

Filed on behalf of ABB, Inc.

By: Richard D. McLeod (Reg. No. 46,921)
Rick.mcleod@klarquist.com
Michael D. Jones (Reg. No. 41,879)
michael.jones@klarquist.com
Klarquist Sparkman LLP
One World Trade Center, Suite 1600
121 S.W. Salmon Street
Portland, Oregon 97204
Telephone: (503) 595-5300
Facsimile: (503) 595-5301

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ABB, INC.
Petitioner

v.

ROY-G-BIV CORPORATION
Patent Owner

Trial No. IPR2013-00062 (joined with IPR2013-00282)
Patent 6,516,236 B1

**ABB'S OPPOSITION TO PATENT OWNER'S MOTION TO SUBMIT
SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. LEGAL STANDARDS	1
III. DISCUSSION	2
A. RGB Was Not Reasonably Diligent In Seeking Evidence	2
B. RGB Fails to Meet the “Interests of Justice” Standard.....	4
1. McClung Is An Unnamed Co-inventor.....	4
2. McClung’s Testimony Does Not Cure All Defects.....	4
IV. CONCLUSION.....	5

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page
Cases	
<i>Coleman v. Dines</i> , 754 F.2d 353 (1985)	5
<i>Gould v. Schawlow</i> , 363 F.2d 908 (CCPA 1966).....	5
<i>Hahn v. Wong</i> , 892 F.2d 1028 (Fed. Cir. 1989)	1
<i>Huston v. Ladner</i> , 973 F.2d 1564 (Fed. Circ. 1992)	1
<i>Illumina, Inc. v Columbia Univ.</i> , IPR2013-00011, Paper 87 at 5	2, 4
<i>Naber v. Cricchi</i> , 567 F.2d 382 (CCPA 1977).....	5

I. INTRODUCTION

Prior to the Trial Argument, RGB did not obtain testimony or introduce documents involving Marc McClung (“Late Submission”), even those it possessed for years. ’062 Trial, Paper 76, 25:1-6. ABB could not provide McClung’s recent testimony due to the terms of the Litigation PO. (Auvil Decl., ¶ 42). Moreover, consideration of the Late Submission without contrary evidence showing that McClung is an unnamed co-inventor unfairly prejudices ABB.

II. LEGAL STANDARDS

Under Rule 123(b), the proponent “must show why the supplemental information reasonably could not have been obtained earlier, and that consideration of the supplemental information would be in the interests-of-justice.”

The “interests-of-justice” standard is higher than “good cause.” 77 Fed. Reg. 48622. Misunderstanding of the law on corroboration does not qualify as “good cause.” *Hahn v. Wong*, 892 F.2d 1028, 1034 (Fed. Cir. 1989); *see also Huston v. Ladner*, 973 F.2d 1564 (Fed. Circ. 1992) (stating that “attorney negligence” is not “good cause” and affirming that “good cause” requires proof that late submitted declaration could not have been obtained and presented earlier).

“The testimony of someone who is not a witness in this trial and who has not testified or been subject to cross-examination in the context of this trial is of insufficient value to warrant its late submission.” *Illumina, Inc. v Columbia Univ.*,

IPR2013-00011, Paper 87 at 5 (denying late submission); *see also* Paper 125 at 3.

III. DISCUSSION

A. RGB Was Not Reasonably Diligent In Seeking Evidence

The Board ordered RGB to show that it could not have reasonably obtained (at an earlier time) the evidence proffered in the Late Submission. However, RGB essentially concedes its failure to obtain any testimony from Marc McClung between April 18, 2013 ('062 Institution Decision) and March 2014 (deposition of McClung by ABB), even though McClung has been known and readily available to RGB throughout 2013. Ex. 2019, 14:23 – 15:1:

JUDGE GIANNETTI: So you've been aware of this Compumotor thing for some time. Is that right?

MR. MEYER: We have been aware of the Compumotor issue...yes.

First, McClung was identified as being relevant to the validity of the claims as least as early as April 15, 2013 in ABB's First Amended Answer and Counterclaims, Litigation Dkt. 138. (Auvil Decl., ¶¶ 3-8, 39-41; *also* '062 Trial, Ex. 1025, submitted May 2013 ("McClung brought up several key suggestions that were integrated...")). ABB asserted that McClung is an unnamed inventor on at least the '236 and '557 Patents based upon documents bearing RGB's production numbers in the Litigation. (*Id.*) RGB insisted that these documents were confidential under the Litigation Protective Order (*Id.*), preventing ABB from bringing this issue to the Board as the undersigned does not have access to these

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.