Trials@uspto.gov
571-272-7822

Paper 11
Entered: December 9, 2024

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ROKU, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

VIDEOLABS, Inc.,
Patent Owner.

IPR2024-01026
Patent 8,667,304 B2

Before KARL D. EASTHOM, STACEY G. WHITE, and BRIAN P. MURPHY, *Administrative Patent Judges.*

MURPHY, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

SCHEDULING ORDER

A. GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

1. INITIAL AND ADDITIONAL CONFERENCE CALLS

The parties are directed to contact the Board within one month of this Scheduling Order if there is a need to discuss proposed changes to this Order or proposed motions that have not been authorized in this Order or other prior Order or Notice. *See* Consolidated Trial Practice Guide ("Consolidated Practice Guide")[1] at 9–10, 65 (guidance in preparing for a conference call); *see also* 84 Fed. Reg. 64,280 (Nov. 21, 2019). A request for an initial conference call shall include a list of proposed motions, if any, to be discussed during the call.

The parties may request additional conference calls by email, if needed. Any email requesting a conference call with the Board shall: (a) copy counsel for all parties, (b) briefly indicate the relief requested, (c) include two or three dates/times when all parties are available, (d) state whether the opposing party opposes the relief requested, and (e) if opposed, either certify that the parties have met and conferred telephonically or in person to attempt to reach agreement, or explain why such meet and confer did not occur. The email shall not contain substantive argument and, unless otherwise authorized, shall not include attachments. *See* Consolidated Practice Guide at 9–10.

2. PROTECTIVE ORDER

No protective order shall apply to this proceeding until the Board enters one. If either party files a motion to seal before entry of a protective order, a jointly proposed protective order shall be filed as an exhibit with the motion. It is the responsibility of the party whose confidential information is

[1] Available at https://www.uspto.gov/TrialPracticeGuideConsolidated.

at issue, not necessarily the proffering party, to file the motion to seal.[2] The Board encourages the parties to adopt the Board's default protective order if they conclude that a protective order is necessary. *See* Consolidated Practice Guide at 107–122 (App. B, Protective Order Guidelines and Default Protective Order). If the parties choose to propose a protective order deviating from the default protective order, they must submit the proposed protective order jointly along with a marked-up (Track Changes) comparison of the proposed and default protective orders showing the differences between the two and explain why good cause exists to deviate from the default protective order.

The Board and the public have a strong interest in the public availability of trial proceedings. Redactions to documents filed in this proceeding should be limited to the minimum amount necessary to protect confidential information, and the thrust of the underlying argument or evidence must be clearly discernible from the redacted versions. We also advise the parties that information subject to a protective order may become public if identified in a final written decision in this proceeding, and that a motion to expunge the information will not necessarily prevail over the public interest in maintaining a complete and understandable file history. *See* Consolidated Practice Guide at 21–22.

3. DISCOVERY DISPUTES

The Board encourages parties to resolve disputes relating to discovery on their own. To the extent a dispute arises between the parties relating to discovery, the parties must meet and confer to resolve such a dispute before

[2] If the entity whose confidential information is at issue is not a party to the proceeding, please contact the Board.

contacting the Board. If attempts to resolve the dispute fail, a party may request a conference call with the Board.

4. TESTIMONY

The Testimony Guidelines appended to the Consolidated Practice Guide at 127–130 (App. D, Testimony Guidelines) apply to this proceeding. The Board may impose an appropriate sanction for failure to adhere to the Testimony Guidelines. 37 C.F.R. § 42.12 (2023). For example, reasonable expenses and attorneys' fees incurred by any party may be levied on a person who impedes, delays, or frustrates the fair examination of a witness.

Whenever a party submits a deposition transcript as an exhibit in this proceeding, the submitting party shall file the full transcript of the deposition rather than excerpts of only the cited portions. After a deposition transcript has been submitted as an exhibit, all parties who subsequently cite to portions of the transcript shall cite to the already submitted exhibit instead of submitting another copy of the same transcript. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(d) ("A document already in the record of the proceeding must not be filed again, not even as an exhibit or an appendix, without express Board authorization.").

5. CROSS-EXAMINATION

Except as the parties might otherwise agree, for each due date:
Cross-examination ordinarily takes place after any supplemental evidence is due. 37 C.F.R. § 42.53(d)(2).

Cross-examination ordinarily ends no later than a week before the filing date for any paper in which the cross-examination testimony is expected to be used. *Id.*

6. MOTION TO AMEND

Patent Owner may file a motion to amend without prior authorization from the Board. Nevertheless, Patent Owner must confer with the Board before filing such a motion. 37 C.F.R. § 42.121(a). To satisfy this requirement, Patent Owner should request a conference call with the Board no later than two weeks prior to DUE DATE 1. *See* Section B below regarding DUE DATES.

