

1 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

2 \_\_\_\_\_  
3 BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD  
4 \_\_\_\_\_

5 BOYDSTUN EQUIPMENT MANUFACTURING, LLC

6 Petitioner

7 v.

8 COTTRELL, INC.

9 Patent Owner

10 \_\_\_\_\_  
11 IPR2017-00962

12 Patent No. 7,585,140  
13 \_\_\_\_\_

14  
15 VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF GEORGE A. CLARK

16 Portland, Oregon

17 Friday, November 10, 2017  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

23 Reported by:

24 MARLA SHARP, RPR, CCRR, CA CSR 11924, WA CSR 3408

25 Job No: 133120

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

November 10, 2017  
8:47 a.m.

Videotaped deposition of  
GEORGE A. CLARK, held at the offices of  
K&L Gates, One Southwest Columbia  
Street, Suite 1900, Portland, Oregon,  
pursuant to agreement before  
Marla Sharp, a shorthand reporter in  
and for the state of Oregon.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

I N D E X

EXAMINATION	PAGE
GEORGE A. CLARK	
BY MR. AMBORN	6, 103
BY MR. JONCUS	74

PREVIOUSLY MARKED EXHIBITS

EXHIBIT	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
Exhibit 1001	9-8-09 US Patent No. 7,585,140 B1 (15 pages)	24
Exhibit 1002	Declaration of George Clark (17 pages)	74
Exhibit 1003	1-19-06 US Patent Application Publication No. US 2006/0013667 A1 (7 pages)	20
Exhibit 1004	5-24-94 US Patent No. 5,314,275 (15 pages)	20
Exhibit 1005	11-30-04 US Patent No. 6,824,121 B2 (8 pages)	20

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

A P P E A R A N C E S:

JONCUS LAW

Attorneys for Petitioner

P.O. Box 838

Clackamas, OR 97015

BY: STEPHEN JONCUS, ESQ.

PERKINS COIE

Attorneys for Patent Owner

1201 Third Avenue

Seattle, WA 98101

BY: KYLE AMBORN, ESQ.

ALSO PRESENT:

Lani Milton, Videographer

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

PORTLAND, OREGON

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 10, 2017

8:47 A.M.

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are now on the  
record. The time is 8:47. Today's date is  
November 10th, 2017.

This is a video-recorded deposition of  
George Clark in the matter of Boydston Equipment  
Manufacturing LLC versus Cottrell Inc. in the United  
States Patent and Trademark Office before the Patent  
Trial and Appeal Board. The case number is  
IPR2017-00962. The US Patent No. is 7,585,140.

This deposition is being held at K&L Gates  
at One Southwest Columbia Street, Suite 1900, in  
Portland, Oregon.

My name is Lani Milton. I am the legal  
video specialist with TSG Reporting. Our court  
reporter is Marla Sharp in association with  
TSG Reporting.

Counsel, can you please introduce  
yourselves for the record?

MR. AMBORN: I'm Kyle Amborn from Perkins  
Coie. I am counsel on behalf of the patent owner,  
Cottrell Inc.

MR. JONCUS: Stephen Joncus, counsel for

1 Boydston and representing the witness today.  
2 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: And our witness can be  
3 sworn in.

4 GEORGE A. CLARK,  
5 called as a witness, having been duly  
6 sworn by the certified shorthand  
7 reporter, was examined and testified as  
8 follows:

9 EXAMINATION

10 BY MR. AMBORN:

11 Q All right. Good morning, Mr. Clark. As I  
12 mentioned, I'm Kyle Amborn.

13 And would you mind just stating your full  
14 name for the record, please?

15 A Sure. George Clark.

16 Q And do you ever use a middle initial?

17 A A.

18 Q A. Okay. And, Mr. Clark, how many times  
19 have you been deposed before?

20 A This would be the first.

21 Q All right. So, then, let me just go over a  
22 couple of ground rules here.

23 First of all, I assume that you understand  
24 that you are under an obligation that you just took  
25 to tell the truth today in your testimony.

1 A Correct.

2 Q And for -- this process is kind of like a  
3 conversation, but it's a little mechanical since  
4 we've got a video that's here and a court reporter  
5 who's transcribing everything.

6 So if you give me time to finish my  
7 questions and I'll try to do the same for you with  
8 your answers so that we're not speaking at the same  
9 time, that will ensure that the record we create  
10 today will be accurate and understandable.

11 You're not under the influence of anything  
12 today that would prevent you from testifying  
13 completely or accurately, are you?

14 A No, I'm not.

15 Q Okay. And if at any point you feel the  
16 need to take a break, feel free to just let me know.

17 A Okay.

18 Q I'll try to ensure that we take a break  
19 every hour or so. But --

20 A Great.

21 Q -- we can take one earlier or whenever you  
22 need.

23 A Thank you.

24 Q I think that does it for background ground  
25 rules. If at some point you have a question, you

1 can feel free to let me know.

