

Paper No. _____
Filed: April 1, 2014

Filed on behalf of: PNC Bank, N.A.,
JP Morgan Chase & Co., and
JP Morgan Chase Bank, N.A.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

PNC BANK, N.A. AND JP MORGAN CHASE & CO.
AND JP MORGAN CHASE BANK, N.A.

Petitioner

v.

MAXIM INTEGRATED PRODUCTS, INC.

Patent Owner

Case CBM2014-00040
Patent No. 6,105,013

**PETITIONERS' MOTION REQUESTING ADVERSE JUDGMENT
AGAINST PNC PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.73(b)(4)**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT 1
- II. PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED 1
- III. BACKGROUND..... 1
- IV. ARGUMENT 2
 - A. Adverse Judgment for PNC is Consistent with PTO Regulations 3
 - B. Maxim Has No Basis to Challenge Adverse Judgment for PNC..... 3
 - C. JP Morgan Consents to Adverse Judgment for PNC 3
 - D. The Statute and Regulations Expressly Provide for Multi-Party Proceedings, Including Means for Withdrawal by Those Parties..... 3
 - E. Petitioners’ Motion for Adverse Judgment as to PNC Would Demonstrably Promote Just, Speedy, and Inexpensive Resolution..... 5
- V. CONCLUSION..... 5

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Patent and Trademark Office Decisions	
<i>BB&T v. Maxim Integrated Products, Inc.</i> , CBM2013-00059, paper 12 (March 20, 2014)	1, 2
<i>Fandango et al. v. Ameranth Inc.</i> , CBM2014-00013, paper 22 (March 24, 2014)	3, 4, 5
<i>SAP v. Pi-Net Int'l</i> , CBM2013-00013, paper 15 (Sept. 19, 2013).....	2
Federal Statutes	
AIA § 18.....	1, 2
35 U.S.C. § 317.....	3
35 U.S.C. § 327.....	2, 4
Federal Regulations	
37 C.F.R. § 42.1.....	2, 5
37 C.F.R. § 42.73	<i>passim</i>
37 C.F.R. § 42.201	1
37 C.F.R. § 42.302	1
77 Fed. Reg. 48693.....	2

I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

Petitioners request adverse judgment against PNC Bank, N.A. (“PNC”) per 37 C.F.R. § 42.73(b)(4). PNC filed four petitions for CBM review with JP Morgan Chase & Co. and JP Morgan Chase Bank, N.A. (“JP Morgan”) on November 22, 2013. At the time, the PTO allowed a declaratory judgment (DJ) plaintiff to petition for CBM review. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.302(a). Recently, however, the Board denied a CBM petition because the petitioner was a DJ plaintiff before it filed its CBM petition. *See BB&T v. Maxim Integrated Products, Inc.*, CBM2013-00059, paper 12 (March 20, 2014). In view of this decision, PNC—a DJ plaintiff before it filed the four CBM petitions—seeks to withdraw from the four CBM proceedings, as allowed by 37 C.F.R. § 42.73(b).

Although Maxim objects, the rules do not allow for an objection to adverse judgment.

II. PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED

Petitioners request adverse judgment against PNC per 37 C.F.R. § 42.73(b)(4).

III. BACKGROUND

Consistent with Petitioners’ understanding of the statute and regulations governing CBM review, Petitioners filed four CBM petitions on November 22, 2013. Section 18(a)(1) of the AIA left open the question of whether a DJ plaintiff could petition for CBM review. But, the PTO regulations and practice expressly allowed a DJ plaintiff to petition for CBM review. *Compare* 37 C.F.R. § 42.201(a) (identifying who may petition for post-grant review and explicitly precluding DJ plaintiffs from doing so) *with* 37 C.F.R. § 42.302(a) (identifying who may petition for CBM review

and not addressing DJ plaintiffs); 77 Fed. Reg. 48693 (“This is consistent with section 18(a)(1) of the AIA, which provides that the transitional proceeding shall be regarded as, and shall employ the standards and procedures of, a post-grant review with certain exceptions.”); *SAP v. Pi-Net Int’l*, CBM2013-00013, Paper No. 15 (Sept. 19, 2013) (instituting CBM review despite Petitioner being a DJ plaintiff). In view of PTO regulations and practice, PNC’s filing of the CBM petitions was entirely in good faith.

However, on March 20, 2014, the Board issued an order in *BB&T*, holding for the first time that a petitioner’s filing of a DJ action bars institution of CBM review. Thus, PNC immediately requested a conference call with the Board to withdraw PNC from the four CBM proceedings. On March 28, 2014, the Board issued an Order on Conduct of the Proceedings, directing PNC to file this motion requesting adverse judgment.

IV. ARGUMENT

37 C.F.R. § 42.73(b)(4) explicitly permits PNC’s request for adverse judgment. Although PNC and JP Morgan jointly filed the CBM petitions-at-issue, the statutory and regulatory framework under 35 U.S.C. § 327 and 37 C.F.R. § 42.73(b) expressly allow for adverse judgment against PNC, and the Patent Owner has no basis to object to PNC’s request. Further, PNC’s request will cause no prejudice to the Patent Owner and will help “secure the just, speedy, and inexpensive resolution” of the proceedings. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.1(b). Therefore, Petitioners’ motion for adverse judgment against PNC pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.73(b)(4) should be granted.

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.