

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

INTEL CORPORATION,	)	
	)	
Petitioner,	)	
	)	
v.	)	Case No. IPR2024-01441
	)	
INTERDIGITAL, INC.,	)	
	)	
Patent Owner.	)	

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
via Teleconference
Thursday, February 27, 2025

PETITION FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW
OF U.S. PATENT NO. 9,674,556

Reported by: Monica Schoonover
CSR No. 10220
Job No. 15196

1 APPEARANCES:

2
3 For the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Patent Trial
4 and Appeal Board:

5 LISA MURRAY, Administrative Patent Judge
6 JAMESON LEE, Administrative Patent Judge
7 KRISTEN L. DROESCH, Administrative Patent Judge

8 For the Petitioner:

9 PERKINS COIE LLP
10 BY: JESSICA C. KAISER, ESQ.
11 JKaiser@perkinscoie.com
12 BY: VINAY SATHE, ESQ.
13 VSathe@perkinscoie.com
14 BY: ATANAS BAITCHEV, ESQ.
15 ABaitchev@perkinscoie.com
16 1900 Sixteenth Street, Suite 1400
17 Denver, Colorado 80202-5255
18 303.291.2300

19 For the Respondent:

20 ALSTON & BIRD LLP
21 BY: M. SCOTT STEVENS, ESQ.
22 scott.stevens@alston.com
23 BY: ANDREW LIGOTTI, ESQ.
24 andy.ligotti@alston.com
25 BY: CHRISTOPHER TL DOUGLAS, ESQ.
christopher.douglas@alston.com
1120 South Tryon Street, Suite 300
Charlotte, North Carolina 28203
704.444.1000

P R O C E E D I N G S

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2025; 7:00 A.M. PST

JUDGE MURRAY: This is a conference call in Case No. IPR2024-01441, Intel Corporation, Petitioner, versus Interdigital, Inc., Patent Owner, concerning U.S. Patent No. 9,674,556 B2.

This is Administrative Patent Judge Lisa Murray.

Presiding today are Judges Jamison Lee, Kristen L. Droesch, and myself.

Would counsel for the parties please introduce yourselves starting with the petitioner?

MS. KAISER: Good morning, your Honor. This is Jessica Kaiser from Perkins Coie on behalf of the petitioner. I believe we also may have a court reporter on the line.

THE COURT REPORTER: Yes. Good morning. My name is Monica Schoonover. I am a California Certified Shorthand Reporter, License No. 10220.

JUDGE MURRAY: Thank you very much.

Miss Kaiser, please ensure that you file a copy of today's transcript with the Board.

MS. KAISER: I will, your Honor. Thank you.

JUDGE MURRAY: All right. Do we have anyone

1 else on the call for petitioner?

2 MS. KAISER: I believe two of my colleagues are
3 also on the line, Vinay Sathe from Perkins Coie and
4 Atanas Baitchev.

5 JUDGE MURRAY: All right. Good morning.

6 Patent owner counsel, please introduce yourself.

7 MR. STEVENS: Good morning, everyone. This is
8 Scott Stevens from Alston & Bird on behalf of the patent
9 owner. With me are my colleagues Chris Douglas and Andy
10 Ligotti, and I am going to ask Mr. Ligotti to speak on
11 our behalf this morning.

12 JUDGE MURRAY: Okay. Thank you.

13 Okay. So I understand that on February 25th,
14 counsel for petitioner emailed the Board requesting
15 authorization to file a preliminary reply to address
16 patent owner's arguments regarding discretionary denial
17 under Section 325(d). I also understand that patent
18 owner opposes this request.

19 Let's start with you, Miss Kaiser. Could you
20 please state the basis for your request?

21 MS. KAISER: Yes, your Honor.

22 We have requested authorization to file a short
23 preliminary reply to address patent owner's section
24 325(d) arguments that were not foreseeable and so could
25 not have reasonably been addressed in the petition.

1 I will note we did address Section 325(d) in the
2 petition and specifically as to Grounds 1A and 1B, and we
3 do -- you know, obviously we foresaw those arguments, so
4 we do think those were foreseeable, and we wouldn't be
5 seeking a preliminary reply to again address Grounds 1A
6 and 1B.

7 Instead, what we think there's good cause for
8 here based on unforeseeability is addressing patent
9 owner's Section 325(d) arguments for Grounds 2 and 3,
10 and, in particular, patent owner's arguments about
11 references being cumulative were not foreseeable. There
12 are approximately 50 references cited on the face of the
13 556 patent, and given the 14,000-word-count limit for a
14 petition, it's unreasonable to expect petitioners to
15 consider and anticipate any cumulative arguments that
16 patent owners might make.

17 Here, patent owner makes two arguments that
18 petitioner seeks to address in the preliminary reply, but
19 first is that the Chiang and VC1 references are not
20 cumulative of prior art of record during prosecution, and
21 the second is that the Guleryuz reference and the
22 applicant admitted prior art are not one and the same.

23 You know, I could certainly address the merits
24 of those arguments. In order to get into more details
25 about foreseeability, I think I would need to explain

1 more of the merits, but I am conscious that a lot of
2 times the Board just prefers to hear about foreseeability
3 on these conference calls.

4 So maybe I will pause there and see if, Judge
5 Murray, you have any questions.

6 JUDGE MURRAY: Can you explain -- patent owner's
7 preliminary response was filed on January 30th. Can you
8 explain why you waited until February 25th to ask relief
9 to file a reply?

10 MS. KAISER: Your Honor, I think it took some
11 time obviously to confer with our client and to
12 internally evaluate and to understand what we wanted to
13 ask for on preliminary reply because we didn't want to
14 give the Board a laundry list of items, and so it took a
15 bit of time to come to ground on that as well as to
16 confer with patent owner's counsel.

17 JUDGE MURRAY: Okay. I will come back to you,
18 but I want to give patent owner's counsel a chance to
19 speak at this point. Do you have a response to
20 petitioner's request?

21 MR. LIGOTTI: Yes, your Honor. Thank you. This
22 is Andrew Ligotti from Austin Bird on behalf of patent
23 owner.

24 As counsel for petitioner noted, petitioner had
25 and took its fair opportunity to address whether 325(d)

1 should bar institution, and specifically petitioner
2 evaluated the Board's precedential Advanced Bionics
3 framework and the Becton, Dickinson factors in its
4 petition at pages 69 to 72.

5 So petitioner to now say that it could not have
6 predicted that Section 325(d) impacts institution and
7 specifically that the Ground 2 and 3 references were not
8 cumulative is belied by the fact that the petition
9 demonstrates that it knew the significance and importance
10 of this threshold issue to institution and the legal
11 framework.

12 And, specifically, those Becton, Dickinson
13 factors from the Board's precedential decision addressed
14 at page 69 to 70, Factor A is the similarities and
15 material differences between the asserted art which would
16 include the three references asserted in Grounds 2 and 3,
17 Chiang, Lin, and VC1, and the prior art involved during
18 examination is a requirement under the Becton, Dickinson
19 factors that Intel says at page 69 they addressed and
20 considered in forming their Section 325(d) arguments.

21 Similarly, Factor B of the Becton, Dickinson
22 decision is the cumulative nature of the asserted art and
23 the prior art evaluated during examination.

24 And so, respectfully, this is not a case where
25 patent owner brings up Section 325(d) for the first time

1 in the patent owner preliminary response and petitioner
2 seeking the opportunity to be heard. Instead, this is
3 precisely the circumstance that led the Board to deny
4 leave to file a preliminary reply on Section 325(d)
5 issues in IPR2019-01595, the Roku versus Universal
6 Electronic case. There, the petitioner addressed 325(d)
7 in its petition and cited the precedential decision of
8 Becton, Dickinson, and the Board there concluded that it
9 was foreseeable that a patent owner would disagree with
10 the conclusion that Factors A and B weighed in favor of
11 institution.

12 And I would note, your Honors, that petitioner
13 goes on in its Section 325(d) section at page 70 to
14 specifically address the Chiang, Lin, and VC1 references
15 that are now the basis of the alleged good cause and
16 concludes that because those references were never before
17 the office, and I am quoting now from page 70 of the
18 petition, "considering the entirety of the Grounds of
19 this petition, the same or substantially the same art or
20 arguments were not previously presented to or considered
21 by the office."

