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JUDGE GERSTENBLITH: Okay. So this is now official and everything I say after this point is official.

This is a conference call for three related cases, IPR2014-00946, 947 and 948.

My name is Judge Gerstenblith and with me on the line are Judge Torquist and Zecher. I understand there is a court reporter on the line.

And let's start with counsel for Petitioner. Please identify yourself,

MR. BAKER: On the phone for Petitioner are Todd Baker from the Oblon firm and James Bailey from law offices of James Bailey.

JUDGE GERSTENBLITH: Thank you, Mr. Baker.

And for Patent Owner?

MR. LEE: For Patent Owner, Mike Lee and Rob Sterne from Sterne Kessler Goldstein & Fox. Also, on the line is Tom Presson, in-house counsel for Parkervision.

And, Rick, you know, I'll let you introduce yourself.

MR. NITTINGER: Yes. Rick Nittinger (phonetic), and I'm backup counsel for Patent
JUDGE GERSTENBLITH: Okay. And is anyone else on the line?
(NO RESPONSE.)
JUDGE GERSTENBLITH: Okay. Thank you all for being on the call today. This call is in relation to an e-mail that we received from Mike Lee on September 22nd. And, in particular, it relates to an update on the related litigation in the Federal Circuit between Parkervision and Qualcomm.

And what we would like -- first, I just want to give a note here about the e-mail and then I'd like to hear from both parties in our case as to an update in that case, which is more likely to be coming from Patent Owner. So we're going to start with Patent Owner when we get there.

But, Mr. Lee, I just wanted to note for the record that the e-mail indicates toward the end that the parties jointly request a further stay of these IPR proceedings and that as of right now there is no stay in the proceedings. I just want to make sure everybody is aware of
that.

Did anybody actually think there is a stay in place now?

MR. LEE:  This is Mike Lee. I guess what we were trying to say is -- I guess a better way of saying it is we request a further delay of the oral hearing in these IPR proceedings.

JUDGE GERSTENBLITH:  Okay.

Petitioner, did you think that there was a stay?

MR. BAKER:  No, we had the same understanding as Mr. Lee.

(There is a discussion off the record.)

MR. BAKER:  I'm sorry. That was Todd Baker speaking for Petitioner.

And it was -- our understanding is the same as what was articulated by Mr. Lee.

JUDGE GERSTENBLITH:  Yes. Sorry about that. Before you respond, please state your name so that the record is clear. The only one that won't be doing that is me.

(There is a discussion off the record.)

JUDGE GERSTENBLITH:  Okay. So, with that understanding, that the request in the
e-mail from the 22nd of September is to request a further delay in the oral hearing, I'm going to turn it over to counsel for Patent Owner.

So give us an update on what's happening at the Federal Circuit and, in particular, I'd like to know whether Qualcomm -- whether the Fed Circuit has requested a response from Qualcomm and whether Patent Owner has decided that if it does not get the case reheard at the Federal Circuit, what, if anything, is happening up to that point.

MR. LEE: Yes. This is Mike Lee for Patent Owner.

I'll just restate what I said in my e-mail. On September 14th, Parkervision fought a petition for Panel rehearing in the related Federal Circuit appeal. At this time the Panel has -- the Panel Circuit has not asked Qualcomm to file a response. So, given that, we anticipate the timing of the Federal Circuit's decision on the petition for Panel rehearing to be sometime in the next week or two weeks.

Assuming that the Federal Circuit denies the petition for Panel rehearing or otherwise rules
in a way not favorable to Parkervision,
Parkervision still has to decide -- has not yet
decided whether it's going to file a cert for
either -- to the Federal Circuit on either issues
of infringement and/or invalidity.

JUDGE GERSTENBLITH: Thank you,
Mr. Lee. I think when you said, "filed the
cert," you mean to the Supreme Court, right?

MR. LEE: That's right, to the
Supreme Court.

JUDGE GERSTENBLITH: Okay. Anything
else from Patent Owner's side about the related
litigation there?

MR. LEE: No, your Honor.

JUDGE GERSTENBLITH: Okay. So does
Petitioner have anything to add on that? I don't
know if Petitioner is aware of what's going on.

