

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

GOOGLE, INC.  
Petitioner,

v.

MAKOR ISSUES & RIGHTS, LTD  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2017-00815 (Patent 6,480,783 B1)  
Case IPR2017-00816 (Patent 6,480,783 B1)  
Case IPR2017-00817 (Patent 6,480,783 B1)  
Case IPR2017-00818 (Patent 6,615,130 B2)

---

Record of Oral Hearing  
Held: May 3, 2018

---

Before Hyun J. Jung, Beverly M. Bunting, and Robert L. Kinder,  
*Administrative Patent Judges.*

Case IPR2017-00815 (Patent 6,480,783 B1)  
Case IPR2017-00816 (Patent 6,480,783 B1)  
Case IPR2017-00817 (Patent 6,480,783 B1)  
Case IPR2017-00818 (Patent 6,615,130 B2)

APPEARANCES:

ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER:

MICHAEL BERTA, ESQUIRE  
Arnold & Porter  
Three Embarcadero Center  
10th Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
Michael\_Berta@arnoldporter.com

RICH BIENIUS, ESQUIRE  
MICHAEL HAWKINS, ESQUIRE  
Fish & Richardson  
3200 RBC Plaza  
60 South 6th Street  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
bisenius@fr.com

ON BEHALF OF THE PATENT OWNER:

ARI JAFFESS, ESQUIRE  
RONALD ABRAMSON, ESQUIRE  
Lewis Baach Kaufmann Middlemiss, PLLC  
The Chrysler Building  
405 Lexington Avenue  
4th Floor  
New York, NY 10174  
Ari.jaffess@lbkmlaw.com

The above-entitled matter came on for hearing Thursday, May 3, 2018, commencing at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, 600 Dulany Street, Alexandria, Virginia.

Case IPR2017-00815 (Patent 6,480,783 B1)  
Case IPR2017-00816 (Patent 6,480,783 B1)  
Case IPR2017-00817 (Patent 6,480,783 B1)  
Case IPR2017-00818 (Patent 6,615,130 B2)

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 - - - - -

3 JUDGE KINDER: -- Good morning everyone. I'm Judge Kinder and  
4 with me remotely today are Judge Jung and Judge Bunting and they're both  
5 appearing remotely as you can see on your monitors. We're calling today  
6 case Google, LLC versus Maker Issues & Rights Limited, Patent Owner.  
7 We have four proceedings today. We have IPR 2017-00815, 816 and 817  
8 involving Patent 6,480,783 and then the fourth proceeding is IPR 2017-  
9 00818 involving Patent 6,615,130.

10 Before we begin today, I want to get a roll call of who will be  
11 representing each party. For the Petitioner, Google, could you stand please?

12 MR. HAWKINS: Good morning, Your Honors. My name is Michael  
13 Hawkins from Fish & Richardson, lead Counsel for Google, LLC. With me  
14 today is my associate, Rich Bisenius, who will be speaking, and also  
15 Michael Berta, who will be also speaking.

16 JUDGE KINDER: All right. Thank you.

17 For the Patent Owner, Maker, could you please rise and give an  
18 appearance?

19 MR. JAFFESS: Good morning, Your Honors. My name is Ari  
20 Jaffess from the firm of Lewis, Baach, Kaufmann Middlemiss representing  
21 the Patent Owner, Makor Issues & Rights Limited and with me today is Ron  
22 Abramson from my firm.

23 JUDGE KINDER: Thank you.

24 So as we stated in our hearing order, each party today will get 60  
25 minutes to present its arguments and I've marked that time on the wall and

Case IPR2017-00815 (Patent 6,480,783 B1)  
Case IPR2017-00816 (Patent 6,480,783 B1)  
Case IPR2017-00817 (Patent 6,480,783 B1)  
Case IPR2017-00818 (Patent 6,615,130 B2)

1 I'll keep my fellow judges up to speed on that countdown. Petitioner bears  
2 the ultimate burden of proof that the claims at issue in these proceedings are  
3 unpatentable. Therefore, the Petitioner will go first to present its case with  
4 regards to the challenged claims. Petitioner may reserve rebuttal time.

5 If you could rise and just let me know what rebuttal time you want  
6 today.

7 MR. BIENIUS: We would like to reserve 20 minutes rebuttal time.

8 JUDGE KINDER: Twenty minutes? All right.

9 I have a couple more things. The Patent Owner will argue its  
10 opposition to the Petitioner's case after that and currently right now we don't  
11 see a need for rebuttal time. If that changes, we might ask you a couple  
12 questions on -- but as it stands right now, you will not have any rebuttal  
13 time. Again, to remind you, no new evidence or argument should be  
14 presented during oral hearing.

15 Because we have four proceedings today, if you're referring to issues  
16 that involve only one proceeding, please identify that proceeding by the IPR  
17 number so we can keep a clean record. Some issues overlap, as you know,  
18 but there are a few that are specific to a given proceeding. So if we could  
19 identify that proceeding, it would be helpful when we go back into the  
20 record and review it. And also, because we have remote Counsel, please be  
21 very clear if you put something on your ELMO, what you're referring to by  
22 exhibit number and page number. All right. At this time, if there are no  
23 other questions I will go ahead and turn it over to Petitioner.

24 MR. BIENIUS: Good morning, Yours Honors. I'm going to  
25 address a few issues related specifically to the IPR 2017-00815 proceeding,

Case IPR2017-00815 (Patent 6,480,783 B1)  
Case IPR2017-00816 (Patent 6,480,783 B1)  
Case IPR2017-00817 (Patent 6,480,783 B1)  
Case IPR2017-00818 (Patent 6,615,130 B2)

1 then my colleague, Mr. Berta, is going to address some issues that are  
2 global, to all four proceedings, and additional issues that are specific to the  
3 817 proceeding.

4 With respect to the 815 proceeding, I'd like to talk about the recitation  
5 of predicted road section coefficients in Claim 1 of the '783 patent.  
6 Specifically, in the petition at page 7, Petitioner laid out construction for the  
7 term "road section coefficients" specifying that "road section coefficients are  
8 coefficients associated with road sections in a route search." This  
9 construction was not dispute by Patent Owner.

10 JUDGE KINDER: Do we offer an interpretation on that in our  
11 decision on institution?

12 MR. BIENIUS: In the institution decision, I believe that the Board,  
13 at the time, found that construction was not necessary.

14 JUDGE KINDER: Okay. Do you think it is necessary to decide this  
15 dispute before us?

16 MR. BIENIUS: I don't believe it's necessary to decide the dispute  
17 here. I just wanted to point out that Patent Owner had not disagreed with  
18 Petitioner's construction of "road section coefficient".

19 JUDGE KINDER: But they seem to take an implied construction  
20 now in their argument. Would you agree with that?

21 MR. BIENIUS: Correct, which they framed as a construction-based  
22 on the term "predicted road section coefficients". So, as you just mentioned,  
23 their implied construction indicated that the term "predicted" requires the  
24 coefficients to be dynamic or variable. Patent Owner provided no intrinsic  
25 evidence for this implied construction, no extrinsic evidence for this implied

# 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.