AIA Trial Roundtables
# Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:00 PM</td>
<td>Welcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:10 PM</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Overview of trials, statistics, and lessons learned (30 minutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Audience Questions/Comments (20 minutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 PM</td>
<td>Mock Conference Call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Topics include motion to amend and motion for additional discovery (30 minutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Audience Questions/Comments (20 minutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:50 PM</td>
<td>BREAK (10 minutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 PM</td>
<td>Panel Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 PM</td>
<td>Closing Remarks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Roundtable Materials

• Available at:

PTAB Presentation
Overview

• AIA Trials
  – Statistics
  – Lessons Learned

• Administrative Patent Judges

• PTAB Website Tour
Trial Proceeding Timeline

1. Petition Filed
2. PO Preliminary Response
3. Decision on Petition
4. PO Response & Motion to Amend Claims
5. Petitioner Reply to PO Response & Opposition to Amendment
6. PO Reply to Opposition to Amendment
7. Oral Hearing
8. Final Written Decision

- 3 months
- No more than 3 months
- 3 months
- 3 months
- 1 month
- Hearing Set on Request
- Period for Observations & Motions to Exclude Evidence
- No more than 12 months
Inter Partes Review Petitions Terminated to Date (As of 5/1/2014)

205 Petitions

- 68 Trials Not Instituted
- 137 Trials Instituted

137 Trials Instituted

- 92 Trials Settled / Dismissed / Request for Adverse Judgment
- 45 Trials Reached Final Written Decisions

92 Trials Settled / Dismissed / Request for Adverse Judgment

- 26 Trials All Instituted Claims Unpatentable (13% of Total Petitions)
- 12 Trials Some Instituted Claims Unpatentable (6% of Total Petitions)
- 7 Trials None of Instituted Claims Unpatentable (3% of Total Petitions)
Inter Partes Review Petitions Terminated to Date (As of 5/1/2014)

7,095 Claims in 205 Petitions

2,874 Claims Challenged (205 Petitions) 4,221 Claims Not Challenged

1,900 Claims Instituted (66% of Claims Challenged) (137 Petitions) 974 Claims Challenged but Not Instituted (34% of Claims Challenged)

467 Claims Found Unpatentable (25% of Claims Instituted, 16% of Claims Challenged) (38 Petitions) 417 Claims Cancelled or Disclaimed (Non-PTAB) (22% of Claims Instituted, 15% of Claims Challenged)

144 Claims Found Patentable by PTAB (8% of Claims Instituted, 5% of Claims Challenged) 872 Claims Remaining Patentable (46% of Claims Instituted, 55% of Claims Challenged)
Petition Filing

1. Petition Filed
2. PO Preliminary Response
3. Decision on Petition
4. PO Response & Motion to Amend Claims
5. Petitioner Reply to PO Response & Opposition to Amendment
6. PO Reply to Opposition to Amendment
7. Oral Hearing
8. Final Written Decision

3 months → No more than 3 months → 3 months → 3 months → 1 month → Hearing Set on Request

- PO Discovery Period
- Petitioner Discovery Period
- PO Discovery Period
- Period for Observations & Motions to Exclude Evidence

No more than 12 months
AIA Petitions
(Cumulative Number as of 5/1/2014)

- Total: 1306
- IPR: 1139
- CBM: 161
- Derivation: 6
AIA Petitions
(Technology Breakdown as of 5/1/14)

- Electrical/Computer (930) - 71.2%
- Mechanical (195) - 15.0%
- Chemical (106) - 8.1%
- Bio/Pharma (67) - 5.1%
- Design (8) - 0.6%
Petition Challenges
(As of 5/1/2014)

- CBM
  - Challenged < All Claims: 75
  - Challenged = All Claims: 86

- IPR
  - Challenged < All Claims: 739
  - Challenged = All Claims: 400
§101 and § 112 Grounds Raised in CBM Petitions Only (As of 5/1/2014)

101 Grounds

Yes: 96
No: 65

112 Grounds

Yes: 54
No: 107
Lessons Learned: Petitions

• Conclusions need to be supported by:
  – Sound legal analysis; and
  – Citations to evidentiary record

• Analysis needs to appear in petition itself (no incorporation by reference from declaration)

• Better to provide detailed analysis for limited number of challenges than identify large number of challenges for which little analysis is provided

• See Wowza Media v. Adobe, IPR2013-00054 (Paper 12)(denying petition)
Lessons Learned: Claim Charts

• Use standard two-column format. See FAQ D13

• Claim charts are not sufficient by themselves; they must be explained.