Patent Owner has the option to receive preliminary guidance from the Board on its motion to amend. *See* Notice Regarding a New Pilot Program Concerning Motion to Amend Practice and Procedures in Trial Proceedings under the America Invents Act before the Patent Trial and Appeal Board, 84 Fed. Reg. 9,497 (Mar. 15, 2019) ("MTA Pilot Program Notice"); *see also* Consolidated Practice Guide at 67. If Patent Owner elects to request preliminary guidance from the Board on its motion, it must do so in its motion to amend filed on DUE DATE 1.

Any motion to amend and briefing related to such a motion shall comply with the rules pertaining to motions to amend, 37 C.F.R. § 42.121, unless otherwise ordered by the Board in this proceeding. The parties are further directed to *Lectrosonics, Inc. v. Zaxcom, Inc.*, IPR2018-01129, Paper 15 (PTAB Feb. 25, 2019) (precedential), and *Rules Governing Motion To Amend Practice and Procedures in Trial Proceedings Under the America Invents Act Before the Patent Trial and Appeal Board*, 89 Fed. Reg. 76421 (September 18, 2024) (effective October 18, 2024) ("MTA Final Rule").

At DUE DATE 3, Patent Owner has the option to file a reply to the opposition to the motion to amend and preliminary guidance, or a revised motion to amend. *See* MTA Final Rule at 76430 (37 C.F.R. § 42.121(e)(3),

(f). Patent Owner may elect to file a revised motion to amend even if Patent Owner did not request to receive preliminary guidance on its motion to amend. A revised motion to amend must provide amendments, arguments, and/or evidence in a manner that is responsive to issues raised in the preliminary guidance or Petitioner's opposition.

If Patent Owner files a revised motion to amend, the Board will enter a revised scheduling order setting the briefing schedule for that revised motion and adjusting other due dates as needed. *See* MTA Final Rule at 76430 (37 C.F.R. § 42.121(f)(1)). The Board may also determine whether to request the Chief Administrative Patent Judge to extend the final written decision deadline more than one year from the date a trial is instituted in accordance with § 42.100(c) and whether to extend any remaining deadlines under § 42.5(c)(2). *Id.*

As also discussed in the MTA Final Rule, if the Board issues preliminary guidance on the motion to amend, and Patent Owner files neither a reply to the opposition to the motion to amend nor a revised motion to amend at DUE DATE 3, Petitioner may file a reply to the Board's preliminary guidance, no later than three (3) weeks after DUE DATE 3. *Id.* (37 C.F.R. § 42.121(e)(4)). The reply may only respond to the preliminary guidance. Patent Owner may file a sur-reply in response to Petitioner's reply to the Board's preliminary guidance. *Id.* The sur-reply may only respond to arguments made in the reply and must be filed no later than three (3) weeks after Petitioner's reply. *Id.* No new evidence may accompany the reply or the sur-reply in this situation.

7. ORAL ARGUMENT

Requests for oral argument must comply with 37 C.F.R. § 42.70(a). To permit the Board sufficient time to schedule oral argument, the parties shall not stipulate to an extension of the request for oral argument beyond the date set forth in the Due Date Appendix.

Unless otherwise notified by the Board, the parties may request that the oral argument be held at USPTO headquarters in Alexandria, Virginia. The parties may also request that the oral argument instead be held virtually by videoconference. The parties should state in the request for oral argument (DUE DATE 4) whether the parties would prefer either a video hearing or an in-person hearing. The Board will conduct an in-person hearing only when requested by all parties.

Note that the Board may not be able to honor the parties' preferences due to, among other things, the availability of hearing room resources, the needs of the panel, and USPTO policy at the time of the hearing. The Board will consider the parties' request and notify the parties of how and where the hearing will be conducted.

For in-person hearings, seating in the Board's hearing rooms may be limited, and will be available on a first-come, first-served basis. If either party anticipates that more than five (5) individuals will attend the argument on its behalf, the party should notify the Board as soon as possible, and no later than the request for oral argument. Parties should note that the earlier a request for accommodation is made, the more likely the Board will be able to accommodate additional individuals.

The Board has established the "Legal Experience and Advancement Program," or "LEAP," to encourage advocates before the Board to develop

their skills and to aid in succession planning for the next generation. The Board defines a LEAP practitioner as a patent agent or attorney having three (3) or fewer substantive oral arguments in any federal tribunal, including PTAB. Parties are encouraged to participate in the Board's LEAP program.[3] The Board will grant up to fifteen (15) minutes of additional argument time to that party, depending on the length of the proceeding and the PTAB's hearing schedule. A party should submit a request, no later than at least five (5) business days before the oral hearing, by email to the Board at PTABHearings@uspto.gov.[4]

All practitioners appearing before the Board shall demonstrate the highest professional standards. All practitioners are expected to have a command of the factual record, the applicable law, and Board procedures, as well as the authority to commit the party they represent. If a LEAP practitioner has the best understanding of the facts of the case and evidence of record, the Board encourages their participation.