22 And so it's our position that petitioner had its
23 opportunity to address this issue. It took its
24 opportunity to address this issue, and it seems now that
25 the request for preliminary reply is tantamount to a

1 request for a do-over or an opportunity to get five more
2 pages against what was already a 13,984-word petition
3 right up against that 14,000-word limit, but petitioner
4 made its choice to address the arguments that it thought
5 were relevant to institution in its petition, and it
6 took -- it took those opportunities, and, you know, if it
7 wanted to spend more words addressing those in more
8 detail, it could have done so.

9 Last, I will just quickly note the argument that
10 it was not foreseeable that per patent owner would point
11 out that Chiang and VC1, the Ground 2 and 3 references,
12 as well as Guleryuz were cumulative or identical to art
13 that was before the office, patent owner's preliminary
14 response simply points out that these references
15 addressed by petitioner and used in its grounds are
16 cumulative with other grounds or the other art used in
17 its other grounds which were the art that was before the
18 office, and so this isn't a circumstance where the bulk
19 of patent owner's argument is plucking one from the 50
20 references cited on the face. Rather, patent owner's
21 position is focused on the fact that petitioner utilizes
22 the different references in its grounds in precisely the
23 same way, and those -- the application of that art is
24 being used in a cumulative way as the examiner considered
25 during prosecution.

1 And so it would be our position that that is an
2 entirely foreseeable argument, and Board decisions have
3 denied preliminary replies on the basis that a
4 petitioner's utilization of the art can demonstrate the
5 cumulative nature, and that's also a foreseeable argument
6 for patent owners to make, and that would include that
7 Roku versus UEI decision in IPR2019-01595, Paper 8.

8 And so with that, I will stop there and ask if
9 the Board has any questions on patent owner's position.

10 JUDGE LEE: Thank you.

11 Good morning, this is Judge Lee. I want to
12 explore something with patent owner. I hear what you are
13 saying, but I am a little concerned to penalize the
14 petitioner for giving the first shot in the petition to
15 address 325(d).

16 For instance, if they don't say anything about
17 it and use the pages to address the merits in some other
18 way and then the patent owner comes back and say, hey,
19 it's 325(d) here, then they certainly will get an
20 opportunity to respond, but it seems like a good thing
21 for petitioner to give a good first shot in the petition
22 to kind of focus the issue, and then the patent owner can
23 look at that and disagree with it, and everything would
24 be streamlined, but, of course, here you say on their
25 first try they missed something else. You are suggesting

1 that, well, then it's too bad. You know, their first
2 casual go around didn't make it and they should never be
3 allowed to speak again.

4 I have a little concern about that, but I also
5 want to explore the other thing. A lot of times there
6 are multiple references in the record; right? So how is
7 petitioner realistically going to know every single word
8 that's said in every single reference and guarantee that
9 something won't be missed? I mean, it's a pretty hard
10 job to do. Some of these patents are so long and so
11 highly technical.

12 How -- how can you persuade me that these
13 references that petitioner -- that you have raised is
14 absolutely something petitioner should have known has
15 something to do with the references they have actually
16 applied, and it's not just, hey, you dug something out of
17 all of this and they should be blamed for not catching
18 it? You know, it shouldn't be a got-you thing. It
19 should be these jump right out. You absolutely should
20 have noticed the similarity between these and the
21 references you applied.

22 So can you, you know, explain something along
23 that line?

24 MR. LIGOTTI: Yes, your Honor, certainly. And,
25 again, this is Andrew Ligotti for patent owner.

1 So with respect to your first concern about a
2 petitioner that gave a try in its petition and perhaps
3 might be penalized for doing so, I think our response on
4 that issue would be that, here, petitioner specifically
5 laid out a conclusion that three references, Chiang, Lin,
6 and VC1, were not substantially the same as arguments and
7 art before the Board and saying that the Becton,
8 Dickinson Factors A and B supported that conclusion.

9 So they specifically did address the issue, and
10 it's just a question of whether the petitioner went
11 further to provide the basis for that conclusion, and
12 really what patent owner's Section 325(d) preliminary
13 response argument points out is that there is no provided
14 basis, at least provide an articulation as to why
15 petitioner came to that conclusion.

16 But speaking to the second part of your question
17 about the concern that a petitioner may need to scour the
18 record and think about all of the different words that
19 might have been used during prosecution, the issue here
20 is that petitioner did not address how its own grounds
21 were not cumulative of each other.

22 So as counsel for petitioner recognized at the
23 top of this conference call, Grounds 1A and B recycle the
24 exact prior art that was before the office, and
25 petitioner says that Chiang, Lin, and VC1 in Grounds 2

1 and 3 are not cumulative in its petition but never
2 analyzed how those references might or might not be
3 cumulative of its own references in Grounds 1A and 1B
4 which were before the office, and that's precisely --

5 JUDGE LEE: I see. I see. Let me get this
6 right. So it's like they have two sets. Set A is
7 definitely before the office, no argument about that, and
8 you are just saying they should at least analyze the
9 references in their Set B to see if they are the same or
10 substantially the same as the ones in Set A. Is that the
11 answer?

12 MR. LIGOTTI: Precisely, your Honor. That's
13 exactly right.

14 JUDGE LEE: I really don't need to consider
15 anything else? I mean, this is -- this succinct an
16 issue, it's like they need to at least look at Set B
17 compared with Set A because they already addressed the
18 issue in general. They should at least look at the
19 internal redundancies, and one set is already before the
20 office, so you need to look at the other set to see if
21 that's the same as that set.

22 MR. LIGOTTI: Your Honor, yes. Patent owner's
23 Section 325(d) argument is that Chiang, which is the
24 leader sort of reference in Ground 2, is cumulative of
25 Lee which is the lead asserted reference in Ground 1 and

1 which was before the examiner and considered during
2 prosecution, and --

3 JUDGE LEE: I see.

4 MR. LIGOTTI: -- with respect to Ground 3,
5 patent owner's argument is that VC1 which is the lead
6 asserted reference in Ground 3, if cumulative to Lee,
7 again, same reference, as well as the fact that Guleryuz
8 which is the secondary reference asserted in Ground 3, is
9 in our view the same as the reference considered during
10 prosecution by the examiner, or at the very least
11 cumulative of the applicant admitted prior art that was
12 considered by the examiner and which is applied in
13 petitioner's Ground 1B.

14 And, in fact, your Honor, the consistent
15 application of these teachings across the various grounds
16 that petitioner never wrestled with why that's not a
17 cumulative assertion of art that was before the office
18 can be seen by the arguments, for instance, at page 59 of
19 the petition wherein Ground 3, petitioner explains that
20 the motivation to combine VC1 and Guleryuz is the same as
21 applying the in-loop de-noising filter after an in-loop
22 deblocking filter as taught in numerous prior art
23 references, including Lee which was before the office and
24 asserted in Grounds 1A and 1B and Chiang which is Ground
25 2.

1 And so what we have here is patent owner simply
2 pointing out that a petitioner that has utilized, as you
3 put it, a set that was before the office and a set that
4 was not before the office should be -- it was foreseeable
5 to at least explain its conclusion that Set 1 was not
6 cumulative of Set 2.

7 JUDGE LEE: Okay. Thank you. I understand.

8 What about the timing, the 28 days that it took?
9 Do you have anything to say about that?

10 MR. LIGOTTI: Your Honor, only that --

11 JUDGE LEE: 28 days from filing of your prelim
12 to the request to file a preliminary reply?

13 MR. LIGOTTI: Yes, your Honor. I mean, we were
14 certainly curious as to whether petitioner was going to
15 ask for a reply, and, you know, it did take nearly four
16 weeks as you pointed out, yes.

17 JUDGE LEE: You know, if we authorize this, it
18 will take some time on both sides, and that kind of
19 leaves very little time for the panel. Anyway, yeah, I
20 don't need to ask you about that.

21 Thank you. I don't have any questions.

22 JUDGE MURRAY: Miss Kaiser, do you have any
23 response to the specific argument that having raised
24 Grounds 1 and 2, you should at least have -- or 1A and
25 1B, you should at least have compared Grounds 2 and 3

1 references to those?

