

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

CAPTIONCALL, LLC and
SORENSEN COMMUNICATIONS, INC.
Petitioner

v.

ULTRATEC, INC.
Patent Owner

Case IPR2015-00636
U.S. Patent 8,917,822 B2

PATENT OWNER ULTRATEC INC.'S NOTICE OF APPEAL

Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office
c/o Office of the General Counsel
Madison Building East, 10B20
600 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314-5793

Patent Owner Ultratec, Inc. hereby gives notice, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 90.2(a), that it is appealing to the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit from the Final Written Decision entered on September 7, 2016 (Paper 97) (“Final Written Decision”) and such other orders and rulings as set forth below.

In accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 90.2(a)(3)(ii), Patent Owner further indicates that the issues on appeal include:

1. Whether the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (“PTAB”) erred in finding that the Petitioner had proved by a preponderance of the evidence that claims 1-7 and 10-29 of U.S. Patent No. 8,917,822 (“‘822 Patent”) are unpatentable as being obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over the *Liebermann* reference (U.S. Patent No. 5,982,853), the *Engelke ‘405* reference (U.S. Patent No. 5,724,405), and the *Mukherji* reference (U.S. Patent No. 7,117,152 B1).
2. Whether the PTAB erred in finding that the Petitioner had proved by a preponderance of the evidence that claims 2, 8-10, 13, and 14 of ‘822 Patent are unpatentable as being obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over the *Liebermann* reference, the *Engelke ‘405* reference, the *Mukherji* reference, and the *Engelke ‘482* reference (U.S. Patent No. 5,909,482).

3. Whether the PTAB erred in construing the terms of claims 1-29 of the '822 Patent and proposed substitute claims 30-43, including, for example, the following terms: “activator”; “the first communication link is a telephone line ... the second communication link includes a communication link that is completely independent of the telephone line”; “wherein the relay is prevented from being able to communicate with the hearing user”; “wherein, the captioned device is further configured not to transmit over the first direct communication link to the hearing user the signals received from the remote captioning relay via the second direct communication link”; “wherein, the captioned device provides the captioning service such that the hearing user is not necessarily aware that a relay is providing assistance on the call, for both outgoing and incoming calls.”
4. Whether the PTAB erred in granting in-part Petitioner’s Motion to Exclude, and specifically finding that Exhibits 2045, 2046, 2048, and 2062 are hearsay without any exception.
5. Whether the PTAB erred in finding the elements of claims 1-29 of the '822 Patent present in the prior art both individually and in combination, for purposes of a finding of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

6. Whether the PTAB erred in determining that a person of ordinary skill in the art would have had a motivation or rationale for combining the cited references.
7. Whether the PTAB erred, procedurally and substantively, in its analysis of Patent Owner's evidence of secondary considerations of non-obviousness, including by first finding claims 1-29 of the '822 Patent to be obvious and the subject matter of those claims to be in the prior art, then discounting secondary considerations on such basis, by further failing to consider secondary considerations at all for proposed substitute claims 37, 40, 41, and further by discounting the testimony of Patent Owner's expert based on the PTAB's misapplication of law and procedure.
8. Whether the PTAB exceeded its statutory and regulatory authority in making its factual findings supporting the ultimate conclusion of obviousness, including but not limited to whether the PTAB improperly conducted independent research and/or relied on arguments not addressed by either party, and/or improperly shifted the burden of proof on factual issues to Patent Owner.
9. Whether the PTAB erred in denying Patent Owner's Motion to Dismiss (Paper No. 95), including whether the proceedings should have been dismissed, because the Petitioner failed to identify all real parties in interest, including as

required under 35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(2) and related regulations, and consequently whether the PTAB lacked authority to proceed in rendering the Final Written Decision.

10. Whether the PTAB erred in denying Patent Owner's Motion for Additional Discovery concerning whether Petitioner properly identified the real parties in interest (Paper 42) and Patent Owner's Request for Rehearing on the PTAB's denial of Patent Owner's Motion for Additional Discovery (Paper 87).
11. Whether the PTAB erred in denying Patent Owner's Request to file a Motion for Additional Discovery regarding facts and materials relied upon by Petitioner's Declarant, Mr. Occhiogrosso (Paper 20).
12. Whether the PTAB erred in denying Patent Owner's Contingent Motion to Amend, including whether the PTAB erred in finding proposed substitute claims 30-36 unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 112(a) for lack of written description support, whether the PTAB erred in finding proposed substitute claims 37, 40, and 41 unpatentable as being obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over the *Liebermann* reference, the *Engelke '405* reference, and the *Mukherji* reference, whether the PTAB erred in finding proposed substitute claim 38 unpatentable as not further limiting claim 37, upon which claim 38 depended, whether the PTAB erred in not entering proposed substitute claims 39, 42, and

43 due to the PTAB's erroneous findings concerning claims 37 and 38, and whether the PTAB erred in placing the burden of persuasion and/or production on Patent Owner regarding the patentability of the proposed substitute claims (*see, e.g., In re Aqua Products, Inc.*, No. 2015-1177, 2016 WL 4375651 (Fed. Cir. August 12, 2016) (granting Aqua Product's petition to rehearing *en banc* the same)).