• Claim charts should contain pinpoint references to the supporting evidence. See FAQ D12
• Claim constructions should be supported by citations to the record that justify the proffered construction and analysis provided as to why the claim construction is the broadest reasonable construction. 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(3).

• An example of a failure to provide a sufficient claim construction occurs where claim terms are open to interpretation, but party merely restates claim construction standard to be used, e.g.,
  
  – A claim subject to inter partes review receives the “broadest reasonable construction in light of the specification of the patent in which it appears.” 37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b)
Lessons Learned: Experts

• Tutorials are helpful especially for complex technologies

• Expert testimony without underlying facts or data is entitled to little or no weight. 37 C.F.R. § 42.65(a). See Monsanto Co. v. Pioneer Hi-Breed Int’l, IPR2013-00022, Paper 43 (denying petition)

• Avoid merely “expertizing” your claim charts
Lessons Learned: Obviousness

• Question of obviousness is resolved based on underlying factual determinations identified in *Graham*
  – Includes addressing differences between claimed subject matter and the prior art

• Address the specific teachings of the art relied upon rather than rely upon what others have said (e.g., examiners)
  – Parties are to address whether there is a reason to combine art (*KSR*) and avoid conclusory statements

• See *Veeam Software v. Symantec*, IPR2013-00145 (Paper 12); *Heart Failure Tech. v. CardioKinetix*, IPR2013-00183 (Paper 12) (denying petition)
Patent Owner Preliminary Response

- Petition Filed
- PO Preliminary Response
- Decision on Petition
- PO Response & Motion to Amend Claims
- Petitioner Reply to PO Response & Opposition to Amendment
- PO Reply to Opposition to Amendment
- Oral Hearing
- Final Written Decision

- 3 months
- No more than 3 months
- 3 months
- 3 months
- 1 month
- Hearing Set on Request
- Period for Observations & Motions to Exclude Evidence

No more than 12 months
Patent Owner Preliminary Responses (As of 5/1/14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Filed</th>
<th>Not Filed or Waived</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IPR</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBM</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lessons Learned: Patent Owner Preliminary Response

- Clearly identify procedural and substantive reasons to deny petition, e.g.,
  - Statutory bar under 35 U.S.C. § 315 or § 325?
  - Failure to identify real parties-in-interest/privies?
  - Weaknesses in Petitioner’s case?
    - Petitioner’s claim construction is improper
    - Cited references are not, in fact, prior art
    - Cited references lack material element(s)

- Cannot present new testimonial evidence
  - BUT can cite existing testimony and reports
Decision on Petition

- Petition Filed
- PO Preliminary Response
- Decision on Petition
- PO Response & Motion to Amend Claims
- Petitioner Reply to PO Response & Opposition to Amendment
- PO Reply to Opposition to Amendment
- Oral Hearing
- Final Written Decision

Timeline:
- 3 months
- No more than 3 months
- 3 months
- 3 months
- 1 month

Other stages:
- Hearing Set on Request
- PO Discovery Period
- Petitioner Discovery Period
- PO Discovery Period
- Period for Observations & Motions to Exclude Evidence

No more than 12 months
Institutions (As of 5/1/2014)