2 MS. KAISER: Yes, your Honor.

3 So a number of things. Mr. Ligotti, I think,
4 talked about some of the merits in terms of in-loop
5 deringing filters. I think there's a lot of reasons why
6 the references are different, and it's undisputed that
7 Chiang and VC1 were not before the office during
8 prosecution, and, you know, it's not just the simple
9 matter of in-loop deringing filters or not.

10 For example, Lee doesn't teach using edge
11 magnitude to calculate filter weight. So these are
12 complicated references with a lot of differences, and so,
13 again, that's part of why it wasn't foreseeable.

14 In addition, Mr. Ligotti is not correct that
15 patent owner's arguments here are just group one versus
16 group two because the preliminary response also includes
17 an argument that VC1 is cumulative of H.264 which is not
18 in the first set of grounds.

19 So, again, it is true that Grounds 1A and 1B are
20 cumulative of or are art that was applied during
21 prosecution, and we don't dispute that, and that's why we
22 foresaw those arguments, and as Judge Lee said, that's
23 why we addressed those arguments. The reason why we used
24 those grounds is because patent owner took a different
25 position in litigation about claim construction. We

1 explained that in the petition.

2 We didn't address the second set of grounds in
3 325(d) because those references were not before the
4 office, and we don't think, you know, there's a good
5 argument that they are cumulative, and we, frankly,
6 because of that, did not anticipate that patent owner
7 would make the argument that they were cumulative.

8 And, you know, on the 28 days point, I sort of
9 hesitate to say this, but I would ask the Board for some
10 grace there. There's been certainly a lot of upheaval in
11 the last 28 days particular to the Board, but that has
12 also personally affected me and so to the extent that,
13 you know, I do think there are good reasons why it took
14 as long as it did, but I will ask and apologize to the
15 Board for some of that delay as well.

16 And I will pause there and see if you all have
17 other questions.

18 JUDGE LEE: Yeah. It's Judge Lee. Can you tell
19 us why -- because according to the other side, the two
20 sets are so similar, you should have addressed them, but
21 you just told us, no, you really can't on their face
22 immediately say one is cumulative of the other. I would
23 like to hear a little bit more about that. Like, why --
24 why would you say it's true that one just wouldn't think
25 that the other ones are same or substantially the same as

1 the ones that are before the office?

2 MS. KAISER: Sure.

3 JUDGE LEE: I mean, it sounds like based on the
4 other side, it's open and shut. You take a look and, of
5 course, they are the same, but you are telling us, oh,
6 that's not true. So I would like to hear a little bit
7 more.

8 MS. KAISER: Sure. I mean, we don't believe
9 it's the case that just because you can point to some
10 similarities between the art that means that they are
11 cumulative. Otherwise, you would sort of have to have a
12 catalog of all of the differences between art, and so, of
13 course, we relied on art that has filtering.

14 As I mentioned, one reason here is because Lee
15 doesn't teach the use of edge magnitude to calculate
16 filter weight. Chiang does. So that's one reason for
17 not cumulative. VC1 is not cumulative of Lee because it
18 doesn't teach and we don't rely on an in-loop deringing
19 filter for VC1.

20 JUDGE LEE: Oh, these are more into the details
21 which I don't want to --

22 MS. KAISER: Right.

23 JUDGE LEE: It's too much detail, but I just
24 want -- the upper question, the upper level, like, you
25 take a look and, you know, there's no reason for you to

1 think they could possibly be substantially the same.

2 MS. KAISER: Right.

3 JUDGE LEE: Take one look and go, yeah, this is
4 not right and then you put it in the other pile. You
5 know, if I were a lawyer, I would look at all of these
6 and I would put it in two piles. I would take a look at
7 this one, oh, yeah, it's possible I need to address, and
8 take a look at another one and go, oh, this is no
9 reasonable possibility. I will put it in the other pile.

10 So tell me what makes you put the second set
11 into the pile that you say, yeah, it's okay not to
12 address them?

13 MS. KAISER: Well, without getting in the weeds,
14 it's a little bit difficult to address your question,
15 Judge Lee, but I would say, number one, they are not in
16 the prosecution history at all, these references, VC1 and
17 Chiang. They are not, you know, related. They don't
18 have similar inventors. They don't have the same
19 disclosures.

20 And so in order to kind of look at, I guess,
21 whether to address them or not, then we look at the
22 details and decide are we relying on them for a different
23 purpose or not or in a different way, and if we think
24 there are sufficient differences, then we don't address
25 them as cumulative.

1 I agree that, you know, this isn't a case where,
2 you know, the -- Lee, for example, is not buried in the
3 prosecution history. So, clearly, we were aware of it.
4 That's why we addressed its Section 325(d) application in
5 the petition.

6 Yeah. I guess, I will say that without getting
7 into details.

8 JUDGE LEE: This is a question better asked the
9 other side. Can I switch to the other side?

10 Counsel for patent owner, can you quickly tell
11 us why counsel for the other side should take a look at
12 these side by side and would immediately come to a
13 conclusion that they should address it --

14 MR. LIGOTTI: Yes, your Honor.

15 JUDGE LEE: -- other than saying that these are
16 all cited in the petition? I already understand that
17 part of it, but I am just going a level deeper to say,
18 technically, why would the other counsel look at these
19 two side by side and immediately should think, yeah, this
20 is something I need to talk about?

21 MR. LIGOTTI: Certainly, your Honor. This is
22 Andrew Ligotti on behalf of patent owner again.

23 Two reasons why this is completely foreseeable.
24 Number one, the references are very similar, if not
25 identical, to each other based on the manner in which

1 petitioner uses the references across its grounds, and
2 the quote that I read from earlier on page 59
3 demonstrates that.

4 And I can provide a little bit more explanation,
5 but it's essentially that the petitioner is utilizing
6 these references consistently across its grounds. That
7 would indicate, if not require, the petitioner to also
8 understand, hey, I am really kind of putting these
9 references in the same bucket; I should address and
10 explain to the Board why it's my view that Factors A and
11 B in Becton, Dickinson counsels in favor of institute.

12 The second point, your Honor, as to why this is
13 a foreseeable outcome is these arguments were precisely
14 the arguments that were at issue and in dispute before
15 the International Trade Commission and co-pending at the
16 time of filing the petition Eastern District of North
17 Carolina cases.

18 So it's no secret that it has been patent
19 owner's perspective that these references were cumulative
20 of one another, especially patent owner's view and
21 perspective that the Guleryuz reference used as a
22 secondary reference in Ground 3 is the applicant admitted
23 prior art addressed in Count 2 of the specification and
24 addressed by the examiner in detail during prosecution of
25 the parent of the 556 patent.

1 So for those two reasons, within the petition
2 itself and petitioner's own arguments and also the
3 broader dispute between the parties or between
4 Interdigital and the parties' accused infringer at the
5 co-pending case and ITC action, it would be foreseeable
6 and it would have been something that we would have
7 expected petitioner to address in its petition.

8 And, again, I will just note that pages 69 to
9 70, petitioner includes the conclusion that Chiang, Lee,
10 and VC1 are not substantially the same as art before the
11 office. They just didn't go further and explain why, and
12 we believe there's not good cause for them to do so now.

13 JUDGE LEE: Thank you. One last question. Miss
14 Kaiser mentioned that your preliminary response actually
15 talk about one other reference that's not in the
16 set-to-set relationship and they should at least get a
17 chance to talk about that other reference. I forgot the
18 name. Do you know what I am talking about?

19 MR. LIGOTTI: Happy to answer that. Yes, your
20 Honor. Again, Andrew Ligotti, counsel for patent owner.

21 So that's the H.264 reference that petitioner
22 referenced. That's the first we are hearing that that
23 may be really the crux of the issue for petitioner, and
24 so if petitioner is requesting a reply -- a preliminary
25 reply limited to the scope of whether VC1 is cumulative

1 of H.264, that is a paper of limited scope that we would
2 not object to.

3 JUDGE LEE: Okay. Thank you.

4 MS. KAISER: Your Honor, this is Jessica Kaiser.
5 May I respond briefly to a couple of points?

6 JUDGE MURRAY: Please do.

7 MS. KAISER: Going back to Judge Lee's question
8 about sort of what's in the bucket or not in the bucket
9 in terms of what needed to be in the petition, here
10 fundamentally we needed references just at a very broad
11 level that masked two different filters, and patent
12 owner's argument seems to be that the similarities here
13 are because we used references with two filters, and we
14 don't disagree, for example, that that's true, but the
15 references in the details of both what they disclosed and
16 how we apply them are very different, and, to us, that
17 wasn't foreseeable, you know, how -- that they would
18 argue that references with such different details were
19 cumulative.

