UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
_____

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD
_____

HEWLETT-PACKARD ENTERPRISE CO.; HP ENTERPRISE
SERVICES LLC; and TERADATA OPERATIONS, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

REALTIME DATA LLC,
Patent Owner.
_____

Case IPR2016-00783
Patent 6,597,812 B1
_____

Record of Oral Hearing
Held: June 30, 2017
_____

BEFORE: GEORGIANNA W. BRADEN, J. JOHN LEE, and
JASON J. CHUNG, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

APPEARANCES:

ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER:
> J. CHRISTOPHER CARRAWAY, ESQUIRE
> Klarquist Sparkman, LLP
> One World Trade Center
> 121 SW Salmon Street, Suite 1600
> Portland, Oregon 97204

> and

> JAMIE R. LYNN, ESQUIRE
> Baker Botts, LLP
> 1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
> Washington, D.C. 20004

ON BEHALF OF PATENT OWNER:
> KAYVAN B. NOROOZI, ESQUIRE
> WILLIAM P. ROTHWELL, ESQUIRE
> Noroozi, P.C.
> 1299 Ocean Avenue, Suite 450
> Santa Monica, California 90401

The above-entitled matter came on for hearing on Friday, June 30, 2017, commencing at 1:01 p.m., at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, 600 Dulany Street, Alexandria, Virginia.

1   P R O C E E D I N G S

2   -   -   -   -   -

3   JUDGE CHUNG: This is the hearing for case

4   IPR2016-00783 pertaining to the U.S. patent number 6,597,812.

5   With me on the panel are Judge Georgianna Braden, who is

6   sitting remote, and Judge John Lee, and myself, Jason Chung.

7   Who do we have for petitioner?

8   MR. CARRAWAY: Petitioner, Your Honor, we have

9   lead counsel, Jamie Lynne, and I am backup counsel, Chris

10   Carraway.

11   JUDGE CHUNG: Who do we have for patent owner?

12   MR. NOROOZI: We have lead counsel, Mr. William

13   Rothwell, and myself, Kayvan Noroozi.

14   JUDGE CHUNG: Each side will have 30 minutes to

15   present their argument. Petitioner will go first. Petitioner may

16   reserve part of that 30 minutes as rebuttal time. Would petitioner

17   like to reserve any of that rebuttal time at this moment?

18   MR. CARRAWAY: Yes, Your Honor, seven minutes,

19   please.

20   JUDGE CHUNG: And the panel would like to remind

21   the parties respectfully to speak into the microphone clearly

22   because one of the judges is remote, and also identify the slide

23   number when referring to -- when the slide is in the presentation

24   so that our remote judge can follow along to the conversation.

25   At this moment, the petitioner may begin.

1   MR. CARRAWAY: May it please the Board, I am

2   again Chris Carraway, counsel for the three petitioners,

3   Hewlett-Packard Enterprise, Hewlett-Packard Enterprise

4   Services, and Teradata. On slide 2, we have the grounds raised

5   by this petition and on which the Board has instituted the IPR for

6   the '812 patent. Ground 1 addresses method claims 1 to 4 and 8

7   and system claim 28 using O'Brien and Nelson. Ground 2

8   addresses claims 14 to 17 and 21, which are CRM claims for

9   software that performs the same steps as method claims 1 to 4

10   and 8.

11   The addition of the Welch prior art for ground 2 is

12   because O'Brien uses hardware circuitry to perform its

13   compression method, and Welch shows that this type of

14   compression can be implemented on either hardware or software.

15   Because these two software claims track the method claims, most

16   of the disputes for ground 2 are going to be the same as ground 1.

17   We'll move to slide 5, please. On slide 5, I want to start

18   by just quickly doing an overview of the '812 patent and the

19   O'Brien patent, which is the primary prior art reference at issue.

20   The '812 patent is directed to a combination of two compression

21   techniques, run length encoding and dictionary encoding. Run

22   length encoding and codes are a run of characters like five As in a

23   row. Dictionary compression instead maps characters and strings

24   to an index or code in the dictionary. Now, the '812 patent admits

25   that both of these compression techniques were old and then

1   purports to try to claim the combination, but the combination was

2   old as well. That is shown by the O'Brien patent.

3   Slide 5 shows overview diagrams for these two patents

4   in both. An input is monitored by a run length encoder which is

5   shaded orange on slide 5. Both of these look for runs of a certain

6   number of characters. In O'Brien it's three. And in both if such a

7   run is encountered, it is encoded using three components, a code

8   telling the character that is being repeated, a code indicating that

9   the -- telling the decoder that what is coming is going to be a run

10 length and should be treated that way, and three, the number of

11 times to repeat. And then in both --

12   JUDGE CHUNG: Excuse me. Can we spend some

13 time on the second thing that you discussed, the code telling the

14 run length that a run length is approaching. Would you be able to

15 point to me in your petition where you map reference value to the

16 control code word and how reference value indicates that a run is

17 approaching. Reference value from Table 8 that is the O'Brien

18 reference.

19   MR. CARRAWAY: Yes, Your Honor. I'm pulling up

20 Exhibit 1005, which is the first Creusere declaration filed with

21 our petition. Your Honor, this is page 51, paragraph 80 of

22 Dr. Creusere's declaration. In it Dr. Creusere explains how

23 O'Brien's compression system encodes a run length by three

24 things: A reference value that represents the character being

25 repeated, a run length reference value selected from table A

DOCKET ALARM

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.

fastcase®
Smarter legal research.