2 So, Mr. Clark, in your declaration I  
3 believe you said that you are being paid by  
4 Boydston.

5 Does that mean you were retained by them?

6 A I'm being paid by the hour for this work.

7 Q Okay. By the party Boydston?

8 A Yes.

9 Q Okay. And are you aware of the district  
10 court action between the two companies here,  
11 Boydston and Cottrell?

12 A You can familiarize me with it.

13 Q Oh, I'm just curious to know if you're  
14 aware of it.

15 A I'm aware of some of it, yes.

16 Q Okay. And are you also working on that  
17 district court action?

18 A I think the answer's no.

19 Q Okay. And in your declaration I think you  
20 said that you were charging a rate of \$185 an hour.

21 A Correct.

22 Q That's correct? Okay.

23 And is that your normal consulting rate?

24 A Yes.

25 Q And do you charge a special rate for

1 testimony like today?

2 A No, we'll -- I do not.

3 Q Okay.

4 A That may change after today.

5 Q All right. I'll try to help ensure this is  
6 as painless as possible.

7 Mr. Clark, do you recall when you were  
8 retained for this case?

9 A The beginning of last year. Might have  
10 been February. Or, sorry, 2017, so same year.

11 Q Okay. So February of this year, 2017?

12 A Correct.

13 Q Mr. Clark, what did you do, just generally  
14 speaking, to prepare for your -- to offer the  
15 declaration that you have in this case?

16 A I read over the patents that are involved  
17 in this case.

18 Q Mm-hmm. Did you do anything else?

19 A No. Primarily, that's it.

20 Q So when you say "the patents involved in  
21 this case," I assume you mean the '140 patent?

22 A Correct.

23 Q And then the three patents, the -- not  
24 patents but the prior art references --

25 A That's correct.

1 Q -- Boice, Cottrell '275, and Ruan?  
 2 A Right.  
 3 Q Did you review anything else?  
 4 A There's another patent, and the inventor's  
 5 name was Boice.  
 6 Q Yes. Boice.  
 7 A Right. That's also in there.  
 8 Q Did you review the file history of the '140  
 9 patent?  
 10 A Yes, I looked it over.  
 11 Q And in this case there are excerpts of that  
 12 file history that are exhibits.  
 13 Did you review the full file history or  
 14 just the parts that are being used as exhibits?  
 15 A Just the parts that are being used as  
 16 exhibits.  
 17 Q Mr. Clark, did you review the parties'  
 18 actual products, by any chance?  
 19 A Yes. Not in -- physically, but, you know,  
 20 online.  
 21 Q Online. Okay. So did you look at the  
 22 website, then?  
 23 A Yes.  
 24 Q Have you reviewed any materials other than  
 25 what's available on their websites?

1 involved in preparing the actual petition for the  
 2 IPR?  
 3 A Yes.  
 4 Q As opposed to your declaration?  
 5 A Oh, no. I'm sorry.  
 6 Q Okay.  
 7 A No. I only prepared my declaration.  
 8 Q I got you. All right.  
 9 So, Mr. Clark, I'd like to ask you just a  
 10 little bit about your background now and your  
 11 qualifications.  
 12 A Okay.  
 13 Q What's your current occupation?  
 14 A I'm an engineering consultant.  
 15 Q Okay. And what type of engineering do you  
 16 consult on?  
 17 A Mechanical.  
 18 Q Any other types of engineering?  
 19 A Nope, just mechanical.  
 20 Q And what is your -- what's your educational  
 21 background? What degrees do you hold?  
 22 A I have a bachelor's and a master's degree  
 23 in mechanical engineering. A bachelor's from  
 24 University of Missouri at Rolla and a master's from  
 25 Purdue.

1 A No. I did see the Boydston invention in  
 2 front of me, the pieces in front of me.  
 3 Q So the Boydston Rapid Ratchet?  
 4 A Correct.  
 5 Q Where did you review that?  
 6 A In Boydston's office.  
 7 Q And, Mr. Clark, just generally speaking,  
 8 about how much time did you spend on this case so  
 9 far, to your recollection?  
 10 A Oh, I think about 50 hours or so.  
 11 Q Okay. And that includes your time  
 12 preparing for this deposition?  
 13 A Correct.  
 14 Q Do you recall roughly how much of that time  
 15 was spent preparing your declaration?  
 16 A I would say a third of that, roughly.  
 17 Q And what would the other two-thirds have  
 18 been spent on?  
 19 A Well, I guess you could say it's all the  
 20 same. Reviewing the patents, getting ready to, you  
 21 know -- some of it is writing the IPR; some of it is  
 22 reviewing the patents in preparation for it. So...  
 23 Q Okay. When you say "writing the IPR," did  
 24 you -- without getting into any conversations about  
 25 strategy or anything along those lines, were you

