Trials @uspto.gov Paper 62 Tel: 571-272-7822 Entered: May 9, 2014

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

\_\_\_\_\_

### BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

GNOSIS S.p.A., GNOSIS BIORESEARCH S.A. and GNOSIS U.S.A., INC., Petitioners,

v.

# SOUTH ALABAMA MEDICAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION and MERCK & CIE, Patent Owners.

Case IPR2013-00116 (Patent 5,997,915)

Case IPR2013-00117 (Patent 6,011,040)

Case IPR2013-00118 (Patent 6,673,381)

Case IPR2013-00119 (Patent 7,172,778)

### RECORD OF ORAL HEARING

Before: JACQUELINE WRIGHT BONILLA, SCOTT E. KAMHOLZ, and SHERIDAN K. SNEDDEN, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

#### **APPEARANCES:**

ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER:

JOSEPH E. CWIK, ESQ. Husch Blackwell 120 South Riverside Plaza, Suite 2200 Chicago, Illinois 60606

and



1	JONATHAN J. KRIT, ESQ.
2	Amin Talati LLC
3	55 West Monroe Street, Suite 3400
4	Chicago, Illinois 60603
5 6	ON BEHALF OF PATENT OWNER:
7	THOMAS J. PARKER, ESQ.
8	ANDREW STERLING, ESQ.
9	JITENDRA "JITTY" MALIK, ESQ.
10	Alston & Bird, LLP
11	90 Park Avenue
12	New York, New York 10016
13	
14 15	The above entitled matter same on for hearing on Thursday
16	The above-entitled matter came on for hearing on Thursday, March 20, 2014, commencing at 10:02 a.m., at the U.S. Patent and
17	Trademark Office, 600 Dulany Street, Alexandria, Virginia.
18	
19	
20	
21	PROCEEDINGS
22	
23	JUDGE KAMHOLZ: Good morning. We will hear
24	argument this morning in Case Numbers IPR2013-00116, 118, 119,
25	Gnosis versus South Alabama Medical Science Foundation. We will
26	hear argument this afternoon for Case Number IPR2013-00117, Gnosis
27	versus Merck. Counsels for the parties please introduce yourself,
28	starting with petitioner?
29	MR. CWIK: Yes, Your Honor. My name is Joe Cwik, and
30	I'm here on behalf of petitioners. With me is my co-counsel Jonathan
31	Krit. Jonathan Krit has been designated lead counsel as of record.
32	JUDGE KAMHOLZ: Good morning.



1	MR. PARKER: Good morning, Your Honors. My name is
2	Thomas Parker. I'll be speaking on behalf of the University of South
3	Alabama, and with me is my associate colleague, Andrew Sterling, who
4	will be assisting with the presentation.
5	JUDGE KAMHOLZ: Who is here for Merck?
6	MR. PARKER: I'll also be here for Merck as well for the
7	afternoon session, and with that, Your Honor, I just wanted to raise one
8	housekeeping item, and I spoke with counsel as well. Can we have one
9	single transcript and possibly captioned with all four IPRs? Because
10	what that will do is in the afternoon, we may be referring back to
11	statements that were made in the morning session, and we can just
12	simply refer back to the morning session, and if we have it in the same
13	transcript, it may be a bit more clearer to do that as oppose to two
14	certain transcripts, if that's okay with the panel.
15	JUDGE SNEDDEN: Is that acceptable to you?
16	MR. CWIK: Your Honor, that's fine, if we have one
17	transcript. I think that will eliminate some duplication when we're
18	talking in the afternoon. I mean, I think it would not be proper to use
19	the afternoon session to make arguments about the morning patents. I
20	don't think that's the intent of it, but I think a single transcript is
21	acceptable to us.
22	JUDGE KAMHOLZ: Well, to the extent that you've briefed
23	it, any arguments you make at any time in any session are applicable to
24	all cases, but where argument is focused on one case or fewer than all
25	cases, it will perhaps help if you indicate that when making argument.



1	With that in mind, I think that's fine with us to have a single
2	transcript.
3	MR. PARKER: Thank you.
4	MR. CWIK: Thank you, Your Honor.
5	JUDGE KAMHOLZ: Thank you. Per our order dated
6	March 7, 2014, each side will have a total of two hours to argue, one
7	hour in the morning, one hour in the afternoon. The petitioner will go
8	first for each session and should begin by indicating how much time, if
9	any, will be reserved for rebuttal. I'll remind the parties that the
10	petitioner bears the burden of proving any proposition of
11	unpatentability by a preponderance of the evidence.
12	Although motions to seal have been granted and others are
13	pending in these cases, this hearing is public. The final reminder, when
14	referring to demonstratives, please mention the slide number you are
15	referring to so that it's clear in the record.
16	Are there any questions?
17	MR. PARKER: No, Your Honors.
18	MR. CWIK: Your Honor, regarding the slides, I do have
19	hard copies for the judges, if they want them at this time.
20	JUDGE KAMHOLZ: Yes, please.
21	MR. CWIK: May I approach the Bench?
22	JUDGE KAMHOLZ: Of course.
23	MR. PARKER: Your Honors, may I approach the Bench,
24	please? Would you like your copies as well?
25	JUDGE KAMHOLZ: Yes, please.



1	MR. PARKER: Your Honors, we only made one copy to
2	cover all three of the IPRs relating to I'll refer to the same set of
3	patents if that's okay.
4	JUDGE KAMHOLZ: Parties, are there any particular set of
5	slides we should we referring to?
6	MR. CWIK: Your Honor, I expect I will primarily be
7	relying on the 116 case, the '915 patent case. The slides are very
8	similar for most of the slides, except for some of the claim charts in the
9	beginning of the slide, and if we get that far I'm not sure we will get
10	that far, but if we do, I'll make that indication. I'll even have to change
11	the slides on the computer.
12	So if we can start with the '915 in the 116 case is the one I
13	plan on starting with.
14	JUDGE KAMHOLZ: You may begin when ready.
15	MR. CWIK: Good morning, Your Honors. My name is Joe
16	Cwik, and for the record I'm here on behalf of the petitioners. Your
17	Honors, I would like to give you a brief outline of what petitioners plan
18	on doing with their oral argument today. I am going to start with 20
19	minutes to discuss our prima facie case with respect to the '915, the
20	'381, '778 patents. The parties have collectively called those patents the
21	Bailey patents.
22	Patent owners will then have their one hour of response time
23	and petitioners will reserve 40 minutes for rebuttal, and the reason we
24	broke out the time that way is, as you can see in the briefing so far,



# DOCKET

# Explore Litigation Insights



Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

# **Real-Time Litigation Alerts**



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time** alerts and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

## **Advanced Docket Research**



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

## **Analytics At Your Fingertips**



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

### API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

#### **LAW FIRMS**

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

#### **FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS**

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

## **E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS**

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.