**CBM**
- Petitions Denied: 15
- Petitions Instituted: 59

**IPR**
- Petitions Denied: 107
- Petitions Instituted: 469
Institutions (As of 5/1/2014)

- Instituted Claims < Challenged Claims
- Instituted Claims = Challenged Claims

CBM

- 11 Instituted Claims
- 48 Challenged Claims

IPR

- 101 Instituted Claims
- 368 Challenged Claims
### Petition Dispositions (As of 5/1/14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total No. of Decisions on Institution</th>
<th>Trials Instituted</th>
<th>Joinders</th>
<th>Denials</th>
<th>Percent Instituted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>IPR</strong></td>
<td>576</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>12+</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CBM</strong></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1+</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+13 cases joined to 12 base trials for a total of 25 cases involved in joinder.
### Joinders (As of 5/1/14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Trials Instituted</th>
<th>Joinders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IPR</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>12+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBM</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+13 cases joined to 12 base trials for a total of 25 cases involved in joinder.
Lessons Learned: Joinder

- Must be a like review proceeding
- Requires filing a motion and petition
- File within one month of institution
- Impact on schedule important

- *Dell v. Network-1, IPR2013-00385 (Paper 17)* (joinder granted)
- *Sony v. Network-1, IPR2013-00386 (Paper 16)* (joinder denied)
Types of Discovery


• Routine Discovery
  – Cited exhibits
  – Cross-examination of witnesses
  – Inconsistent information

• Additional Discovery
Lessons Learned: Additional Discovery

- Five factor test used in evaluating additional discovery requests (IPR2012-00001, *Garmin v. Cuozzo* (Paper 26)):
  1. More than a possibility and mere allegation must exist that something useful might be found.
  2. Is the request merely seeking early identification of opponent’s litigation position?
  3. Can party requesting discovery generate the information?
  4. Interrogatory questions must be clear.
  5. Are requests overly burdensome to answer?

- Requests for specific documents with a sufficient showing of relevance are more likely to be granted whereas requests for general classes of documents are typically denied.
Lessons Learned: Depositions

• Federal Rules of Evidence apply

• Objections to admissibility waived

• Follow the Testimony Guidelines (Practice Guide Appendix D)
  – No “speaking” objections or coaching
  – Instructions not to answer are limited

• Foreign language/country. See Ariosa v. Isis, IPR2013-00022 (Papers 55, 67)
Motion to Amend

- Petition Filed
- PO Preliminary Response
- Decision on Petition
- PO Response & Motion to Amend Claims
- Petitioner Reply to PO Response & Opposition to Amendment
- PO Reply to Opposition to Amendment
- Oral Hearing
- Final Written Decision

Timeline:
- 3 months
- No more than 3 months
- 3 months
- 3 months
- 1 month
- Hearing Set on Request
- Period for Observations & Motions to Exclude Evidence
- No more than 12 months
Motions to Amend

- Board conference required
- Normally one-for-one claim substitution
- Must narrow scope
- Need to show patentable distinction
- Clearly state the contingency of substitution
- See *Idle Free v. Bergstrom*, IPR2012-00027 (Paper 26)
Motions to Amend

• Unlike during examination, PTAB does not “examine” amended claims during an AIA proceeding
  – No search is conducted
  – No claim rejections made

• Burden is on the movant (i.e., the patent owner) to show the patentable distinction of the proposed amended claim
Oral Hearing

Petition Filed → PO Preliminary Response → Decision on Petition → PO Response & Motion to Amend Claims → Petitioner Reply to PO Response & Opposition to Amendment → PO Reply to Opposition to Amendment → Oral Hearing → Final Written Decision

3 months → No more than 3 months → 3 months → 3 months → 1 month → Hearing Set on Request → Period for Observations & Motions to Exclude Evidence → No more than 12 months
Lessons Learned: Oral Hearing

• Attorneys should bear in mind that:
  – Panel may have more than three judges;
  – Some panel members may participate by video; and
  – All questions from the judges are based on the written record, including arguments made in the parties’ briefs and expert testimony filed in support of the parties’ briefs

• Attorneys should be prepared to answer questions about the entire record, including claim construction, motion to amend, priority, secondary consideration and swearing-behind issues
  – Have sufficient familiarity with the record to answer questions effectively; and
  – Be ready to deviate from a prepared presentation to answer questions
Lessons Learned: Oral Hearing

