

EXHIBIT 1

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION

TOUCHSTREAM TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,) (
PLAINTIFF,) (CIVIL ACTION NO.
VS.) (2:23-CV-59-JRG-RSP
CHARTER COMMUNICATIONS, INC.,) (
ET AL.,) (MARSHALL, TEXAS
DEFENDANTS.) (DECEMBER 19, 2024
9:01 A.M.

PRETRIAL HEARING
BEFORE THE HONORABLE ROY S. PAYNE
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

FOR THE PLAINTIFF: Mr. Mark D. Schafer
Mr. Ryan D. Dykal
Mr. Jordan T. Bergsten
Ms. Anita Liu
Boies Schiller Flexner LLP
1401 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005

Mr. Philip Eckert
Shook, Hardy & Bacon LLP
2555 Grand Boulevard
Kansas City, MO 64108

Mr. John Michael Lyons
Boies Schiller Flexner LLP
55 Hudson Yards
New York, NY 10001

Mr. Tom Gorham
Gillam & Smith LLP
102 N. College
Suite 800
Tyler, TX 75702

01:48:25 1 significant differences between the applications, and the
01:48:28 2 fact witnesses confirmed as much.

01:48:30 3 So there's nothing in the record to suggest that
01:48:33 4 the X1 Remote app is relevant.

01:48:37 5 THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Ms. Farber.

01:48:40 6 I'll deny Motion in Limine No. 2.

01:48:42 7 That takes us to No. 3.

01:48:55 8 MR. SAUNDERS: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Tom
01:48:58 9 Saunders for Comcast.

01:48:58 10 So Motion in Limine No. 3 goes to the issue of
01:49:01 11 testimony, evidence, and argument regarding alleged
01:49:04 12 willfulness before the damages period. And willfulness can
01:49:09 13 only be relevant to the issue of enhanced damages under
01:49:13 14 Section 284. And enhancement of damages is only relevant
01:49:18 15 during the damages period when there would be damages to
01:49:21 16 enhance.

01:49:22 17 THE COURT: What I see as the central issue on
01:49:24 18 this motion is that I don't think the law is that evidence
01:49:34 19 from before the period in suit can't be considered in
01:49:41 20 determining whether the infringement during the relevant
01:49:45 21 period was willful.

01:49:52 22 MR. SAUNDERS: So, Your Honor, it's -- we're not
01:49:53 23 arguing for a per se rule here. We're arguing under Rule
01:49:57 24 403 and that when you have a much later damages period --
01:49:59 25 you know, they want to reach back at least to 2011, six

01:50:03 1 years before the earliest damages period, two years before
01:50:05 2 the issuance of the earliest patent in this suit, and when
01:50:10 3 you have to be measuring culpability as of the relevant
01:50:14 4 period, which for here is going to be the damages period,
01:50:18 5 means the concern is that the jury's attention is going to
01:50:20 6 be focused on the wrong period of time. It's not the
01:50:24 7 operative period it needs to be determining.

01:50:26 8 And we submit, Your Honor, that the prejudice
01:50:28 9 really sort of steps up the further back you go in time and
01:50:32 10 the more attenuated this gets.

01:50:34 11 And so, you know, there's no allegation in that
01:50:39 12 part that there's an accusation of infringement even before
01:50:43 13 this suit is filed. But as we understand their evidence,
01:50:47 14 their communication of the patent number that allegedly
01:50:50 15 occurred here was in 2016.

01:50:53 16 But they also want to bring in a lot of more
01:50:55 17 evidence before that in which no patent number is
01:50:58 18 communicated. They would have very little, if any,
01:51:02 19 probative value in light of that. But it's prejudicial
01:51:06 20 because it's focusing the jury on the wrong time period.

01:51:09 21 And so this problem gets worse the further back
01:51:11 22 you go, the further back you go. And then we have, you
01:51:14 23 know, the period where you have communications with Comcast
01:51:17 24 that are six years before the damages period even began and
01:51:22 25 before there is even a patent. And under those

01:51:26 1 circumstances, it's getting so attenuated. The fact that
01:51:30 2 there may be a pending patent doesn't tell you if one's
01:51:33 3 going to issue. It doesn't tell you what the claims are
01:51:35 4 going to be. And so in those circumstances, the balance
01:51:39 5 should be struck in favor of excluding that evidence.

01:51:42 6 And the final thing I'll say is this does also --
01:51:46 7 part of our concern here ties in with an instructional
01:51:48 8 issue which is that Touchstream is resisting any
01:51:53 9 instructions that would give the jury the relevant time
01:51:57 10 period for willfulness. They just want to say we're
01:52:03 11 presenting a pre-suit willfulness argument with no starting
01:52:06 12 time period.

01:52:06 13 So part of the concern about the evidentiary mixes
01:52:08 14 in front of the jury also goes to their position on that
01:52:13 15 and whether they're going to essentially be arguing
01:52:16 16 willfulness in 2013 when at most they could be arguing
01:52:20 17 earlier evidence with respect to willfulness in a later
01:52:24 18 time period, because only that later willfulness would be
01:52:30 19 relevant.

01:52:30 20 THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Saunders.

01:52:41 21 MR. SCHAFER: Mark Schafer for Touchstream.

01:52:42 22 So as a threshold issue, Comcast did not move for
01:52:47 23 summary judgment of no willfulness. So that is -- that is
01:52:49 24 an issue that's in the case.

01:52:51 25 Touchstream is prepared to offer evidence that

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.