

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

NINTENDO OF AMERICA INC. and NINTENDO CO., LTD.,
Petitioner,

v.

ILIFE TECHNOLOGIES,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2015-00105 (Patent 6,307,481 B1)
Case IPR2015-00106 (Patent 6,703,939 B2)
Case IPR2015-00109 (Patent 6,864,796 B2)
Case IPR2015-00112 (Patent 7,095,331 B2)
Case IPR2015-00113 (Patent 7,145,461 B2)
Case IPR2015-00115 (Patent 7,479,890 B2)¹

Before JACQUELINE WRIGHT BONILLA, MICHELLE R. OSINSKI, and
HYUN J. JUNG, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

OSINSKI, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

Order
Conduct of Proceedings
37 C.F.R. § 42.5

¹ This Order addresses issues that are the same in all six cases. Therefore, we exercise our discretion to issue one Order to be filed in each case. The parties are not authorized to use this style heading for any subsequent papers.

Case IPR2015-00105 (Patent 6,307,481 B1)
Case IPR2015-00106 (Patent 6,703,939 B2)
Case IPR2015-00109 (Patent 6,864,796 B2)
Case IPR2015-00112 (Patent 7,095,331 B2)
Case IPR2015-00113 (Patent 7,145,461 B2)
Case IPR2015-00115 (Patent 7,479,890 B2)

In an email dated November 6, 2015, Patent Owner requested a conference call with the Board, under 37 C.F.R. § 42.5, to discuss whether Patent Owner may be permitted to file a motion to strike or disregard portions of Petitioner's Reply Briefs that are believed by Patent Owner to improperly include new arguments and refer to evidence that was not previously addressed in the Petitions.

The panel has considered Patent Owner's request, and a conference is not necessary. Patent Owner is authorized to file a paper in each proceeding calling the Board's attention to those portions of Petitioner's Reply that are believed by Patent Owner to raise new issues or belatedly present evidence. The paper should be in the form of a list providing the location and a concise description of any portion of the Petitioner's Reply that Patent Owner wishes to draw to the Board's attention, but it should not contain argument. The paper is limited to two (2) pages and should be filed by Due Date 4.

We also authorize Petitioner to file a paper in response to Patent Owner's submission in each proceeding. If filed by Petitioner, this paper should identify, in an itemized manner, what Petitioner regards as the material contained in the Patent Owner Response which triggered or caused the Petitioner to include in its Reply each item listed by Patent Owner and/or where each item listed by Patent Owner appears in the Petition, but it should not contain argument. This paper is also limited to two (2) pages and should be filed by Due Date 5.

Case IPR2015-00105 (Patent 6,307,481 B1)
Case IPR2015-00106 (Patent 6,703,939 B2)
Case IPR2015-00109 (Patent 6,864,796 B2)
Case IPR2015-00112 (Patent 7,095,331 B2)
Case IPR2015-00113 (Patent 7,145,461 B2)
Case IPR2015-00115 (Patent 7,479,890 B2)

In rendering its Final Written Decision, the Board will determine what weight, if any, is to be given to all of the presented evidence and arguments in accordance with the rules of the Board.

It is

ORDERED that the parties are authorized to file the above-discussed papers consistent with the requirements and deadlines set forth in this Order.

Case IPR2015-00105 (Patent 6,307,481 B1)
Case IPR2015-00106 (Patent 6,703,939 B2)
Case IPR2015-00109 (Patent 6,864,796 B2)
Case IPR2015-00112 (Patent 7,095,331 B2)
Case IPR2015-00113 (Patent 7,145,461 B2)
Case IPR2015-00115 (Patent 7,479,890 B2)

PETITIONER:

Joseph S. Presta
Robert W. Faris
NIXON & VANDERHYE, P.C.
jsp@nixonvan.com
rwf@nixonvan.com

PATENT OWNER:

Daniel E. Venglarik
David M. Doyle
Michael C. Wilson
S. Wallace Dunwoody
MUNCK WILSON MANDALA LLP
PTAB-ILIF@munckwilson.com
dvenglarik@munckwilson.com
didoyle@munckwilson.com
mwilson@munckwilson.com
wdunwoody@munckwilson.com