• Attorneys should focus on the best argument and not try to cover every argument made during the course of the trial

• No new evidence or argument is permitted

• Demonstrative exhibits should serve merely as visual aids
  – Pages of the record, with appropriate highlighting (e.g., highlighted figures), are effective and could be very helpful
  – When referring to slides, identify the number of the slide rather than say “this slide” or “next slide”
Settlements* (As of 5/1/2014)

* Pool is taken from 148 cases that have settled since inception.
## Settlements and Adverse Judgments (As of 5/1/14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Settlements</th>
<th>Adverse Judgments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IPR</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBM</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lessons Learned: Settlement

• Parties may file a joint motion to terminate a proceeding on the basis of settlement
  – Preauthorization is required; and
  – May be filed at any stage of the proceeding, even before institution
    • If the proceeding is terminated before institution, petitioner may file a request for refund of post-institution fee

• Board has discretion to proceed to final written decision, especially at an advanced stage when all briefing is complete

• Board is more likely to grant early motions to terminate
Lessons Learned: Settlement

- When there are multiple petitioners, proceeding may be terminated with respect to one petitioner when that petitioner settles with patent owner.

- Joint motion to terminate must be accompanied by a true copy of the settlement agreement; a redacted version is not permitted.

- Parties may request that the settlement agreement be treated as business confidential information.
  - See § 42.74(c) and FAQ G2.
Inter Partes Review Petitions Terminated to Date (As of 5/1/2014)

7,095 Claims in 205 Petitions

2,874 Claims Challenged (205 Petitions)
4,221 Claims Not Challenged

1,900 Claims Instituted (66% of Claims Challenged) (137 Petitions)
974 Claims Challenged but Not Instituted (34% of Claims Challenged)

467 Claims Found Unpatentable (25% of Claims Instituted, 16% of Claims Challenged) (38 Petitions)
417 Claims Cancelled or Disclaimed (Non-PTAB) (22% of Claims Instituted, 15% of Claims Challenged)

144 Claims Found Patentable by PTAB (8% of Claims Instituted, 5% of Claims Challenged)
872 Claims Remaining Patentable (46% of Claims Instituted, 55% of Claims Challenged)

38 Petitions
Final Written Decisions in IPRs (As of 5/1/2014)

- All Instituted Claims Unpatentable: 26 cases
- Some Instituted Claims Unpatentable: 12 cases
- None of Instituted Claims Unpatentable: 7 cases

*IPR (45 Final Written Decisions)
Final Written Decisions in CBMs (As of 5/1/2014)

*CBM (10 Final Written Decisions)
Final Written Decisions: Basis for Unpatentability (As of 5/1/2014)

* Multiple bases can be reported for a single Final Written Decision
• **ABB Inc. v. Roy-G-Biv Corp.,** IPR 2013-00062 & IPR 2013-00282, Paper 84 (issued 4/11/2014) (petitioner did not meet burden to prove any of the challenged claims unpatentable)

• **ABB Inc. v. Roy-G-Biv Corp.,** IPR 2013-00074 & IPR 2013-00286, Paper 80 (issued 4/11/2014) (petitioner did not meet burden to prove any of the challenged claims unpatentable)

• **Corning, Inc. v. DSM IP Assets B.V.,** IPR2013-00047, Paper 84 (issued 5/1/2014) (petitioner did not meet burden to prove any of the challenged claims unpatentable)

• **Corning, Inc. v. DSM IP Assets B.V.,** IPR2013-00043, Paper 95 (issued 5/1/2014) (petitioner did not meet burden to prove any of the challenged claims unpatentable)

• **Corning, Inc. v. DSM IP Assets B.V.,** IPR2013-00044, Paper 92 (issued 5/1/2014) (petitioner did not meet burden to prove any of the challenged claims unpatentable)
Administrative Patent Judges
Allocation of Judges

* As of April 15, 2014 (183 judges)
Board Hiring

• Goal is to add 52 judges by October

• Opportunities exist at Alexandria and at the Detroit/Denver/Dallas/Silicon Valley Satellite Offices

• Current job posting on USAJOBS
  – https://www.usajobs.gov/GetJob/ViewDetails/367273800
PTAB Website Tour
PTAB Website: From USPTO Home Page
PTAB Website: Trials Page

PATS refreshing background for the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

PTAB Website: Trials Page

Trials (PTAB)

This page includes information about proceedings conducted by the Patent Trial and Appeal Board, including inter partes review, post-grant review, the transitional post-grant review for covered business method patents, derivations, and interferences.