20 And so, as you know, the word count is very
21 limited, and so we took the arguments that were
22 foreseeable and addressed them in the petition, but we
23 did not believe that these arguments were foreseeable.

24 In terms of the timing, Judge Lee mentioned, you
25 know, adding time would give the panel less time. I

1 certainly understand that. I believe, in our email, we
2 asked for two weeks for a preliminary reply. We would
3 certainly be willing to do it in significantly less than
4 that to aid the panel and give the panel more time.

5 And then Mr. Ligotti made some arguments about
6 the Guleryuz reference and what happened in the ITC.
7 Candidly, we are not litigation counsel, and it's not
8 clear to me that the issues that Mr. Ligotti was talking
9 about to the extent that they crystallized in the ITC --
10 it's not clear to me they had crystallized at the time
11 the petition was filed. So I just wanted to make that
12 point as well.

13 JUDGE MURRAY: All right. Judge Droesch, Judge
14 Lee, do you have any further questions?

15 JUDGE LEE: No, thank you.

16 JUDGE MURRAY: All right. In that case, I would
17 like to thank counsel for both parties for their
18 attendance and for their arguments.

19 An order regarding petitioner's request will
20 issue shortly. And let me ask petitioner whether there
21 are any other issues that need to be discussed on this
22 call?

23 MS. KAISER: Not from petitioner, your Honor.

24 JUDGE MURRAY: And patent owner, same question?

25 MR. LIGOTTI: Not from patent owner, your Honor.

1 JUDGE MURRAY: All right. Thank you very much.
2 In that case, the conference call is adjourned. Have a
3 good afternoon, everyone.

4 MR. LIGOTTI: Thank you, your Honor.

5 MS. KAISER: Thank you, your Honor.

6 MR. LIGOTTI: You as well.

7 (The proceedings concluded at 7:33 a.m.)
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, the undersigned, a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of California, do hereby certify:

That the foregoing proceedings were taken before me at the time and place herein set forth; that a record of the proceedings was made by me using machine shorthand which was thereafter transcribed under my direction; that the foregoing transcript is a true record of the testimony given.

I further certify I am neither financially interested in the action nor a relative or employee of any attorney or party to this action.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have this date subscribed my name.

Dated: March 8, 2025



Monica Schoonover
CSR No. 10220

WORD INDEX

< 1 >

1 13:25 15:5, 24
10220 1:24 3:20
 26:23
1120 2:17
13,984-word 9:2
14,000-word 9:3
14,000-word-count
 5:13
1400 2:11
15196 1:25
1900 2:11
1A 5:2, 5 12:23
 13:3 14:24 15:24
 16:19
1B 5:2, 6 13:3
 14:13, 24 15:25
 16:19

< 2 >

2 5:9 7:7, 16 9:11
 12:25 13:24 14:25
 15:6, 24, 25 21:23
2025 1:16 3:2 26:18
25th 4:13 6:8
27 1:16 3:2
28 15:8, 11 17:8, 11
28203 2:18

< 3 >

3 5:9 7:7, 16 9:11
 13:1 14:4, 6, 8, 19
 15:25 21:22
300 2:17
303.291.2300 2:12
30th 6:7
325(d) 4:17, 24 5:1, 9
 6:25 7:6, 20, 25 8:4,
 6, 13 10:15, 19 12:12
 13:23 17:3 20:4

< 5 >

50 5:12 9:19
 556 5:13 21:25
 59 14:18 21:2

< 6 >

69 7:4, 14, 19 22:8

< 7 >

7:00 3:2
 7:33 25:7
70 7:14 8:13, 17
 22:9
704.444.1000 2:18
 72 7:4

< 8 >

8 10:7 26:18
80202-5255 2:11

< 9 >

9,674,556 1:19 3:7

< A >

A.M 3:2 25:7
ABaitchev@perkinscoi
e.com 2:10
absolutely 11:14, 19
accused 22:4
action 22:5 26:12, 13
adding 23:25
addition 16:14
address 4:15, 23 5:1,
 5, 18, 23 6:25 8:14,
 23, 24 9:4 10:15, 17
 12:9, 20 17:2 19:7,
 12, 14, 21, 24 20:13
 21:9 22:7
addressed 4:25 7:13,
 19 8:6 9:15 13:17
 16:23 17:20 20:4
 21:23, 24 23:22
addressing 5:8 9:7
adjourned 25:2
Administrative 2:3, 5
 3:8
admitted 5:22 14:11
 21:22
Advanced 7:2
afternoon 25:3
agree 20:1
aid 24:4
alleged 8:15
allowed 11:3
ALSTON 2:14 4:8

