

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

DRONE TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,	§	
	§	
Plaintiff,	§	Civil Action No. 2:14-cv-00111
	§	
v.	§	Judge Arthur J. Schwab
	§	
PARROT S.A. and PARROT, INC.,	§	ELECTRONICALLY FILED
	§	
Defendants.	§	

**DEFENDANTS PARROT S.A. AND PARROT, INC.’S
NOTICE OF APPEAL UNDER 28 U.S.C. § 1295**

Notice is hereby given that Defendants Parrot S.A. and Parrot, Inc., (collectively, “Defendants”) in the above-named case, appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit from the judgment denying Parrot’s post-trial motions, entered on July 16, 2015 (Doc. No. 436), the final judgment and order entered in this action on June 12, 2015 (Doc. No. 405), and from all orders and rulings merged therein, and all other underlying or related orders, rulings, and findings, including but not limited to:

1. Memorandum Order dated May 19, 2014 (Doc. No. 29), denying Defendants’ Motion to Stay Pending *Inter Partes* Review or Transfer Venue (Doc. No. 17);
2. Text Order dated May 30, 2014, denying Defendants’ Motion to Clarify the Protective Order to Include a Limited Patent Prosecution Bar;
3. Order dated July 1, 2014 (Doc. No. 48), granting Plaintiff’s Motion to Compel Initial Disclosure Documents (Doc. No. 41);
4. Text Order dated July 8, 2014, denying Defendants’ Emergency Motion for Reconsideration of the Court’s July 1, 2014 Order;

5. Text Order dated July 9, 2014, denying Defendants' Motion to Bifurcate Discovery and Trial;
6. Text Order dated July 11, 2014, denying Defendants' Motion to Compel the Deposition of Mr. Bruce Ding;
7. Order dated July 25, 2014 (Doc. No. 63), granting Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Defendants to Obey the Court's July 1, 2014 Order (Doc. No. 61);
8. Order dated August 7, 2014 (Doc. No. 70), denying Defendants' Emergency Motion to Modify the Protective Order (Doc. No. 64);
9. Memorandum Order dated August 14, 2014 (Doc. No. 77), denying Defendants' Emergency Motion for Relief from the Court's Order dated July 25, 2014, or, in the Alternative, for a Stay Pending a Petition for Writ of Mandamus (Doc. No. 74);
10. Order dated August 19, 2014 (Doc. No. 81), Re: granting in part and denying in part Defendants' Motion to Compel the 30(b)(6) Deposition of Drone Technologies, Inc. and the Depositions of Mr. Bruce Ding and Ms. Diane Lee (Doc. No. 72);
11. Order and Memorandum Opinion dated November 3, 2014, striking Defendants' Answer and Counterclaims, entering default judgment against Defendants as to liability, and denying Defendants' Motion for Leave to File First Amended Answer and Counterclaims (Doc. Nos. 106, 107);
12. Memorandum Order dated November 19, 2014 (Doc. No. 125), denying Defendants' Motion to Stay Pending Appeal or, in the Alternative, to Stay Pending *Inter Partes* Review (Doc. No. 112);

13. Order dated December 4, 2014 (Doc. No. 137), denying Defendants' Motion Challenging the Confidentiality Designations of the Depositions of Drone Technologies, Inc., Bruce Ding, and Yu-Tuan "Diane" Lee under Paragraph 5 of the Protective Order (Doc. No. 128);
14. Order dated December 16, 2014 (Doc. No. 145), granting Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Damages Discovery (Doc. No. 138);
15. Order dated January 15, 2015 (Doc. No. 154), granting Plaintiff's Second Motion to Compel Damages Discovery (Doc. Nos. 150, 152);
16. Order dated February 2, 2015 (Doc. No. 164), granting in part Plaintiff's Third Motion to Compel Damages Discovery (Doc. No. 158);
17. Order dated February 5, 2015 (Doc. No. 171), denying Defendants' Objections to the Court's February 2, 2015 Order Requiring Defendants to Produce Documents for *In Camera* Review;
18. Memorandum Order dated March 2, 2015 (Doc. No. 209), denying Defendants' Motion for Leave to File Affirmative Defense to Plaintiff's Damages Claims and Request for Equitable Relief Based upon Unclean Hands (Doc. No. 188);
19. Memorandum Order dated March 24, 2015 (Doc. No. 228), denying Defendants' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment (Doc. No. 210);
20. Memorandum Order dated March 24, 2015 (Doc. No. 229), denying Defendants' Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Standing (Doc. No. 172);
21. Memorandum Order dated April 9, 2015 (Doc. No. 287), granting or granting in part certain of Plaintiff's Motions *in Limine* and denying certain of Defendants' Motions *in Limine* (Doc. Nos. 236, 237, 238, 246, 248, 250, 252, and 256);

22. Order dated April 10, 2015 (Doc. No. 293), denying Defendants' Motion for Leave to File Supplemental Damages Expert Report (Doc. No. 282);
23. Order dated April 20, 2015 (Doc. No. 314), sustaining certain of Plaintiff's Objections to Defendants' Exhibits, and overruling certain of Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Exhibits (Doc. No. 301);
24. Order dated April 21, 2015 ("Preliminary Jury Instructions," Doc. No. 320), overruling certain of Defendants' Objections to Preliminary Jury Instructions (Doc. No. 318);
25. Order dated April 22, 2015 (Doc. No. 333), overruling Defendants' Objections to Jury Verdict Form (Doc. No. 317);
26. Order dated April 22, 2015 (Doc. No. 334), sustaining certain of Plaintiff's Objections to Draft Final Jury Instructions (Doc. No. 315), and overruling certain of Defendants' Objections to Draft Final Jury Instructions (Doc. No. 316), and "Final Jury Instructions Re: Damages" dated April 22, 2015 (Doc. No. 335);
27. Order dated April 22, 2015 (Doc. No. 336), sustaining Plaintiff's Objections and Overruling Defendants' Objections to Designation of Deposition Excerpts (Doc. Nos. 326-329);
28. Text Order dated April 28, 2015 (Doc. No. 351), granting in part and denying in part Plaintiff's Motion for a Curative Instruction;
29. Text Order dated April 30, 2015 (Doc. No. 359), denying Defendants' Motion for Judgment as a Matter of Law;
30. Order and Memorandum Opinion dated June 12, 2015 (Doc. Nos. 403, 404), granting Plaintiff's Motion for Fees under Rule 37, granting in part and denying

in part Plaintiff's Motion for Pre-Judgment Interest, granting in part and denying in part Plaintiff's Renewed Motion for an Exceptional Case Finding and an Award of Attorneys' Fees, and granting Plaintiff's Motion for Post-Judgment Interest.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 27, 2015

/s/ James E. Hopenfeld
James E. Hopenfeld (pro hac vice)

Attorney-in-Charge

CA Bar No. 190268

E-mail: Hopenfeld@oshaliang.com

Tammy J. Terry (pro hac vice)

Texas Bar No. 24045660

E-mail: Terry@oshaliang.com

OSHA LIANG LLP

909 Fannin Street, Suite 3500

Houston, TX 77010-1034

Phone: (713) 228-8600

Fax: (713) 228-8778

Eric G. Soller, Esquire
PA I.D. #65560
EGS@Pietragallo.com
Firm I.D. #834
PIETRAGALLO GORDON ALFANO BOSICK &
RASPANTI, LLP
The Thirty-Eighth Floor
One Oxford Centre
Pittsburgh, PA 15219
Phone: (412) 263-1836
Fax: (412) 263-4242

**COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANTS
PARROT S.A. AND PARROT, INC.**

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.