- Patent Review Processing System (PRPS)
- Frequently Asked Questions
- Suggestion Box
- Board Trial Rules
- Board Practice Guide [PDF]
- Representative Orders, Decisions, and Notices
- Interferences
The following policies, procedures, rules, guides, tools and manuals are associated with proceedings before the Patent Trial and Appeal Board.

- Board-related Official Gazette Notices
- Board Rules for Ex Parte Appeals [effective Jan. 23, 2012]
- Board Trial Rules
- Board Practice Guide [PDF]
- Standard Operating Procedures
- Satellite Offices
- Patent Review Processing System (PRPS)
- Interferences

Other Resources
- U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit
- USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct
- Title 35 of the United States Code
Help (PTAB)

This page contains answers to frequently asked questions and other useful information about the Patent Trial and Appeal Board.

- Frequently Asked Questions
- Contact Information
- Mailing Addresses
- Directions

Feedback and Suggestion Boxes

- PTAB Trial Suggestions for AIA proceedings
- Patent Review Processing System (PRPS) Suggestions
PTAB Subscription Center
Welcome to the USPTO Subscription Center. Sign up here to receive the latest news and updates from the USPTO conveniently via e-mail.

Subscribe to one or more news updates by entering your e-mail address.

E-mail

Confirm your e-mail address

Preferred format for e-mails:

☐ Text
☐ HTML

Please select the newsletters or updates you would like to receive:

☐ America Invents Act Alerts
  The USPTO’s America Invents Act website will contain the latest news and information regarding the agency’s implementation of the new law. Subscribe to America Invents Act Alerts to receive notifications when the website is updated.

☐ USPTO Press Releases
  Announcements of USPTO initiatives, programs, and policies—the same announcements that are provided to the media. Members of the media can receive announcements immediately upon release by sending a request to Paul Furt.

☐ USPTO Director’s Forum Blog
  A weekly interactive blog by USPTO’s leadership discussing the latest topics of interest to the USPTO and the intellectual property community.

☐ USPTO Monthly Review
  A monthly at-a-glance summary of new initiatives, events and significant media coverage during the previous month.

☐ FYI
  Timely updates on happenings and news of interest to a broad audience of the USPTO.

☐ Inventors Eye
  Inventors Eye is for and about America’s independent and small entity inventor community. Inventors Eye comes out every other month. Each issue will feature information you can use, tips on working with the USPTO, events, and your who have become successful inventors.

☐ Patents Alerts
  Receive notices and announcements on patents, patent applications, patent filings, and other patent information.

☐ Trademarks Alerts
  Receive updates and announcements on trademark system changes, events, and roundtables, rules changes, and other Trademarks Operation matters.

☐ Copyright Alerts
  Your source for USPTO news related to the Copyright Green Paper. Get the latest alerts on events and announcements about upcoming conferences, roundtables, and filing of public comments.

☐ Patent Appeals and Trials
  Receive notices and announcements on Patent Trial and Appeal Board operations, AIA trials (inter partes review, post-grant review, covered business method review, and derivations), ex parte appeals, and stakeholder meetings.