13. Whether the *Inter Partes* Review proceedings in general, and this case in particular, are unconstitutional and in violation of principles of administrative agency authority, including to the extent the PTAB is empowered (including under 35 U.S.C. §§ 311 and 316) to invalidate, cancel, and/or render unpatentable an issued patent without affording any deference or presumption of validity to the issued claims, and to the extent the PTAB is further empowered to preclude patent owners from seeking to amend claims without first satisfying unduly restrictive and prohibitive threshold requirements via motion (*see, e.g., 37 C.F.R. § 42.121; Idle Free Systems, Inc. v. Bergstrom, Inc.*, Case IPR2012-00027 (PTAB June 11, 2013) (Paper 26) (setting forth requirements for motions to amend, and designated "informative" by the PTAB)).

14. Whether 35 U.S.C. § 318(b) violates Article III of the United States Constitution, including because it empowers an executive agency tribunal to

assert judicial power cancelling a private property right amongst private parties embroiled in a private federal dispute of a type known in the common law courts of 1789, rather than merely issue an advisory opinion as an adjunct to a trial court (*see, e.g., Cooper v. Square, Inc.*, No. 16-76 (S. Ct. *petition for cert. filed* July 13, 2016)).

Simultaneous with this submission, a copy of this Notice of Appeal is being filed with the Patent Trial and Appeal Board. In addition, three copies of this Notice of Appeal, along with the required docketing fees, are being filed with the Clerk's Office for the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit.

Respectfully submitted,

QUARLES & BRADY LLP

Date: November 8, 2016

s/Michael Jaskolski
Reg. No. 37,551
Lead Attorney for Patent Owner
michael.jaskolski@quarles.com
411 East Wisconsin Ave. Ste. 2350
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202
Tel: (414) 277-5711
Fax: (414) 978-8711

Michael J. Curley
Reg. No. 63,251
Attorney for Patent Owner
michael.curley@quarles.com
One South Church Ave., Ste. 1700
Tucson, Arizona 85701
Tel: (520) 770-8768

Martha Jahn Snyder
Reg. No. 66,294
martha.snyder@quarles.com
Stephen J. Gardner
Reg. No. 59,057
stephen.gardner@quarles.com
Attorneys for Patent Owner
33 East Main Street, Ste. 900
Madison, WI 53703-3095
Tel: (608) 251-5000

Nikia L. Gray
Reg. No. 57,770
Attorney for Patent Owner
nikia.gray@quarles.com
1701 Pennsylvania Ave. NW Ste. 700
Washington, D.C. 20006
Tel: (202) 372-9517

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

CAPTIONCALL, LLC and
SORENSEN COMMUNICATIONS, INC.
Petitioner

v.

ULTRATEC, INC.
Patent Owner

Case IPR2015-00636
U.S. Patent 8,917,822 B2

CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

Filed Electronically via PTAB E2E

The undersigned hereby certifies that the foregoing PATENT OWNER ULTRATEC, INC.'S NOTICE OF APPEAL was filed with the Patent Trial and Appeal Board on November 8, 2016, using the PTAB E2E System pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(b)(1).

The undersigned further certifies that on November 8, 2016, a copy of the foregoing PATENT OWNER ULTRATEC, INC.'S NOTICE OF APPEAL and the Final Written Decision (along with the fee set forth in Federal Circuit Rule 52), were electronically filed with the Federal Circuit using the Court's CM/ECF System.

The undersigned further certifies that on November 8, 2016, a copy of the foregoing PATENT OWNER ULTRATEC, INC.'S NOTICE OF APPEAL and the Final Written Decision were filed by hand delivery with the Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, at the following address:

Michelle K. Lee
Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office
c/o Office of the General Counsel
Madison Building East, 10B20
600 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314-5793

The undersigned further certifies that on November 8, 2016, a copy of the foregoing PATENT OWNER ULTRATEC, INC.'S NOTICE OF APPEAL was served via UPS Next Day Air on lead counsel for Petitioner and via email on all counsel for Petitioner:

Ruben H. Munoz (rmunoz@akingump.com)
Daniel L. Moffett (dmoffett@akingump.com)
Michael P. Kahn (mkahn@akingump.com)
sorensonipservice@akingump.com
AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD LLP
Two Commerce Square
2001 Market Street, Suite 4100
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103

Date: November 8, 2016

s/Michael Jaskolski
Michael Jaskolski
Reg. No. 37,551
Lead Attorney for Patent Owner
michael.jaskolski@quarles.com
QUARLES & BRADY LLP
411 East Wisconsin Ave., Suite 2350
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202
Tel: (414) 277-5711

Michael J. Curley
Reg. No. 63,251
Attorney for Patent Owner
michael.curley@quarles.com
QUARLES & BRADY LLP
One South Church Avenue,
Suite 1700
Tucson, Arizona 85701
Tel: (520) 770-8768

Martha Jahn Snyder
Reg. No. 66,294
martha.snyder@quarles.com
Stephen J. Gardner
Reg. No. 59,057
stephen.gardner@quarles.com
Attorneys for Patent Owner
QUARLES & BRADY LLP
33 East Main Street
Madison, WI 53703-3095
Tel: (608) 251-5000

Nikia L. Gray
Reg. No. 57,770
Attorney for Patent Owner
nikia.gray@quarles.com
QUARLES & BRADY LLP
1701 Pennsylvania Ave. NW Ste. 700
Washington, DC 20006
Tel: (202) 372-9600