B. DUE DATES

This Order sets due dates for the parties to take action after institution of the proceeding. The parties may stipulate different dates for DUE DATES 1, 5, and 6, as well as the portion of DUE DATE 2 related to Petitioner's reply (earlier or later, but no later than DUE DATE 3 for Patent Owner's sur-reply) and the portion of DUE DATE 3 related to Patent Owner's sur-reply (earlier or later, but no later than DUE DATE 7). The

[3] Information about the LEAP program can be found at www.uspto.gov/leap.
[4] Additionally, a LEAP Verification Form shall be submitted by the LEAP practitioner, confirming eligibility for the program. A combined LEAP Practitioner Request for Oral Hearing Participation and Verification Form is available at www.uspto.gov/leap.

parties may not stipulate to a different date for the portion of DUE DATE 2 related to Petitioner's opposition to a motion to amend, or for the portion of DUE DATE 3 related to Patent Owner's reply to an opposition to a motion to amend (or Patent Owner's revised motion to amend) without prior authorization from the Board. In stipulating to move any due dates in the scheduling order, the parties must be cognizant that the Board requires four weeks after the filing of an opposition to the motion to amend (or the due date for the opposition, if none is filed) for the Board to issue its preliminary guidance, if requested by Patent Owner. A notice of the stipulation, specifically identifying the changed due dates, must be promptly filed. The parties may not stipulate an extension of DUE DATES 4, 7, and 8.

In stipulating different dates, the parties should consider the effect of the stipulation on times to object to evidence (37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(1)), to supplement evidence (§ 42.64(b)(2)), to conduct cross-examination (§ 42.53(d)(2)), and to draft papers depending on the evidence and cross-examination testimony.

1. DUE DATE 1

Patent Owner may file—

a. A response to the petition (37 C.F.R. § 42.120). If Patent Owner elects not to file a response, Patent Owner shall arrange a conference call with the parties and the Board. Patent Owner is cautioned that any arguments not raised in the response may be deemed waived or forfeited; and

b. A motion to amend the patent (37 C.F.R. § 42.121).

2. DUE DATE 2

Petitioner may file a reply to the Patent Owner's response.

Petitioner may file an opposition to the motion to amend.

3. DUE DATE 3

Patent Owner may file a sur-reply to Petitioner's reply.

Patent Owner may also file either:

a. a reply to the opposition to the motion to amend and/or preliminary guidance (if provided); or

b. a revised motion to amend.

NOTE: If Patent Owner files neither of the above papers (a reply to the opposition or a revised motion to amend), and the Board has issued preliminary guidance, Petitioner may file a reply to the preliminary guidance, no later than three (3) weeks after DUE DATE 3. Patent Owner may file a sur-reply to Petitioner's reply to the preliminary guidance no later than three (3) weeks after Petitioner's reply.

4. DUE DATE 4

Either party may file a request for oral argument (may not be extended by stipulation).

5. DUE DATE 5

Petitioner may file a sur-reply to Patent Owner's reply to the opposition to the motion to amend.

Either party may file a motion to exclude evidence (37 C.F.R. § 42.64(c)).

6. DUE DATE 6

Either party may file an opposition to a motion to exclude evidence.

Either party may request that the Board hold a pre-hearing conference.

7. DUE DATE 7

Either party may file a reply to an opposition to a motion to exclude evidence.

8. DUE DATE 8

Oral argument (if requested by either party) shall be held on this date. Approximately one month prior to the argument, the Board will issue an order setting the start time of the hearing and the procedures that will govern the parties' arguments.

DUE DATE APPENDIX

DUE DATE 1 ..... February 28, 2025

Patent Owner's response to the petition

Patent Owner's motion to amend the patent

DUE DATE 2 ..... May 23, 2025

Petitioner's reply to Patent Owner's response to petition

Petitioner's opposition to motion to amend

DUE DATE 3 ..... June 20, 2025

Patent Owner's sur-reply to reply

Patent Owner's reply to opposition to motion to amend
(or Patent Owner's revised motion to amend)[5]

DUE DATE 4 ..... July 18, 2025

Request for oral argument (may not be extended by stipulation)

DUE DATE 5 ..... August 15, 2025

Petitioner's sur-reply to reply to opposition to motion to amend

Motion to exclude evidence

DUE DATE 6 ..... August 29, 2025

Opposition to motion to exclude

Request for prehearing conference

DUE DATE 7 ..... September 10, 2025

Reply to opposition to motion to exclude

DUE DATE 8 ..... September 17, 2025

Oral argument (if requested)

[5] If Patent Owner files neither a reply to Petitioner's opposition to the MTA nor a revised MTA, the parties are directed to Section B(3) above.

For PETITIONER:

Scott McKeown
Victor Cheung
WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS P.C.
Smckeown-ptab@wolfgreenfield.com
Vcheung-ptab@wolfgreenfield.com

For PATENT OWNER:

Jerry Tice
Aaron Hand
BUNSOW DE MORY LLP
jtice@bdiplaw.com
ahand@bdiplaw.com