Subscribe to the selections
Thank You
Mock Conference Call
Motion to Amend: Fact Pattern

- IPR instituted against claims 1-5
  - Claims 1, 4, and 5 are independent
  - Claims 2 and 3 depend from claim 1

- **Before** telephone conference, Patent Owner contemplates filing a motion to amend that will:
  - Replace claim 1 with substitute claim 1;
  - Replace claim 4 with substitute claims 6-10; and
  - Cancel claim 5
Motion to Amend: Fact Pattern

• After teleconference, Patent Owner intends to file a motion to amend that will:
  – Replace claim 1 with substitute claim 6;
  – Replace claim 4 with substitute claim 7; and
  – Cancel claim 5
Lessons Learned: Motion to Amend

• Motion to amend may request cancellation or substitution of an original claim
  – Wholesale addition of new claims generally is not allowed

• A substitute claim generally should contain all of the limitations of the original claim that it replaces

• A substitute claim should add one or more features that respond to the grounds of unpatentability at issue in the trial

• Each original claim that changes in scope as a result of the amendment should be presented as a substitute claim with a unique claim number
  – Applies to claims that change in scope only by virtue of their dependence on a substitute claim too
Motion to Amend: Lessons Learned

- AIA trial is not a patent examination
  - Board does not conduct a prior art search or enter rejections

- If a motion to amend is granted, the substitute claim is added to an issued patent without any Office search or examination

- Patent Owner “moves” to amend; no amendment of right

- As the party requesting relief, Patent Owner bears the burden of establishing the patentability of proposed substitute claims

- In general, the Board takes up a motion to amend only if the original claim is cancelled or found unpatentable, so no gloss of patentability transfers from original claim to substitute claim
Lessons Learned: Motion to Amend

• An inventory that catalogues the individual disclosures of each prior art reference may not be helpful or the best use of the 15 pages allowed for motions

• Provide a narrative that explains what the Patent Owner knows about the state of the prior art as it relates to the feature added by amendment
  – Focus on why adding that feature to the combined elements of the original claim would not have been obvious

• Patent Owner may support that narrative with an expert declaration, citations to textbooks, or evidence of conventional practices relevant to the added feature
Motion to Amend: Some Interesting Cases


- *Corning Gilbert, Inc. v. PPC Broadband, Inc.*, IPR2013-00347, Paper 20 (discussing the burden regarding the state of the prior art and level of ordinary skill in the art with respect to features added by amendment).


- *Nichia Corp. v. Emcore Corp.*, IPR2012-00005, Paper 27 (motion to amend should adequately establish written description support for substitute claims based on the original disclosure of the application).
• **Before** the telephone conference call, Patent Owner seeks pre-authorization to file a motion for additional discovery requesting 2 categories of documents:

1. All sales and pricing documents relating to Petitioner’s products that are at issue in a district court infringement action; and

2. All documents regarding the relationship between Petitioner and two non-parties:
   – Acme = Petitioner’s customer; and
   – Universal = a company recently acquired by Petitioner
Motion for Additional Discovery: Fact Pattern

After the telephone conference, the Board authorizes Patent Owner to file a motion for additional discovery directed to the following documents:

1. A summary document that reflects sales and pricing data for the products manufactured by Petitioner that are accused of infringement in district court. Counsel for Petitioner admitted that a summary document already exists, so compiling a summary is not required; and

2. A customer sales agreement between Acme and Petitioner, as well as an acquisition agreement between Universal and Petitioner. Counsel for Petitioner admitted that these documents exist and are easily accessible.
Lessons Learned: Motion for Additional Discovery

• The discovery permitted in an AIA trial is more limited than the discovery available in a district court.

• Party seeking discovery that exceeds the scope of routine discovery must ask the Board for authorization to file a motion for additional discovery.

• Motion must show that a grant of the additional discovery will serve the interests of justice (for an IPR) or is supported by good cause (for a CBM or PGR).
Lessons Learned: Motion for Additional Discovery

- Motion must do more than target information that is likely to be useful. Motion must show that the requested documents likely exist and will be useful in making out an element of the requesting party’s case.

- Requests seeking “any” or “all” documents in a broad category may be viewed as speculative.

- Board will consider whether the discovery request would unduly burden the producing party or can be obtained from other sources, such as the Internet.