MR. BAILEY: Yes, yes, your Honor.
This is Jim Bailey. I'd just like to add a
little bit.

I agree with Mr. Lee, you know, two to
three weeks is likely. As you're probably all
aware, CASC Rule of Practice 40(A)3 says that
unless the Court requests, no answer to a
petition for Panel rehearing is permitted, but, ordinarily, a rehearing will not be granted in the absence of such a request.

So we're 16 days out and we haven't gotten such a request. We're probably not going to get such a request and, likely, there will be a denial in a week or two.

From that point on, Parkervision has 90 days to file cert. You know, Mr. Lee just stated and reiterated his position from Tuesday's e-mail that Parkervision has not decided whether to file cert.

But, you know, I will note, you know, I've gotten some public documents from their ongoing current litigation with Qualcomm and other Defendants. And on Monday of last week, the 21st of September, they filed a document, Docket No. 216, and it was Titled, "Corrected Joint Statement Regarding Requested Williamson Briefing and Proposed Procedure to Address Impact of Parkervision 1." And at Page five to 6 of that document, it states, "In a brief filed on Monday, September 14, 2015, Parkervision sought rehearing at the Federal Circuit with respect to the
Federal Circuit's judgment in Parkervision 1. Should Parkervision's rehearing petition be denied, Parkervision also anticipates filing a cert petition with the Supreme Court."

Parkervision --

JUDGE GERSTENBLITH: I don't mean to interrupt you. But where are you reading from again?

MR. BAILEY: This is a document filed in a case in the Middle District of Florida ongoing between the Patent Owner, Parkervision, and Qualcomm as well as HTC and Samsung. It's Docket No. 216 filed Monday, September 21st and it's titled, "Corrected Joint Statement Regarding Requested Williamson Briefing and Proposed Procedure to Address Impact At Parkervision 1."

JUDGE GERSTENBLITH: Okay. What's the -- you have the case -- Civil Action number for that case?

MR. BAILEY: It's Case 6:14-cv-687-PGB-KRS.

JUDGE GERSTENBLITH: Did you say cv-687?

MR. BAILEY: Yes, your Honor.
JUDGE GERSTENBLITH: Okay. Is there anything else you wanted to say about that?

MR. BAILEY: Well, there's another paper filed Friday, September 25th, in the same case. It's document or Docket No. 217. Parkervision filed a motion to sever and stay receiver patents and claims pending appeal.

And on Page 3 of that filing, they say, quote, "No ruling on the rehearing petition has been received, but assuming the Panel's original decision stands, Parkervision plans to file a petition for RIT of cert in the Supreme Court."

So, at least, in the litigation, I'm sure -- I'm not saying these statements are even inconsistent. I'm just saying they have told the court in Florida they plan to or anticipate it. That would be 90 days from, you know, whenever the denial comes that would be due.

But the reality is, I mean, I think the rehearing petition, which didn't challenge validity, probably, you know, foretells what any cert petition would have because in order to challenge validity on any of the claims found invalid in the prior litigation, in order for it
to be meaningful, they would have to challenge both validity and infringement. So they have to get the Supreme Court to grant cert to two distinct issues in a unanimous non-precedential opinion, which I think the chances are zero. And I'm not sure that the Patent Owner would even have the audacity to ask for such a thing.

JUDGE GERSTENBLITH: Okay. Mr. Lee, anything else to add about the Florida case or any other related case?

MR. LEE: No, we have nothing more to add.

JUDGE GERSTENBLITH: Okay, slightly different question. When we first received the parties' correspondence on postponing -- the idea of postponing the oral argument, oral hearing in our three cases in relation to what was happening at the Federal Circuit, it was our impression -- I'm speaking for the Panel here -- that the principal issue that was the most relevant, perhaps the only issue that was relevant but, at least, the most relevant was the issue of the validity of the claims before the Fed Circuit. I'm saying that as opposed to the issue of
infringement.

So what I'd like to know, Mr. Lee, is what effect, you know, what is the -- if there is a reason, what, if any, is the reason why at this point since Patent Owner has not requested rehearing on the ruling on validity or I should say invalidity that we need to postpone what we're doing here rather than hearing from Patent Owner that the intent is to drop the resistance to the challenge here and request adverse judgment?

