UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

FITBIT, INC., Petitioner,

v.

ALIPHCOM, INC., d/b/a JAWBONE, Patent Owner.

Case IPR2016-00714

Patent 8,446,275 B2

Record of Oral Hearing Held: June 13, 2017

Before BRYAN F. MOORE, TREVOR M. JEFFERSON, and MIRIAM L. QUINN, *Administrative Patent Judges*.



APPEARANCES:

ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER:

DAVID OKANO, ESQ.
NAVEEN MODI, ESQ.
MICHAEL C. HENDERSHOT, ESQ.
Paul Hastings LLP
1117 South California Avenue
Palo Alto, California 94304

ON BEHALF OF PATENT OWNER:

RICHARD TORCZON, ESQ. WES DERRYBERRY, ESQ. Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati 1700 K Street, NW, Fifth Floor Washington, DC 20006-3817

The above-entitled matter came on for hearing on Tuesday, June 13, 2017, commencing at 10:00 a.m., at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, 600 Dulany Street, Alexandria, Virginia.



1	PROCEEDINGS
2	
3	JUDGE MOORE: Good morning. We are here for the
4	hearing in IPR2016-00714. I am Judge Moore and with me today
5	are Judges Jefferson and, remotely, Judge Quinn.
6	Starting with the Petitioner, who do we have here
7	today?
8	MR. OKANO: David Okano with Paul Hastings for
9	Fitbit, Incorporated.
10	MR. HENDERSHOT: Michael Hendershot of Paul
11	Hastings for Petitioner Fitbit.
12	MR. MODI: Good morning, Your Honors, Naveen
13	Modi on behalf of Fitbit as well.
14	JUDGE MOORE: And for Patent Owner?
15	MR. TORCZON: Richard Torczon for Aliphcom,
16	doing business as Jawbone. With me Wes Derryberry, and
17	shadowing from our office we have Shan Liu.
18	JUDGE MOORE: Thank you.
19	Petitioner has the burden, Petitioner will go first, will
20	have 30 minutes with an opportunity to reserve time for rebuttal,
21	and following your opening presentation, Patent Owner will have
22	30 minutes.
23	Unless there's any questions, Petitioner, you may begin.
24	MR. OKANO: Your Honors, may I approach?
25	JUDGE MOORE: Certainly.



1	MR. OKANO: One quick question before we start.
2	Will there be a timer for me to see my remaining time or is that
3	something I will need to keep track of on my own?
4	JUDGE MOORE: Yeah, I think you need to take care
5	of that. We have something here, but I think the only thing that
6	they can see is the lights.
7	MR. OKANO: Okay.
8	JUDGE MOORE: So, yeah, the best for you is going to
9	be to keep the time yourself. I certainly can
10	MR. OKANO: That's fine, as long as I know.
11	JUDGE MOORE: I certainly can let you know once
12	you tell me how much time you're going to take for your opening
13	I can let you know when you're close.
14	MR. OKANO: I would like to reserve 10 minutes for
15	rebuttal.
16	JUDGE MOORE: Ten minutes.
17	MR. HENDERSHOT: I have a watch, Your Honor,
18	you won't be offended if I pass him a note to let him know the
19	time?
20	JUDGE MOORE: Certainly, you can pass notes.
21	MR. HENDERSHOT: Very much appreciate it.
22	JUDGE MOORE: Sure. And any time you're ready.
23	MR. OKANO: Okay, again, I'm David Okano of Paul
24	Hastings for Fitbit, Incorporated, and the patent we are
25	challenging today issued without the benefit of its claims being



1	properly shaped by a relevant prior art reference. This reference,
2	of course, is Hoffman, which is Exhibit 1003 in the record.
3	Our papers highlight the teachings of this reference,
4	which is assigned to Nike and is entitled an athletic activity user
5	experience and environment. In response, the Patent Owner
6	advances a broadest reasonable interpretation of the phrase
7	"target score" that is inconsistent with the language of the
8	independent claims, inconsistent with the language of the
9	dependent claims, inconsistent with the teachings of the
10	specification, and also inconsistent with an agreed-upon
11	construction in a related proceeding.
12	On the other hand, the Board's preliminary construction
13	of "target score" under its ordinary meaning to encompass a goal
14	is consistent with the intrinsic evidence. That being said, in our
15	papers, we submit that we have shown that even under the
16	affirmative portion of Patent Owner's narrow construction,
17	Hoffman anticipates the relevant challenged claims of the '275
18	patent.
19	So, in my opening time here, I plan to discuss the
20	disputed "target score" term, as that is kind of the center of the
21	parties' dispute, and perhaps provide a more full and accurate
22	characterization of the Hoffman reference than is in Patent
23	Owner's response. And, of course, I'm happy to answer any
24	questions from the panel.



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.

