

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

PUNGKUK EDM WIRE MANUFACTURING COMPANY,
Petitioner,

v.

SEONG, KI CHUL,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2016-00764
Patent 6,492,036 B2

Mailed: March 24, 2016

Before PAUL SULLIVAN, *Trial Paralegal*

NOTICE OF FILING DATE ACCORDED TO PETITION
AND
TIME FOR FILING PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

The petition for ***inter partes* review** in the above proceeding has been accorded the filing date of March 15, 2016.

A review of the petition identified the following defect(s):

Improper usages of claim charts: The rules require that a petition identify how the challenged claims are to be construed and how the claims are unpatentable under the statutory grounds raised. This information is to be provided pursuant to the page limit requirements, which require double

spacing. Additionally, the rules require that the petition specify where each element of a challenged claim is to be found in the prior art. The element-by-element showing may be provided in a claim chart, which is permitted to be written with single spacing. See 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(a)(2)(iii). Placing one's argument in a claim chart to circumvent the double spacing requirement is not permitted. Claim charts should only be used to provide an element-by-element showing as to how the prior art teaches the limitations of a claim (e.g., citations to a prior art reference, quotations from a prior art reference). Claim charts may not include arguments, claim construction, statements of the law, or detailed explanations as to why a claim limitation is taught or rendered obvious by the prior art. A mere citation to an expert declaration (e.g., "See Ex. 1015 ¶ 29") in a claim chart is permissible, but anything more than a mere citation is improper.

The instant Petition contains arguments in the claim charts. This defect can be corrected by removing all arguments from the claim charts and uploading the corrected Petition in PRPS.

Petitioner must correct the defect(s) within **FIVE BUSINESS DAYS** from this notice. Failure to correct the defect(s) may result in an order to show cause as to why the Board should institute the trial. No substantive changes (e.g., new grounds) may be made to the petition.

Patent Owner may file a preliminary response to the petition no later than three months from the date of this notice. The preliminary response is limited to setting forth the reasons why the requested review should not be instituted. Patent Owner may also file an election to waive the preliminary response to expedite the proceeding. For more information, please consult

the Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48756 (Aug. 14, 2012), which is available on the Board Web site at <http://www.uspto.gov/PTAB>.

Patent Owner is advised of the requirement to submit mandatory notice information under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(a)(2) within 21 days of service of the petition.

The parties are encouraged to use the heading on the first page of this Notice for all future filings in the proceeding.

The parties are advised that under 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c), recognition of counsel *pro hac vice* requires a showing of good cause. The parties are authorized to file motions for *pro hac vice* admission under 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c). Such motions shall be filed in accordance with the “Order -- Authorizing Motion *for Pro Hac Vice* Admission” in Case IPR2013-00639, Paper 7, a copy of which is available on the Board Web site under “Representative Orders, Decisions, and Notices.”

The parties are reminded that unless otherwise permitted by 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(b)(2), all filings in this proceeding must be made electronically in the Patent Review Processing System (PRPS), accessible from the Board Web site at <http://www.uspto.gov/PTAB>.

If there are any questions pertaining to this notice, please contact Paul Sullivan at 571-272-0338 or the Patent Trial and Appeal Board at 571-272-7822.

IPR2016-00764
Patent 6,492,036 B2

PETITIONER:

Steve Y. Cho
Jinchul Hong
AMPACC Law Group, PLLC
6100 219th Street SW
Suite 580
Mountlake Terrace, WA 98043

syc@ampacc.com
jch@ampacc.com

PATENT OWNER:

Birch Stewart Kolasch & Birch, LLP
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747

NOTICE CONCERNING ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION (ADR)

The Patent Trial and Appeal Board (PTAB) strongly encourages parties who are considering settlement to consider alternative dispute resolution as a means of settling the issues that may be raised in an AIA trial proceeding. Many AIA trials are settled prior to a Final Written Decision. Those considering settlement may wish to consider alternative dispute resolution techniques early in a proceeding to produce a quicker, mutually agreeable resolution of a dispute or to at least narrow the scope of matters in dispute. Alternative dispute resolution has the potential to save parties time and money.

Many non-profit organizations, both inside and outside the intellectual property field, offer alternative dispute resolution services. Listed below are the names and addresses of several such organizations. The listings are provided for the convenience of parties involved in cases before the PTAB; the PTAB does not sponsor or endorse any particular organization's alternative dispute resolution services. In addition, consideration may be given to utilizing independent alternative dispute resolution firms. Such firms may be located through a standard keyword Internet search.

CPR INSTITUTE FOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION	AMERICAN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW ASSOCIATION (AIPLA)	AMERICAN ARBITRATION ASSOCIATION (AAA)	WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION (WIPO)	AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION (ABA)
Telephone: (212) 949-6490	Telephone: (703) 415-0780	Telephone: (212) 484-3266	Telephone: 41 22 338 9111	Telephone : (202) 662-1000
Fax: (212) 949-8859	Fax: (703) 415-0786	Fax: (212) 307-4387	Fax: 41 22 733 5428	N/A
575 Lexington Ave	241 18th Street, South, Suite 700	140 West 51st Street	34, chemin des Colombettes	1050 Connecticut Ave, NW
New York, NY 10022	Arlington, VA 22202	New York, NY 10020	CH-1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland	Washington D.C. 20036
www.cpradr.org	www.aipla.org	www.adr.org	www.wipo.int	www.americanbar.org

If parties to an AIA trial proceeding consider using alternative dispute resolution, the PTAB would like to know whether the parties ultimately decided to engage in alternative dispute resolution and the reasons why or why not. If the parties actually engage in alternative dispute resolution, the PTAB would be interested to learn what mechanism (e.g., arbitration, mediation, etc.) was used and the general result. Such a statement from the parties is not required but would be helpful to the PTAB in assessing the value of alternative dispute resolution to parties involved in AIA trial proceedings. To report an experience with ADR, please forward a summary of the particulars to the following email address: PTAB_ADR_Comments@uspto.gov