

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

TEXAS INSTRUMENTS INCORPORATED,
Petitioner,

v.

PARKERVISION, INC.,
Patent Owner.

IPR2024-00934
Patent 7,496,342 B2

Before MICHAEL R. ZECHER and IFTIKHAR AHMED,
Administrative Patent Judges.

ZECHER, *Administrative Patent Judge.*

ORDER
Conduct of the Proceeding
37 C.F.R. § 42.5(a)

A conference call in this proceeding was held on March 5, 2025, among counsel for Petitioner, Texas Instruments Incorporated (“TI”), counsel for Patent Owner, ParkerVision, Inc. (“ParkerVision”), and Judges Zecher, Gerstenblith, and Ahmed. The purpose of the call was to discuss ParkerVision’s request for guidance regarding when, and if, updated circuit simulations performed by TI’s declarant, Dr. Ian Galton, should be entered into the record of this proceeding. Ex. 3002. ParkerVision arranged for a court reporter, but the court reporter was not present at the start of the conference call so no transcript will be entered into the record.

ParkerVision represented that, during the deposition of Dr. Galton, it discovered that he performed updated circuit simulations on models of DeMaw’s¹ and Macnally’s² circuit diagrams, which are the two asserted prior art references that form the basis of the obviousness grounds at issue in this proceeding. ParkerVision then explained that TI offered to provide the updated circuit simulations to ParkerVision and then make Dr. Galton available for another deposition. ParkerVision expressed its concerns regarding these offers, including, among other things, that its declarant would not have ample time to consider the updated circuit simulations and prepare a response.

In response, TI reiterated that it offered to provide the updated circuit simulations performed by Dr. Galton to ParkerVision and then make Dr. Galton available for another deposition. TI explained that it was not seeking to file the updated circuit simulations at this time and, without the benefit of

¹ Doug DeMaw, “*Practical RF Design Manual*” (Prentice-Hall 1982) (Ex. 1016, “DeMaw”).

² WO 00/16492 (filed Sept. 10, 1999) (published Mar. 23, 2000) (Ex. 1023, “Macnally”).

seeing the arguments that ParkerVision plans to present and develop in the Patent Owner Response, it takes no position as to whether it will file the updated circuit simulations with the Reply. TI, however, clarified that it does not oppose providing the updated circuit simulations to ParkerVision so that it may file those simulations together with corresponding arguments in the Patent Owner Response.

During the conference call, we explained that this scenario could play out a number of different ways, but we are not inclined to direct the parties to follow a particular course of action. We concluded the call with an understanding that the parties will continue to work together to resolve this dispute. The parties may reach out to us for further guidance, if needed.

IPR2024-00934
Patent 7,496,342 B2

For PETITIONER

Joshua A. Griswold
Rishi Gupta
Yao Wang
Patrick J. Bisenius
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
griswold@fr.com
rgupta@fr.com
ywang@fr.com
bisenius@fr.com

For PATENT OWNER

Jason S. Charkow
Richard Juang
Chandran B. Iyer
DAIGNAULT IYER LLP
jason.s.charkow@gmail.com
richard.juang@gmail.com
cbiyer@daignaultiyer.com