analyze 13:8

analyzed 13:2

ANDREW 2:15 6:22
 11:25 20:22 22:20

Andy 4:9

andy.ligotti@alston.co
m 2:16

answer 13:11 22:19

anticipate 5:15 17:6

Anyway 15:19

apologize 17:14

APPEAL 1:2 2:3

APPEARANCES 2:1

applicant 5:22 14:11
 21:22

application 9:23

14:15 20:4

applied 11:16, 21

14:12 16:20

apply 23:16

applying 14:21

approximately 5:12

argue 23:18

argument 9:9, 19

10:2, 5 12:13 13:7,
 23 14:5 15:23 16:17
 17:5, 7 23:12

arguments 4:16, 24

5:3, 9, 10, 15, 17, 24

7:20 8:20 9:4 12:6

14:18 16:15, 22, 23

21:13, 14 22:2 23:21,

23 24:5, 18

art 5:20, 22 7:15, 17,

22, 23 8:19 9:12, 16,

17, 23 10:4 12:7, 24

14:11, 17, 22 16:20

18:10, 12, 13 21:23

22:10

articulation 12:14

asked 20:8 24:2

asserted 7:15, 16, 22

13:25 14:6, 8, 24

assertion 14:17

ATANAS 2:10 4:4

attendance 24:18

attorney 26:13

Austin 6:22

authorization 4:15, 22

authorize 15:17

aware 20:3

< B >

B2 3:7

back 6:17 10:18

23:7

bad 11:1

BAITCHEV 2:10 4:4

bar 7:1

based 5:8 18:3

20:25

basis 4:20 8:15

10:3 12:11, 14

Becton 7:3, 12, 18, 21

8:8 12:7 21:11

behalf 3:15 4:8, 11

6:22 20:22

belied 7:8

believe 3:16 4:2

18:8 22:12 23:23

24:1

better 20:8

Bionics 7:2

BIRD 2:14 4:8 6:22

bit 6:15 17:23 18:6

19:14 21:4

blamed 11:17

BOARD 1:2 2:3

3:23 4:14 6:2, 14

8:3, 8 10:2, 9 12:7

17:9, 11, 15 21:10

Board's 7:2, 13

briefly 23:5

brings 7:25

broad 23:10

broader 22:3

bucket 21:9 23:8

bulk 9:18

buried 20:2

< C >

calculate 16:11 18:15

California 3:19 26:4

call 3:4 4:1 12:23

24:22 25:2

calls 6:3

Candidly 24:7

Carolina 2:18 21:17

Case 1:6 3:4 7:24 8:6 18:9 20:1 22:5 24:16 25:2 cases 21:17 casual 11:2 catalog 18:12 catching 11:17 cause 5:7 8:15 22:12 certainly 5:23 10:19 11:24 15:14 17:10 20:21 24:1, 3 CERTIFICATE 26:1 Certified 3:19 26:3 certify 26:4, 11 chance 6:18 22:17 Charlotte 2:18 Chiang 5:19 7:17 8:14 9:11 12:5, 25 13:23 14:24 16:7 18:16 19:17 22:9 choice 9:4 Chris 4:9 CHRISTOPHER 2:16 christopher.douglas@alston.com 2:17 circumstance 8:3 9:18 cited 5:12 8:7 9:20 20:16 claim 16:25 clear 24:8, 10 clearly 20:3 client 6:11 COIE 2:5 3:15 4:3 colleagues 4:2, 9 Colorado 2:11 combine 14:20 come 6:15, 17 20:12 comes 10:18 Commission 21:15 compared 13:17 15:25 completely 20:23 complicated 16:12 concern 11:4 12:1, 17 concerned 10:13	concerning 3:6 concluded 8:8 25:7 concludes 8:16 conclusion 8:10 12:5, 8, 11, 15 15:5 20:13 22:9 confer 6:11, 16 conference 3:4 6:3 12:23 25:2 conscious 6:1 consider 5:15 13:14 considered 7:20 8:20 9:24 14:1, 9, 12 considering 8:18 consistent 14:14 consistently 21:6 construction 16:25 co-pending 21:15 22:5 copy 3:22 CORPORATION 1:4 3:5 correct 16:14 counsel 3:12 4:6, 14 6:16, 18, 24 12:22 20:10, 11, 18 22:20 24:7, 17 counsels 21:11 Count 21:23 23:20 couple 23:5 course 10:24 18:5, 13 court 3:16, 18 crux 22:23 crystallized 24:9, 10 CSR 1:24 26:23 cumulative 5:11, 15, 20 7:8, 22 9:12, 16, 24 10:5 12:21 13:1, 3, 24 14:6, 11, 17 15:6 16:17, 20 17:5, 7, 22 18:11, 17 19:25 21:19 22:25 23:19 curious 15:14 < D > date 26:15 Dated 26:18 days 15:8, 11 17:8, 11	deblocking 14:22 decide 19:22 decision 7:13, 22 8:7 10:7 decisions 10:2 deeper 20:17 definitely 13:7 delay 17:15 demonstrate 10:4 demonstrates 7:9 21:3 denial 4:16 denied 10:3 de-noising 14:21 Denver 2:11 deny 8:3 deringing 16:5, 9 18:18 detail 9:8 18:23 21:24 details 5:24 18:20 19:22 20:7 23:15, 18 Dickinson 7:3, 12, 18, 21 8:8 12:8 21:11 differences 7:15 16:12 18:12 19:24 different 9:22 12:18 16:6, 24 19:22, 23 23:11, 16, 18 difficult 19:14 direction 26:8 disagree 8:9 10:23 23:14 disclosed 23:15 disclosures 19:19 discretionary 4:16 discussed 24:21 dispute 16:21 21:14 22:3 District 21:16 doing 12:3 do-over 9:1 DOUGLAS 2:16 4:9 DROESCH 2:5 3:11 24:13 dug 11:16 < E > earlier 21:2	Eastern 21:16 edge 16:10 18:15 Electronic 8:6 email 24:1 emailed 4:14 employee 26:12 ensure 3:22 entirely 10:2 entirety 8:18 especially 21:20 ESQ 2:8, 9, 10, 14, 15, 16 essentially 21:5 evaluate 6:12 evaluated 7:2, 23 exact 12:24 exactly 13:13 examination 7:18, 23 examiner 9:24 14:1, 10, 12 21:24 example 16:10 20:2 23:14 expect 5:14 expected 22:7 explain 5:25 6:6, 8 11:22 15:5 21:10 22:11 explained 17:1 explains 14:19 explanation 21:4 explore 10:12 11:5 extent 17:12 24:9 < F > face 5:12 9:20 17:21 fact 7:8 9:21 14:7, 14 Factor 7:14, 21 factors 7:3, 13, 19 8:10 12:8 21:10 fair 6:25 favor 8:10 21:11 February 1:16 3:2 4:13 6:8 file 3:22 4:15, 22 6:9 8:4 15:12 filed 6:7 24:11 filing 15:11 21:16 filter 14:21, 22 16:11
---	---	--	---

18:16, 19
filtering 18:13
filters 16:5, 9 23:11, 13
financially 26:11
first 5:19 7:25
 10:14, 21, 25 11:1
 12:1 16:18 22:22
five 9:1
focus 10:22
focused 9:21
foregoing 26:5, 9
foresaw 5:3 16:22
foreseeability 5:25 6:2
foreseeable 4:24 5:4, 11 8:9 9:10 10:2, 5 15:4 16:13 20:23 21:13 22:5 23:17, 22, 23
forgot 22:17
forming 7:20
forth 26:6
four 15:15
framework 7:3, 11
frankly 17:5
fundamentally 23:10
further 12:11 22:11 24:14 26:11

< G >

general 13:18
getting 19:13 20:6
give 6:14, 18 10:21 23:25 24:4
given 5:13 26:10
giving 10:14
go 11:2 19:3, 8 22:11
goes 8:13
going 4:10 11:7 15:14 20:17 23:7
Good 3:14, 18 4:5, 7 5:7 8:15 10:11, 20, 21 17:4, 13 22:12 25:3
got-you 11:18
grace 17:10

ground 6:15 7:7 9:11 13:24, 25 14:4, 6, 8, 13, 19, 24 21:22
Grounds 5:2, 5, 9 7:16 8:18 9:15, 16, 17, 22 12:20, 23, 25 13:3 14:15, 24 15:24, 25 16:18, 19, 24 17:2 21:1, 6
group 16:15, 16
guarantee 11:8
guess 19:20 20:6
Guleryuz 5:21 9:12 14:7, 20 21:21 24:6

< H >

H.264 16:17 22:21 23:1
happened 24:6
Happy 22:19
hard 11:9
hear 6:2 10:12 17:23 18:6
heard 8:2
hearing 22:22
hesitate 17:9
hey 10:18 11:16 21:8
highly 11:11
history 19:16 20:3
Honor 3:14, 24 4:21 6:10, 21 11:24 13:12, 22 14:14 15:10, 13 16:2 20:14, 21 21:12 22:20 23:4 24:23, 25 25:4, 5
Honors 8:12

< I >

identical 9:12 20:25
immediately 17:22 20:12, 19
impacts 7:6
importance 7:9
include 7:16 10:6
includes 16:16 22:9
including 14:23
indicate 21:7
infringer 22:4

in-loop 14:21 16:4, 9 18:18
instance 10:16 14:18
institute 21:11
institution 7:1, 6, 10 8:11 9:5
INTEL 1:4 3:5 7:19
INTER 1:18
INTERDIGITAL 1:7 3:6 22:4
interested 26:12
internal 13:19
internally 6:12
International 21:15
introduce 3:12 4:6
inventors 19:18
involved 7:17
IPR2019-01595 8:5 10:7
IPR2024-01441 1:6 3:5
issue 7:10 8:23, 24 10:22 12:4, 9, 19 13:16, 18 21:14 22:23 24:20
issues 8:5 24:8, 21
ITC 22:5 24:6, 9
items 6:14
its 6:25 7:3 8:7, 13, 22, 23 9:4, 5, 15, 17, 22 12:2, 20 13:1, 3 15:5 20:4 21:1, 6 22:7

< J >

JAMESON 2:5
Jamison 3:10
January 6:7
JESSICA 2:8 3:15 23:4
JKaiser@perkinscoie.c
om 2:8
Job 1:25 11:10
Judge 2:3, 5 3:4, 8, 21, 25 4:5, 12 6:4, 6, 17 10:10, 11 13:5, 14 14:3 15:7, 11, 17, 22 16:22 17:18 18:3, 20, 23 19:3, 15 20:8, 15

22:13 23:3, 6, 7, 24 24:13, 15, 16, 24 25:1
Judges 3:10
jump 11:19

< K >

KAISER 2:8 3:14, 15, 22, 24 4:2, 19, 21 6:10 15:22 16:2 18:2, 8, 22 19:2, 13 22:14 23:4, 7 24:23 25:5
kind 10:22 15:18 19:20 21:8
knew 7:9
know 5:3, 23 9:6 11:1, 7, 18, 22 15:15, 17 16:8 17:4, 8, 13 18:25 19:5, 17 20:1, 2 22:18 23:17, 20, 25
known 11:14
KRISTEN 2:5 3:10

< L >

laid 12:5
laundry 6:14
lawyer 19:5
lead 13:25 14:5
leader 13:24
leave 8:4
leaves 15:19
led 8:3
LEE 2:5 3:10 10:10, 11 13:5, 14, 25 14:3, 6, 23 15:7, 11, 17 16:10, 22 17:18 18:3, 14, 17, 20, 23 19:3, 15 20:2, 8, 15 22:9, 13 23:3, 24 24:14, 15
Lee's 23:7
legal 7:10
level 18:24 20:17 23:11
License 3:20
LIGOTTI 2:15 4:10 6:21, 22 11:24, 25 13:12, 22 14:4 15:10, 13 16:3, 14 20:14, 21, 22 22:19, 20 24:5, 8,