1 Q Okay. And roughly when did you obtain  
 2 those degrees?  
 3 A 1979 and 1980, respectively.  
 4 Q And have you held any positions, as a  
 5 professional engineer or otherwise, in an  
 6 engineering capacity for companies?  
 7 A Yes.  
 8 Q What are the companies that you've worked  
 9 for in the past?  
 10 A General Motors, the proving grounds in Ann  
 11 Arbor, Michigan. International Harvester outside of  
 12 Chicago.  
 13 THE COURT REPORTER: What was the last one?  
 14 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. International  
 15 Harvester.  
 16 It's funny, these businesses are out of  
 17 business now. That would have been during the early  
 18 '80s.  
 19 RCA Astro, also out of business, where we  
 20 built satellites -- weather and communication  
 21 satellites. Two or three different consulting  
 22 firms. And now working for myself.  
 23 BY MR. AMBORN:  
 24 Q Okay. And now that you're working for  
 25 yourself, do you have a company --

1 A Yes.  
 2 Q -- that you run?  
 3 What is that company?  
 4 A It's called the Mercury Group LLC.  
 5 Q Okay. And is the Mercury Group just you?  
 6 A That's right.  
 7 Q You mentioned that you worked at the  
 8 General Motors proving grounds?  
 9 A Mm-hmm.  
 10 Q What did you do there?  
 11 A My focus was on acoustics at the time,  
 12 which -- so it's trying to measure and mitigate the  
 13 sound that gets transmitted into the car's interior.  
 14 Q Okay. Was that a position -- I mean, was  
 15 General Motors your employer?  
 16 A Yes.  
 17 Q Okay. So, now, Mr. Clark, I'd just like to  
 18 ask you some questions, just generally speaking,  
 19 about the nature of your analysis, how you went  
 20 about forming the opinions that you did.  
 21 A Okay.  
 22 Q So you mentioned that you reviewed the '140  
 23 patent and the prior art references at issue here.  
 24 A Correct.  
 25 Q How -- again, just generally speaking, what

1 BY MR. AMBORN:  
 2 Q Okay. And when you say "what one of skill  
 3 in the art would have thought" --  
 4 A Mm-hmm.  
 5 Q -- again, what is -- from your perspective,  
 6 how do you figure out what one of skill of art would  
 7 have thought --  
 8 A Okay.  
 9 MR. JONCUS: Objection.  
 10 BY MR. AMBORN:  
 11 Q -- in that analysis?  
 12 MR. JONCUS: Objection. Form.  
 13 THE WITNESS: That would be someone  
 14 typically with a bachelor's degree, perhaps a couple  
 15 of years' experience but not much, or the  
 16 equivalent, and made up by years of experience in  
 17 dealing with these sorts of devices -- designing,  
 18 developing these sorts of devices.  
 19 I would look at it from their point of  
 20 view.  
 21 BY MR. AMBORN:  
 22 Q And in this case, how did you go about  
 23 figuring out what such a person's point of view  
 24 would have been?  
 25 A I had a number of those kind of people

1 is your standard for whether something is obvious --  
 2 whether a claimed patent like the '140 is obvious --  
 3 A Okay.  
 4 Q -- in light of prior art?  
 5 A Okay. In --  
 6 MR. JONCUS: Objection. Form.  
 7 BY MR. AMBORN:  
 8 Q Go ahead.  
 9 A I would review it, review the prior art,  
 10 think back in time to what it was at the time -- now  
 11 these things haven't changed much over this time so,  
 12 you know -- but where the state of the art was for  
 13 the development for these types of products at that  
 14 time.  
 15 Q Mm-hmm.  
 16 A And then see if they kind of pass, at first  
 17 blush, a test of obviousness.  
 18 Q And when you say "a test of obviousness,"  
 19 what do you mean by that?  
 20 MR. JONCUS: Objection. Form.  
 21 THE WITNESS: That they are obvious to one  
 22 who's skilled in the art; that is to say that anyone  
 23 who typically would be skilled in the art at the  
 24 time would look at these features and say that,  
 25 "Well, of course, you'd do that."

1 working for me in the past, so I kind of looked at  
 2 it from their point of view.  
 3 Q Okay. And when you say "those kind of  
 4 people," who do you mean?  
 5 A Those people who are skilled in the art.  
 6 These are people with, let's say, a bachelor's  
 7 degree in mechanical engineering and one or two  
 8 years of experience.  
 9 Q Okay. And did you -- you said that you've  
 10 had some of these people work for you in the past?  
 11 A Yes.  
 12 Q Did any of those people work on ratchets?  
 13 A One, yes.  
 14 Q And what kind of ratchet was that?  
 15 A That was a ratchet in a -- it was a medical  
 16 instrument, and it was a grabber -- endoscopic  
 17 grabber used to, you know, grab whatever the doc is  
 18 working on. And the ratchet was meant to hold the  
 19 compression on a member so that he could take his  
 20 hands off, much in the same way that the strap is  
 21 held in tension on the car transport carriers.  
 22 Q Did you work on that --  
 23 A Yes.  
 24 Q -- ratchet as well?  
 25 A Mm-hmm.

# 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.