Trials@uspto.gov
571-272-7822



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

GOOGLE LLC,
Petitioner,

v.

138 EAST LCD ADVANCEMENTS LIMITED,
Patent Owner.

IPR2024-00956
Patent 8,355,574 B2

Mailed: July 11, 2024

Before CARLA D. CHRISP, *Trial Paralegal*

# NOTICE OF FILING DATE ACCORDED TO PETITION AND TIME FOR FILING PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

The petition for *inter partes* review, filed in the above proceeding has been accorded the filing date of June 21, 2024.

Patent Owner may file a preliminary response to the petition no later than three months from the date of this notice. The preliminary response is limited to setting forth the reasons why the requested review should not be instituted. Patent Owner may also file an election to waive the preliminary

response to expedite the proceeding. For more information, please consult the Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48756 (Aug. 14, 2012), which is available on the Board Web site at http://www.uspto.gov/PTAB.

Patent Owner is advised of the requirement to submit mandatory notice information under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(a)(2) within 21 days of service of the petition. Mandatory notices include identifying any other judicial or administrative matter that would affect, or be affected by, a decision in the proceeding. 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2). Such administrative matters include requests for certificates of correction.

The parties are encouraged to use the heading on the first page of this Notice for all future filings in the proceeding.

The parties are advised that under 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c), recognition of counsel *pro hac vice* requires a showing of good cause. The parties are authorized to file motions for *pro hac vice* admission under 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c). Such motions shall be filed in accordance with the "Order -- Authorizing Motion *for Pro Hac Vice* Admission" in Case IPR2013-00639, Paper 7, a copy of which is available on the Board Web site under "Representative Orders, Decisions, and Notices."

The parties are reminded that unless otherwise permitted by 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(b)(2), all filings in this proceeding must be made electronically in the Patent Trial Appeal Case Tracking System (P-TACTS), accessible from the Board Web site at http://www.uspto.gov/PTAB. To file documents, users must first obtain a user ID by registering with MyUSPTO. Information regarding how to register with MyUSPTO and use P-TACTS is available at

the Board Web site at https://www.uspto.gov/patents/ptab/patent-trial-and-appeal-case-tracking-system-p-tacts.

The parties may request a conference call as needed. Any email requesting a conference call with the Board should: (a) copy all parties, (b) indicate generally the relief being requested or the subject matter of the conference call, (c) include multiple times when all parties are available, (d) state whether the opposing party opposes any relief requested, and (e) if opposed, either certify that the parties have met and conferred telephonically or in person in an attempt to reach agreement, or explain why such meet and confer did not occur. The email may not contain substantive argument and, unless otherwise authorized, may not include attachments. *See* Trial Practice Guide at 9–10. If practicable, in order to ensure emails are consistent with the above, the parties should send a single, joint email that includes items (a)–(e).

If there are any questions pertaining to this notice, please contact the Patent Trial and Appeal Board at trials@uspto.gov or 571-272-7822.

PETITIONER:

Erika Harmon Arner
Daniel C. Cooley
Kevin D. Rodkey
Robert K. High
Alissa E. Green
Safiya Aguilar
Grace K. Mills
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, LLP
erika.arner@finnegan.com
daniel.cooley@finnegan.com
kevin.rodkey@finnegan.com
robert.high@finnegan.com
alissa.green@finnegan.com
safiya.aguilar@finnegan.com
gracie.mills@finnegan.com
Google-Longitude-IPRs@finnegan.com

PATENT OWNER:

Cyrus A. Morton
Samuel J. LaRoque
ROBINS KAPLAN LLP
CMorton@RobinsKaplan.com
SLaRoque@RobinsKaplan.com

**NOTICE CONCERNING ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION (ADR)**

The Patent Trial and Appeal Board (PTAB) strongly encourages parties who are considering settlement to consider alternative dispute resolution as a means of settling the issues that may be raised in an AIA trial proceeding. Many AIA trials are settled prior to a Final Written Decision. Those considering settlement may wish to consider alternative dispute resolution techniques early in a proceeding to produce a quicker, mutually agreeable resolution of a dispute or to at least narrow the scope of matters in dispute. Alternative dispute resolution has the potential to save parties time and money.

Many non-profit organizations, both inside and outside the intellectual property field, offer alternative dispute resolution services. Listed below are the names and addresses of several such organizations. The listings are provided for the convenience of parties involved in cases before the PTAB; the PTAB does not sponsor or endorse any particular organization's alternative dispute resolution services. In addition, consideration may be given to utilizing independent alternative dispute resolution firms. Such firms may be located through a standard keyword Internet search.

| **CPR INSTITUTE FOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION** | **AMERICAN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW ASSOCIATION (AIPLA)** | **AMERICAN ARBITRATION ASSOCIATION (AAA)** | **WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION (WIPO)** | **AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION (ABA)** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Telephone: (212) 949-6490 | Telephone: (703) 415-0780 | Telephone: (212) 484-3266 | Telephone: 41 22 338 9111 | Telephone : (202) 662-1000 |
| Fax: (212) 949-8859 | Fax: (703) 415-0786 | Fax: (212) 307-4387 | Fax: 41 22 733 5428 | N/A |
| 575 Lexington Ave | 241 18th Street, South, Suite 700 | 140 West 51st Street | 34, chemin des Colombettes | 1050 Connecticut Ave, NW |
| New York, NY 10022 | Arlington, VA 22202 | New York, NY 10020 | CH-1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland | Washington D.C. 20036 |
| www.cpradr.org | www.aipla.org | www.adr.org | www.wipo.int | www.americanbar.org |

If parties to an AIA trial proceeding consider using alternative dispute resolution, the PTAB would like to know whether the parties ultimately decided to engage in alternative dispute resolution and the reasons why or why not. If the parties actually engage in alternative dispute resolution, the

PTAB would be interested to learn what mechanism (e.g., arbitration, mediation, etc.) was used and the general result. Such a statement from the parties is not required but would be helpful to the PTAB in assessing the value of alternative dispute resolution to parties involved in AIA trial proceedings. To report an experience with ADR, please forward a summary of the particulars to the following email address: PTAB_ADR_Comments@uspto.gov