25 25:4, 6 limit 5:13 9:3 limited 22:25 23:1, 21 Lin 7:17 8:14 12:5, 25 line 3:17 4:3 11:23 LISA 2:3 3:8 list 6:14 litigation 16:25 24:7 little 10:13 11:4 15:19 17:23 18:6 19:14 21:4 LLP 2:5, 14 long 11:10 17:14 look 10:23 13:16, 18, 20 18:4, 25 19:3, 5, 6, 8, 20, 21 20:11, 18 lot 6:1 11:5 16:5, 12 17:10 < M > machine 26:7 magnitude 16:11 18:15 manner 20:25 March 26:18 masked 23:11 material 7:15 matter 16:9 mean 11:9 13:15 15:13 18:3, 8 means 18:10 mentioned 18:14 22:14 23:24 merits 5:23 6:1 10:17 16:4 missed 10:25 11:9 Monica 1:24 3:19 26:22 morning 3:14, 18 4:5, 7, 11 10:11 motivation 14:20 multiple 11:6 MURRAY 2:3 3:4, 9, 21, 25 4:5, 12 6:5, 6, 17 15:22 23:6 24:13, 16, 24 25:1 < N >	name 3:19 22:18 26:16 nature 7:22 10:5 nearly 15:15 need 5:25 12:17 13:14, 16, 20 15:20 19:7 20:20 24:21 needed 23:9, 10 neither 26:11 never 8:16 11:2 13:1 14:16 North 2:18 21:16 note 5:1 8:12 9:9 22:8 noted 6:24 noticed 11:20 number 16:3 19:15 20:24 numerous 14:22 < O > object 23:2 obviously 5:3 6:11 OFFICE 1:1 2:3 8:17, 21 9:13, 18 12:24 13:4, 7, 20 14:17, 23 15:3, 4 16:7 17:4 18:1 22:11 oh 18:5, 20 19:7, 8 Okay 4:12, 13 6:17 15:7 19:11 23:3 ones 13:10 17:25 18:1 open 18:4 opportunities 9:6 opportunity 6:25 8:2, 23, 24 9:1 10:20 opposes 4:18 order 5:24 19:20 24:19 outcome 21:13 Owner 1:8 3:6 4:6, 9, 18 5:17 6:23 7:25 8:1, 9 9:10 10:12, 18, 22 11:25 15:1 16:24 17:6 20:10, 22 22:20 24:24, 25 owners 5:16 10:6	owner's 4:16, 23 5:9, 10 6:6, 16, 18 9:13, 19, 20 10:9 12:12 13:22 14:5 16:15 21:19, 20 23:12 < P > page 7:14, 19 8:13, 17 14:18 21:2 pages 7:4 9:2 10:17 22:8 panel 15:19 23:25 24:4 Paper 10:7 23:1 parent 21:25 part 12:16 16:13 20:17 PARTES 1:18 particular 5:10 17:11 parties 3:12 22:3, 4 24:17 party 26:13 PATENT 1:1, 2, 8, 19 2:3, 5 3:6, 8 4:6, 8, 16, 17, 23 5:8, 10, 13, 16, 17 6:6, 16, 18, 22 7:25 8:1, 9 9:10, 13, 19, 20 10:6, 9, 12, 18, 22 11:25 12:12 13:22 14:5 15:1 16:15, 24 17:6 20:10, 22 21:18, 20, 25 22:20 23:11 24:24, 25 patents 11:10 pause 6:4 17:16 penalize 10:13 penalized 12:3 PERKINS 2:5 3:15 4:3 personally 17:12 perspective 21:19, 21 persuade 11:12 PETITION 1:18 4:25 5:2, 14 7:4, 8 8:7, 18, 19 9:2, 5 10:14, 21 12:2 13:1 14:19 17:1 20:5, 16 21:16 22:1, 7 23:9, 22 24:11	Petitioner 1:5 2:5 3:5, 13, 16 4:1, 14 5:18 6:24 7:1, 5 8:1, 6, 12, 22 9:3, 15, 21 10:14, 21 11:7, 13, 14 12:2, 4, 10, 15, 17, 20, 22, 25 14:16, 19 15:2, 14 21:1, 5, 7 22:7, 9, 21, 23, 24 24:20, 23 petitioners 5:14 petitioner's 6:20 10:4 14:13 22:2 24:19 pile 19:4, 9, 11 piles 19:6 place 26:6 please 3:12, 22 4:6, 20 23:6 plucking 9:19 point 6:19 9:10 17:8 18:9 21:12 24:12 pointed 15:16 pointing 15:2 points 9:14 12:13 23:5 position 8:22 9:21 10:1, 9 16:25 possibility 19:9 possible 19:7 possibly 19:1 precedential 7:2, 13 8:7 precisely 8:3 9:22 13:4, 12 21:13 predicted 7:6 prefers 6:2 prelim 15:11 preliminary 4:15, 23 5:5, 18 6:7, 13 8:1, 4, 25 9:13 10:3 12:12 15:12 16:16 22:14, 24 24:2 presented 8:20 Presiding 3:10 pretty 11:9 previously 8:20 prior 5:20, 22 7:17, 23 12:24 14:11, 22 21:23
---	--	--	--

PROCEEDINGS

1:14 25:7 26:5, 7
prosecution 5:20
 9:25 12:19 14:2, 10
 16:8, 21 19:16 20:3
 21:24
provide 12:11, 14
 21:4
provided 12:13
PST 3:2
purpose 19:23
put 15:3 19:4, 6, 9,
 10
putting 21:8

< Q >

question 12:10, 16
 18:24 19:14 20:8
 22:13 23:7 24:24
questions 6:5 10:9
 15:21 17:17 24:14
quickly 9:9 20:10
quote 21:2
quoting 8:17

< R >

raised 11:13 15:23
read 21:2
realistically 11:7
really 12:12 13:14
 17:21 21:8 22:23
reason 16:23 18:14,
 16, 25
reasonable 19:9
reasonably 4:25
reasons 16:5 17:13
 20:23 22:1
recognized 12:22
record 5:20 11:6
 12:18 26:6, 9
recycle 12:23
redundancies 13:19
reference 5:21 11:8
 13:24, 25 14:6, 7, 8, 9
 21:21, 22 22:15, 17,
 21 24:6
referenced 22:22
references 5:11, 12,
 19 7:7, 16 8:14, 16
 9:11, 14, 20, 22 11:6,

13, 15, 21 12:5 13:2,
 3, 9 14:23 16:1, 6, 12
 17:3 19:16 20:24
 21:1, 6, 9, 19 23:10,
 13, 15, 18
regarding 4:16 24:19
related 19:17
relationship 22:16
relative 26:12
relevant 9:5
relied 18:13
relief 6:8
rely 18:18
relying 19:22
replies 10:3
reply 4:15, 23 5:5,
 18 6:9, 13 8:4, 25
 15:12, 15 22:24, 25
 24:2
Reported 1:24
reporter 3:16, 18, 20
 26:4
REPORTER'S 1:14
 26:1
request 4:18, 20
 6:20 8:25 9:1 15:12
 24:19
requested 4:22
requesting 4:14
 22:24
require 21:7
requirement 7:18
respect 12:1 14:4
respectfully 7:24
respond 10:20 23:5
Respondent 2:13
response 6:7, 19 8:1
 9:14 12:3, 13 15:23
 16:16 22:14
REVIEW 1:18
right 3:25 4:5 9:3
 11:6, 19 13:6, 13
 18:22 19:2, 4 24:13,
 16 25:1
Roku 8:5 10:7
 < S >
SATHE 2:9 4:3
saying 10:13 12:7