- Expect the Board to encourage reasonable compromise.
Motion for Additional Discovery:
Some Interesting Cases

• *Garmin Int’l v. Cuozzo Speed Techs.*, IPR2012-00001, Paper 26 (enumerating the “Garmin factors”)

• *Corning, Inc. v. DSM IP Assets B.V.*, IPR2013-00043, Paper 27 (granting additional discovery request for laboratory notebooks)

• *RPX Corp. v. Virnetx Inc.*, IPR2014-00171, Paper 25 (granting additional discovery regarding real-party-in-interest and privity issues after identifying a limited set of relevant documents)

• *Apple Inc. v. Achates Ref. Publ., Inc.*, IPR2013-00080, Paper 66 (granting additional discovery of email communications exchanged directly between patent owner’s two experts)
Thank You
Break
Fact Pattern: Patents

- Patent Owner is assigned two patents:
  - ‘001 Patent
    - has 100 claims; and
    - was issued in 2000
  - ‘002 Patent
    - has 5 claims;
    - was issued in 2014; and
    - and is subject to the first-inventor-to-file provisions of the America Invents Act
Fact Pattern: District Court Litigation

• Patent Owner has sued Petitioner for infringement of certain claims in the ‘001 Patent in District Court

• Patent Owner is considering suing the Petitioner for infringement of certain claims in the ‘002 Patent in District Court too
Fact Pattern: AIA Trial

• Petitioner wants to file one or more AIA trial proceedings against the ‘001 Patent and the ‘002 Patent because it believes:

  – certain claims in the ‘001 Patent are anticipated and obvious as well as unpatentable under § 101 and § 112; and
  
  – certain claims of the '002 Patent are obvious
Trial Proceeding Timeline

- Petition Filed
- PO Preliminary Response
- Decision on Petition
- PO Response & Motion to Amend Claims
- Petitioner Reply to PO Response & Opposition to Amendment
- PO Reply to Opposition to Amendment
- Oral Hearing
- Final Written Decision

- 3 months
- No more than 3 months
- 3 months
- 3 months
- 1 month
- Hearing Set on Request
- PO Discovery Period
- Petitioner Discovery Period
- PO Discovery Period
- Period for Observations & Motions to Exclude Evidence

No more than 12 months
Thank You
Closing Remarks
PTAB Website: From USPTO Home Page
Welcome to the USPTO Subscription Center. Sign up here to receive the latest news and updates from the USPTO conveniently via e-mail.

Subscribe to one or more news updates by entering your e-mail address.

E-mail: 

Confirm your e-mail address: 

Preferred format for e-mails: 
- Text
- HTML

Please select the newsletters or updates you would like to receive:

- **America Invents Act Alerts**
  The USPTO's America Invents Act website will contain the latest news and information regarding the agency's implementation of the new law. Subscribe to America Invents Act Alerts to receive notifications when the website is updated.

- **USPTO Press Releases**
  Announcements of USPTO initiatives, programs and policies—only announcements that are provided to the media. Members of the media can receive announcements immediately upon release by sending a request to Paul Pettit.

- **USPTO Director's Forum Blog**
  A weekly interactive blog by USPTO's leadership discussing the latest topics of interest to the USPTO and the intellectual property community.

- **USPTO Monthly Review**
  A monthly at-a-glance summary of new initiatives, events and significant media coverage during the previous month.

- **FYI**
  Timely updates on happenings and news of interest to a broad audience of the USPTO.

- **Inventors' Eye**
  Inventors' Eye is for and about America's independent and small entity inventor community. Inventors' Eye comes out every other month. Each issue will feature information you can use, tips on working with the USPTO, events organized by you who have become successful Inventors.

- **Patents Alerts**

- **Trademarks Alerts**
  Receive updates and announcements on upcoming Trademark system changes, events and roundtables, rules changes, and other Trademarks Operation matters.

- **Copyright Alerts**
  Your source for USPTO news related to the Copyright Green Paper. Get the latest alerts on events and announcements about upcoming conferences, roundtables, and filing of public comments.

- **Patent Appeals and Trials**
  Receive notices and announcements on Patent Trial and Appeal Board operations, AIA trials (Inter partes review, post grant review, covered business method review, and derivations), ex parte appeals, and stakeholder meetings.

[Subscribe to the selections]
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