrick.com>.

In the course of our business relationship, we may collect, store and transfer information about you. Please see our privacy policy at <https://www.orrick.com/Privacy-Policy> to learn about how we use this information.

=====

This message may be confidential and privileged. Use or disclosure by anyone other than an intended addressee is prohibited. If you received this message in error, please delete it and advise the sender by reply email. Learn about Morrison & Foerster LLP's [Privacy Policy](#).

.

NOTICE TO RECIPIENT | This e-mail is meant for only the intended recipient of the transmission, and may be a communication privileged by law. If you received this e-mail in error, any review, use, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. Please notify us immediately of the error by return e-mail and please delete this message from your system. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

For more information about Orrick, please visit <http://www.orrick.com>.

In the course of our business relationship, we may collect, store and transfer information about you. Please see our privacy policy at <https://www.orrick.com/Privacy-Policy> to learn about how we use this information.

=====

This message may be confidential and privileged. Use or disclosure by anyone other than an intended addressee is prohibited. If you received this message in error, please delete it and advise the sender by reply email. Learn about Morrison & Foerster LLP's [Privacy Policy](#).

.

NOTICE TO RECIPIENT | This e-mail is meant for only the intended recipient of the transmission, and may be a communication privileged by law. If you received this e-mail in error, any review, use, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. Please notify us immediately of the error by return e-mail and please delete this message from your system. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

For more information about Orrick, please visit <http://www.orrick.com>.

In the course of our business relationship, we may collect, store and transfer information about you. Please see our privacy policy at <https://www.orrick.com/Privacy-Policy> to learn about how we use this information.

=====

This message may be confidential and privileged. Use or disclosure by anyone other than an intended addressee is prohibited. If you received this message in error, please delete it and advise the sender by reply email. Learn about Morrison & Foerster LLP's [Privacy Policy](#).

.