13:8 20:15
says 7:19 12:25
Schoonover 1:24
 3:19 26:22
scope 22:25 23:1
SCOTT 2:14 4:8
scott.stevens@alston.c
om 2:15
scour 12:17
second 5:21 12:16
 17:2 19:10 21:12
secondary 14:8 21:22
secret 21:18
Section 4:17, 23 5:1,
 9 7:6, 20, 25 8:4, 13
 12:12 13:23 20:4
see 6:4 13:5, 9, 20
 14:3 17:16
seeking 5:5 8:2
seeks 5:18
seen 14:18
Set 13:6, 9, 10, 16, 17,
 19, 20, 21 15:3, 5, 6
 16:18 17:2 19:10
 26:6
sets 13:6 17:20
set-to-set 22:16
short 4:22
Shorthand 3:20 26:3,
 7
shortly 24:20
shot 10:14, 21
shut 18:4
side 17:19 18:4
 20:9, 11, 12, 19
sides 15:18
significance 7:9
significantly 24:3
similar 17:20 19:18
 20:24
similarities 7:14
 18:10 23:12
similarity 11:20
Similarly 7:21
simple 16:8
simply 9:14 15:1
single 11:7, 8
Sixteenth 2:11
sort 13:24 17:8

18:11 23:8
sounds 18:3
South 2:17
speak 4:10 6:19
 11:3
speaking 12:16
specific 15:23
specifically 5:2 7:1,
 7, 12 8:14 12:4, 9
specification 21:23
spend 9:7
start 4:19
starting 3:13
state 4:20 26:4
STATES 1:1
STEVENS 2:14 4:7,
 8
stop 10:8
streamlined 10:24
Street 2:11, 17
subscribed 26:15
substantially 8:19
 12:6 13:10 17:25
 19:1 22:10
succinct 13:15
sufficient 19:24
suggesting 10:25
Suite 2:11, 17
supported 12:8
Sure 18:2, 8
switch 20:9
 < T >
take 15:15, 18 18:4,
 25 19:3, 6, 8 20:11
taken 26:5
talk 20:20 22:15, 17
talked 16:4
talking 22:18 24:8
tantamount 8:25
taught 14:22
teach 16:10 18:15, 18
teachings 14:15
technical 11:11
technically 20:18
Teleconference 1:15
tell 17:18 19:10
 20:10
telling 18:5

terms 16:4 23:9, 24
testimony 26:10
Thank 3:21, 24 4:12
 6:21 10:10 15:7, 21
 22:13 23:3 24:15, 17
 25:1, 4, 5
thing 10:20 11:5, 18
things 16:3
think 5:4, 7, 25 6:10
 12:3, 18 16:3, 5 17:4,
 13, 24 19:1, 23 20:19
thought 9:4
three 7:16 12:5
threshold 7:10
Thursday 1:16 3:2
time 6:11, 15 7:25
 15:18, 19 21:16
 23:25 24:4, 10 26:6
times 6:2 11:5
timing 15:8 23:24
TL 2:16
today 3:10
today's 3:23
told 17:21
top 12:23
Trade 21:15
TRADEMARK 1:1
 2:3
transcribed 26:8
TRANSCRIPT 1:14
 3:23 26:9
TRIAL 1:2 2:3
true 16:19 17:24
 18:6 23:14 26:9
try 10:25 12:2
Tryon 2:17
two 4:2 5:17 13:6
 16:16 17:19 19:6
 20:19, 23 22:1 23:11,
 13 24:2

< U >
U.S 1:19 2:3 3:6
UEI 10:7
undersigned 26:3
understand 4:13, 17
 6:12 15:7 20:16
 21:8 24:1
undisputed 16:6

unforeseeability 5:8
UNITED 1:1
Universal 8:5
unreasonable 5:14
upheaval 17:10
upper 18:24
use 10:17 18:15
uses 21:1
utilization 10:4
utilized 15:2
utilizes 9:21
utilizing 21:5

< V >
various 14:15
VC1 5:19 7:17 8:14
 9:11 12:6, 25 14:5,
 20 16:7, 17 18:17, 19
 19:16 22:10, 25
versus 3:5 8:5 10:7
 16:15
view 14:9 21:10, 20
VINAY 2:9 4:3
VSathe@perkinscoie.c
om 2:9

< W >
waited 6:8
want 6:13, 18 10:11
 11:5 18:21, 24
wanted 6:12 9:7
 24:11
way 9:23, 24 10:18
 19:23
weeds 19:13
weeks 15:16 24:2
weighed 8:10
weight 16:11 18:16
well 6:15 9:12 11:1
 14:7 17:15 19:13
 24:12 25:6
went 12:10
WHEREOF 26:15
willing 24:3
WITNESS 26:15
word 11:7 23:20
words 9:7 12:18
wrestled 14:16

< Y >

yeah 15:19 17:18
 19:3, 7, 11 20:6, 19

WORD LIST

< 1 >	< 9 >	asked (2)	catching (1)
1 (3)	9,674,556 (2)	asserted (7)	cause (3)
10220 (3)	< A >	assertion (1)	certainly (8)
1120 (1)	A.M (2)	ATANAS (2)	CERTIFICATE (1)
13,984-word (1)	ABaitchev@perkinscoi	attendance (1)	Certified (2)
14,000-word (1)	e.com (1)	attorney (1)	certify (2)
14,000-word-count	absolutely (2)	Austin (1)	chance (2)
(1)	accused (1)	authorization (2)	Charlotte (1)
1400 (1)	action (3)	authorize (1)	Chiang (12)
15196 (1)	adding (1)	aware (1)	choice (1)
1900 (1)	addition (1)	< B >	Chris (1)
1A (7)	address (24)	B2 (1)	CHRISTOPHER (1)
1B (7)	addressed (12)	back (3)	christopher.douglas@a
< 2 >	addressing (2)	bad (1)	lston.com (1)
2 (11)	adjourned (1)	BAITCHEV (2)	circumstance (2)
2025 (3)	Administrative (4)	bar (1)	cited (4)
25th (2)	admitted (3)	based (3)	claim (1)
27 (2)	Advanced (1)	basis (5)	clear (2)
28 (4)	afternoon (1)	Becton (7)	clearly (1)
28203 (1)	agree (1)	behalf (5)	client (1)
< 3 >	aid (1)	belied (1)	COIE (3)
3 (11)	alleged (1)	believe (6)	colleagues (2)
300 (1)	allowed (1)	better (1)	Colorado (1)
303.291.2300 (1)	ALSTON (2)	Bionics (1)	combine (1)
30th (1)	analyze (1)	BIRD (3)	come (3)
325(d (17)	analyzed (1)	bit (5)	comes (1)
< 5 >	ANDREW (5)	blamed (1)	Commission (1)
50 (2)	Andy (1)	BOARD (15)	compared (2)
556 (2)	andy.ligotti@alston.co	Board's (2)	completely (1)
59 (2)	m (1)	briefly (1)	complicated (1)
< 6 >	answer (2)	brings (1)	concern (3)
69 (4)	anticipate (2)	broad (1)	concerned (1)
< 7 >	Anyway (1)	broader (1)	concerning (1)
7:00 (1)	apologize (1)	bucket (3)	concluded (2)
7:33 (1)	APPEAL (2)	bulk (1)	concludes (1)
70 (4)	APPEARANCES (1)	buried (1)	conclusion (8)
704.444.1000 (1)	applicant (3)	< C >	confer (2)
72 (1)	application (3)	calculate (2)	conference (4)
< 8 >	applied (4)	California (2)	conscious (1)
8 (2)	apply (1)	call (5)	consider (2)
80202-5255 (1)	applying (1)	calls (1)	considered (6)
	approximately (1)	Candidly (1)	considering (1)
	argue (1)	Carolina (2)	consistent (1)
	argument (13)	Case (9)	consistently (1)
	arguments (23)	cases (1)	construction (1)
	art (23)	casual (1)	co-pending (2)
	articulation (1)	catalog (1)	copy (1)
			CORPORATION (2)
			correct (1)

counsel (13)
 counsels (1)
 Count (2)
 couple (1)
 course (3)
 court (2)
 crux (1)
 crystallized (2)
 CSR (2)
 cumulative (29)
 curious (1)

< D >

date (1)
 Dated (1)
 days (4)
 deblocking (1)
 decide (1)
 decision (4)
 decisions (1)
 deeper (1)
 definitely (1)
 delay (1)
 demonstrate (1)
 demonstrates (2)
 denial (1)
 denied (1)
 de-noising (1)
 Denver (1)
 deny (1)
 deringing (3)
 detail (3)
 details (6)
 Dickinson (7)
 differences (4)
 different (9)
 difficult (1)
 direction (1)
 disagree (3)
 disclosed (1)
 disclosures (1)
 discretionary (1)
 discussed (1)
 dispute (3)
 District (1)
 doing (1)
 do-over (1)
 DOUGLAS (2)
 DROESCH (3)

dug (1)