MR. LEE: This is Mike Lee.

The agreement that Patent Owner and Petitioner had was that if the Federal Circuit's decision as to invalidity was finally upheld, then Patent Owner would agree to enter adverse judgment as to all the instituted claims. We're not at that point yet.

My understanding that even if the Federal Circuit's decision on the petition for rehearing is adverse to Parkervision, Parkervision still has the opportunity to ask the Supreme Court to rule on invalidity as well as infringement, to look at both issues. So we're not at that point
yet where we've reached a final decision from the Federal Circuit on invalidity.

JUDGE GERSTENBLITH: Okay. Mr. Baker, Mr. Bailey, is there any difference of understanding on your side with respect to what Mr. Lee was just discussing?

MR. BAILEY: This is Mr. Bailey.

I agree that there is theoretical possibility of the Supreme Court taking up invalidity. But, as I stated earlier, I don't think that's realistic at all.

But, you know, we do agree that, I think, that Parkervision has lost or the Federal Circuit has no chance of really reversing that and that will be dispositive of all the challenged claims. So we are of one mind that it's probably done already. But as to, you know, the theory that they could move the Supreme Court on invalidity, you know, I don't dispute that that's theoretically possible.

JUDGE GERSTENBLITH: Okay. So does anyone else want to say anything else about this situation -- well, let me just say this, I guess, before I turn it back over to see if there's any
other thoughts.

Right now, as I mentioned, we do not have a stay and we have a deadline coming up for final written decision, if any, by December -- for our purposes, it's December 17, 2015, which is just over two and a half months away from now.

At this point, in light of what we've heard, we are not inclined to go past that date. And so we are in a position where we need to put it back on the parties to tell us whether we are or are not having an oral hearing in the three cases we have under the circumstances that you're all aware of right now as you both have reiterated the likelihood of different events occurring.

And in terms of trying to find a hearing room and available space here on our end and countervailing full poles on the schedule, what we're going to do is we're going to say and we'll put an order out to this effect that if we do not receive a renewed request for oral hearing by October 16th, which is just over two weeks from now, we are not going to have an oral hearing in these three cases. At some point in the future,
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we may be pushed to make a -- I don't want to say it like this, but a point of no return decision where we get to a certain date, which may be approaching soon after the 16th, where the Panel here will have to begin substantially to work on the final written decisions.

Once that happens, we will be highly unlikely to not issue them if the parties come to us with an agreement or otherwise seeking to stop that process. I don't want to dance around the issue. I want to be as clear as possible without making a firm stance at this exact moment.

Right now October 16th we need to know by that day if there's going to be oral hearing so we can get it calendared ASAP. And if the Federal Circuit is really likely to decide in the next week or two, hopefully, that will give enough time to consider for Patent Owner whether they're going to file a petition. It's not much time. It's short. But at that point we just need to know if there's going to be a request for oral hearing.

If we don't receive a request for oral hearing by the 16th, there will not be an oral
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hearing and then we will reach back out to the parties to set up another conference call to discuss the status most likely in the week or two weeks after the 16th.

Are there any questions about the 16th or otherwise? We'll start with Petitioner.

MR. BAILEY: This is Jim Bailey. I have no questions, your Honor.

JUDGE GERSTENBLITH: Okay. For Patent Owner?

MR. LEE: This is Mike Lee. No questions, your Honor.

JUDGE GERSTENBLITH: Okay. Anything else we need to talk about today from Petitioner?

MR. BAILEY: No, your Honor.

JUDGE GERSTENBLITH: Anything else from Patent Owner?

MR. LEE: No, your Honor.

JUDGE GERSTENBLITH: Okay. If you would all please hold the line for a minute. I'll confer with the panel.

(There is a discussion off the record among and between the Judges Panel.)

JUDGE GERSTENBLITH: Okay. This is
Judge Gerstenblith. We're back on and we have nothing else. So we stand adjourned. Off the record.

(Time noted: 11:23 a.m.)
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