

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

GOOGLE INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

SMARTFLASH LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case CBM2015-00125
Patent 7,334,720 B2

PATENT OWNER'S OPPOSITION TO PETITIONER GOOGLE INC.'S
MOTION FOR JOINDER UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 325(c) AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.222
AND REQUEST FOR SHORTENED RESPONSE TIME FOR PATENT
OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

I. INTRODUCTION

Patent Owner hereby opposes Petitioner Google Inc.'s Motion For Joinder Under 35 U.S.C. § 325(c) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.222 and Request For Shortened Response Time For Patent Owner's Preliminary Response.

Petitioner seeks to join CBM2015-00125 with covered business method review cases CBM2015-00028 and -00029 filed by Apple Inc. Motion, Paper 7 at 1.

The Board should deny the Motion for Joinder because (i) it is too late for the proposed joinder to provide the purported efficiencies Petitioner suggests; (ii) the cases are sufficiently different in terms of proffered exhibits and witnesses to gain any advantage by joinder; and (iii) the Board should exercise its discretion under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d) and decline to institute a covered business method patent review of claims 1 and 15 of U.S. Patent 7,334,720 on 35 U.S.C. § 101 grounds in CBM2015-00125 because it has already instituted covered business method review of those claims on the same grounds in CBM2015-00028 and -00029.

II. RESPONSE TO STATEMENT OF MATERIAL FACTS

1 – 4. Admitted.

III. STATEMENT OF MATERIAL FACTS

1. There has been no Institution Decision issued in CBM2015-00125.

2. Under Petitioner’s proposed “Post-Joinder Schedule” (Motion for Joinder, Paper 7 at 13), the proposed date for Patent Owner’s Preliminary Response to Google’s Petition in CBM2015-00125 is July 13, 2015, 16 days before this Opposition is due, and has already passed.

3. There is no overlap in witnesses proffered by Google in CBM2015-00125 (Dr. Justin Douglas Tygar) with witnesses proffered by Apple in CBM2015-00028 and -00029 (Mr. Anthony J. Wechselberger).

4. In support of its §101 petition, Google relies on Exhibits 1006- 1009 generally relating to electronic publishing, and Exhibits 1023 – 1024 covering wide ranging topics including the history of libraries in the Western world, the first toll roads, the politics of alcohol, and practical aviation security. Those Exhibits, as well as others, are not in CBM2015-00028 and -00029.

IV. ARGUMENT

A. It Is Too Late For The Proposed Joinder To Provide The Purported Efficiencies Petitioner Suggests.

Petitioner claims that “[j]oinder will promote efficient resolution of the question at issue in all of the related proceedings: whether the challenged claims of ... the ’720 patent are unpatentable for failing to claim patent eligible subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101.” Motion, Paper 7 at 1. Any efficiencies that *might have* existed at the time that CBM2015-00028 and -00029 were instituted on May 28, 2015, however, were squandered by Petitioner waiting until the very last

allowable day (June 29, 2015) to file its Motion for Joinder. In the meantime, CBM2015-00028 and -00029 have proceeded through Patent Owner discovery to the point of Patent Owner's Response being filed on July 29, 2015. In CBM2015-00125, the *preliminary* response is not due until August 18, 2015.

Petitioner Google posits that “[j]oinder will have minimal impact on the trial schedule for the existing review, because Google’s petition is substantially similar to the petitions in the Apple CBMs”. Motion, Paper 7 at 7. Review of the petitions, however, reveals that Apple and Google rely on different exhibits and witnesses. Simply comparing the Exhibit Lists shows this.

Petitioner’s proposed schedule is impractical. Under Petitioner’s proposed “Post-Joinder Schedule” (Motion for Joinder, Paper 7 at 13), the proposed date for Patent Owner’s Preliminary Response to Google’s Petition in CBM2015-00125 is July 13, 2015, 16 days before this Opposition is due, and has already passed. Google proposes that Patent Owner’s response be due on August 28, 2015. As noted, there has been no institution decision and thus no discovery conducted by Patent Owner. Google has proffered a witness declaration from Dr. Justin Douglas Tygar. This witnesses does not overlap with Apple’s witness. Patent Owner has a right to depose this witness. 37 CFR § 42.53. Clearly Google’s proposed schedule whereby Patent Owner would depose Google’s witness and prepare a substantive

Patent Owner's Response by August 28, 2015 in a case that has not even been instituted is not reasonable.¹

CBM2015-00028 and -00029 are too far advanced to shoe horn CBM2015-00125 into the same schedule.

B. The CBM2015-00125 and CBM2015-00028 and -00029 Cases Are Sufficiently Different Such That There Is No Advantage To Joinder.

In arguing for joinder, Google states "Google's petition is substantially similar to the petitions in the Apple CBMs." Motion, Paper 7 at 7. While both petitions make the same purely legal argument – that the patent claims are directed to ineligible subject matter, the CBM2015-00125 and CBM2015-00028/ -00029 petitions are sufficiently different in terms of proffered exhibits and witnesses that they will not gain any advantage by joinder.

In support of its §101 petition, Google relies on Exhibits 1006- 1009 generally relating to electronic publishing, and Exhibits 1023 – 1024 covering

¹ Meanwhile, in CBM2015-00059, Petitioner Samsung is proposing that its petition be joined with CBM2015-00031, -00032, and -00033 (which are proceeding in lockstep with CBM2015-00028 and -00029) and proffered a schedule whereby Patent Owner would depose two unique Samsung witnesses and prepare a substantive Patent Owner's Response by August 12, 2015. CBM2015-00059, Motion for Joinder, Paper 11 at 14.

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.