< E >

earlier (1)
 Eastern (1)
 edge (2)
 Electronic (1)
 email (1)
 emailed (1)
 employee (1)
 ensure (1)
 entirely (1)
 entirety (1)
 especially (1)
 ESQ (6)
 essentially (1)
 evaluate (1)
 evaluated (2)
 exact (1)
 exactly (1)
 examination (2)
 examiner (5)
 example (3)
 expect (1)
 expected (1)
 explain (7)
 explained (1)
 explains (1)
 explanation (1)
 explore (2)
 extent (2)

< F >

face (3)
 fact (4)
 Factor (2)
 factors (6)
 fair (1)
 favor (2)
 February (4)
 file (6)
 filed (2)
 filing (2)
 filter (5)
 filtering (1)
 filters (4)
 financially (1)
 first (9)
 five (1)

focus (1)
 focused (1)
 foregoing (2)
 foresaw (2)
 foreseeability (2)
 foreseeable (15)
 forgot (1)
 forming (1)
 forth (1)
 four (1)
 framework (2)
 frankly (1)
 fundamentally (1)
 further (4)

< G >

general (1)
 getting (2)
 give (5)
 given (2)
 giving (1)
 go (4)
 goes (1)
 going (5)
 Good (13)
 got-you (1)
 grace (1)
 ground (12)
 Grounds (23)
 group (2)
 guarantee (1)
 guess (2)
 Guleryuz (6)

< H >

H.264 (3)
 happened (1)
 Happy (1)
 hard (1)
 hear (4)
 heard (1)
 hearing (1)
 hesitate (1)
 hey (3)
 highly (1)
 history (2)
 Honor (21)
 Honors (1)

< I >

identical (2)
 immediately (3)
 impacts (1)
 importance (1)
 include (2)
 includes (2)
 including (1)
 indicate (1)
 infringer (1)
 in-loop (5)
 instance (2)
 institute (1)
 institution (5)
 INTEL (3)
 INTER (1)
 INTERDIGITAL (3)
 interested (1)
 internal (1)
 internally (1)
 International (1)
 introduce (2)
 inventors (1)
 involved (1)
 IPR2019-01595 (2)
 IPR2024-01441 (2)
 issue (12)
 issues (3)
 ITC (3)
 items (1)
 its (20)

< J >

JAMESON (1)
 Jamison (1)
 January (1)
 JESSICA (3)
 JKaiser@perkinscoie.c
 om (1)
 Job (2)
 Judge (43)
 Judges (1)
 jump (1)

< K >

KAISER (22)
 kind (4)
 knew (1)
 know (22)

known (1)		PERKINS (3)	raised (2)
KRISTEN (2)	< N >	personally (1)	read (1)
< L >	name (3)	perspective (2)	realistically (1)
laid (1)	nature (2)	persuade (1)	really (5)
laundry (1)	nearly (1)	PETITION (25)	reason (4)
lawyer (1)	need (9)	Petitioner (46)	reasonable (1)
lead (2)	needed (2)	petitioners (1)	reasonably (1)
leader (1)	neither (1)	petitioner's (5)	reasons (4)
leave (1)	never (4)	pile (3)	recognized (1)
leaves (1)	North (2)	piles (1)	record (5)
led (1)	note (4)	place (1)	recycle (1)
LEE (33)	noted (1)	please (5)	redundancies (1)
Lee's (1)	noticed (1)	plucking (1)	reference (14)
legal (1)	number (3)	point (6)	referenced (1)
level (3)	numerous (1)	pointed (1)	references (34)
License (1)	< O >	pointing (1)	regarding (2)
LIGOTTI (24)	object (1)	points (3)	related (1)
limit (2)	obviously (2)	position (5)	relationship (1)
limited (3)	OFFICE (18)	possibility (1)	relative (1)
Lin (4)	oh (4)	possible (1)	relevant (1)
line (3)	Okay (6)	possibly (1)	relied (1)
LISA (2)	ones (3)	precedential (3)	relief (1)
list (1)	open (1)	precisely (5)	rely (1)
litigation (2)	opportunities (1)	predicted (1)	relying (1)
little (7)	opportunity (6)	prefers (1)	replies (1)
LLP (2)	opposes (1)	prelim (1)	reply (13)
long (2)	order (3)	preliminary (17)	Reported (1)
look (14)	outcome (1)	presented (1)	reporter (4)
lot (5)	Owner (23)	Presiding (1)	REPORTER'S (2)
< M >	owners (2)	pretty (1)	request (7)
machine (1)	owner's (18)	previously (1)	requested (1)
magnitude (2)	< P >	prior (8)	requesting (2)
manner (1)	page (6)	PROCEEDINGS (4)	require (1)
March (1)	pages (4)	prosecution (10)	requirement (1)
masked (1)	panel (4)	provide (3)	respect (2)
material (1)	Paper (2)	provided (1)	respectfully (1)
matter (1)	parent (1)	PST (1)	respond (2)
mean (5)	part (3)	purpose (1)	Respondent (1)
means (1)	PARTES (1)	put (5)	response (9)
mentioned (3)	particular (2)	putting (1)	REVIEW (1)
merits (4)	parties (4)	< Q >	right (13)
missed (2)	party (1)	question (8)	Roku (2)
Monica (3)	PATENT (55)	questions (5)	< S >
morning (6)	patents (1)	quickly (2)	SATHE (2)
motivation (1)	pause (2)	quote (1)	saying (4)
multiple (1)	penalize (1)	quoting (1)	says (2)
MURRAY (16)	penalized (1)	< R >	Schoonover (3)
			scope (2)
			SCOTT (2)

scott.stevens@alston.c om (1)	substantially (6)	Tryon (1)	< Y >
scour (1)	succinct (1)	two (12)	yeah (7)
second (5)	sufficient (1)	< U >	
secondary (2)	suggesting (1)	U.S (3)	
secret (1)	Suite (2)	UEI (1)	
Section (13)	supported (1)	undersigned (1)	
see (7)	Sure (2)	understand (7)	
seeking (2)	switch (1)	undisputed (1)	
seeks (1)	< T >	unforeseeability (1)	
seen (1)	take (8)	UNITED (1)	
Set (16)	taken (1)	Universal (1)	
sets (2)	talk (3)	unreasonable (1)	
set-to-set (1)	talked (1)	upheaval (1)	
short (1)	talking (2)	upper (2)	
Shorthand (3)	tantamount (1)	use (2)	
shortly (1)	taught (1)	uses (1)	
shot (2)	teach (3)	utilization (1)	
shut (1)	teachings (1)	utilized (1)	
side (9)	technical (1)	utilizes (1)	
sides (1)	technically (1)	utilizing (1)	
significance (1)	Teleconference (1)	< V >	
significantly (1)	tell (3)	various (1)	
similar (3)	telling (1)	VC1 (15)	
similarities (3)	terms (3)	versus (4)	
similarity (1)	testimony (1)	view (3)	
Similarly (1)	Thank (14)	VINAY (2)	
simple (1)	thing (3)	VSathe@perkinscoie.c om (1)	
simply (2)	things (1)	< W >	
single (2)	think (14)	waited (1)	
Sixteenth (1)	thought (1)	want (6)	
sort (4)	three (2)	wanted (3)	
sounds (1)	threshold (1)	way (4)	
South (1)	Thursday (2)	weeds (1)	
speak (3)	time (11)	weeks (2)	
speaking (1)	times (2)	weighed (1)	
specific (1)	timing (2)	weight (2)	
specifically (7)	TL (1)	well (8)	
specification (1)	today (1)	went (1)	
spend (1)	today's (1)	WHEREOF (1)	
start (1)	told (1)	willing (1)	
starting (1)	top (1)	WITNESS (1)	
state (2)	Trade (1)	word (2)	
STATES (1)	TRADEMARK (2)	words (2)	
STEVENS (3)	transcribed (1)	wrestled (1)	
stop (1)	TRANSCRIPT (3)		
streamlined (1)	TRIAL (2)		
Street (2)	true (5)		
subscribed (1)	try (2)		