

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION  
Petitioner

v.

PROXYCONN, INC.  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2013-00109 (TLG)  
Patent 6,757,717 B1

---

Before SALLY C. MEDLEY, SCOTT R. BOALICK, and THOMAS L.  
GIANNETTI, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

GIANNETTI, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION  
Motion for Joinder  
*37 C.F.R. § 42.122(b)*

## I. INTRODUCTION

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation requests joinder of this proceeding with instituted trial proceeding IPR2012-00026. Patent Owner has advised the Board that it does not oppose, and in fact encourages joinder. Paper 9. The present motion was filed concurrently with Petitioner's Second Petition for Inter Partes Review (Paper 1) involving the same patent and parties as IPR2012-00026. In a separate decision, entered today, we grant the second Petition as to all claims. For the reasons that follow, we also grant Petitioner's motion for joinder.

## II. BACKGROUND

Petitioner presents a Statement of Material Facts in support of its motion. Mot. 2-3. Those facts are not opposed by Patent Owner and therefore stand as admitted. 37 C.F.R. § 42.24(b). In connection with this motion, the Board makes the following additional findings:

1. IPR2012-00026 and this proceeding involve the same parties.
2. IPR2012-00026 and this proceeding involve the same patent (US Patent 6,757,717).
3. The Yohe patent (US 5,853,943) involved in this proceeding as prior art is also cited in IPR2012-00026.
4. There is no discernible prejudice either to Patent Owner or Petitioner from joining this proceeding with IPR2012-00026.

5. Petitioner proceeded expeditiously in filing a second Petition after learning that additional claims were being asserted by Patent Owner in concurrent district court litigation.

6. Petitioner's motion was filed concurrently with the second Petition and is therefore timely under 37 C.F.R. 42 § 122(b). *See infra*.

7. Joinder of this proceeding with IPR2012-00026 will not unduly delay the resolution of either proceeding. In that regard a Revised Scheduling Order for the joined proceedings is being entered concurrently with this decision.

8. Joinder of this proceeding with IPR2012-00026 will help "secure the just, speedy, and inexpensive resolution" of these proceedings. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.1(b).

9. Petitioner has established good cause for joining this proceeding with IPR2012-00026.

### III. DISCUSSION

The Leahy-Smith America Invents Act (AIA) permits joinder of like review proceedings. Thus, an inter partes review (IPR) may be joined with another inter partes review, and a post-grant review (PGR) may be joined with another post-grant review. The statutory provision governing joinder of inter partes review proceedings is 35 U.S.C. § 315(c), which reads as follows:

(c) JOINDER.--If the Director institutes an inter partes review, the Director, in his or her discretion, may join as a party to that inter partes review any person who properly files a petition under section 311 that the Director, after receiving a preliminary response under section 313 or the expiration of the time for filing such a response, determines warrants the institution of an inter partes review under section 314.

As is apparent from the statute, a request for joinder affects certain deadlines under the AIA. Normally, a petition for inter partes review filed more than one year after the petitioner (or the petitioner's real party-in interest or privy) is served with a complaint alleging infringement of the patent is barred. 35 U.S.C. § 315(b), as amended; 37 C.F.R. § 42.101(b). However, the one-year time bar does not apply to a request for joinder. 35 U.S.C. § 315(b)(final sentence); 37 C.F.R. § 42.122(b). This is an important consideration here, because Microsoft was served with a complaint asserting infringement of the '717 patent more than a year before filing the second Petition. Pet. 1. Thus, absent joinder of this proceeding with IPR2012-00026, the second Petition would be barred. Moreover, in the case of joinder, the one-year time requirement for issuing a final determination in an inter partes review may be adjusted. 35 U.S.C. § 316(a)(11), as amended.

#### IV. ANALYSIS

The policy basis for construing our rules for these proceedings is set forth in the Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48756, 48758 (Aug. 14, 2012): “The rules are to be construed so as to ensure the just, speedy, and inexpensive resolution of a proceeding . . . .” *See also* Rule 1(b) (37 CFR § 42.1(b)). Based upon the admitted facts and our own findings, *supra*, we have determined that this policy would best be served by granting Petitioner's motion. The same patents and parties are involved in both proceedings. There is an overlap in the cited prior art. There is no discernible prejudice to either party. Petitioner has been diligent and timely in filing the motion. And while some adjustments to the schedule have been

necessary, there is not undue delay. In sum, the relevant factors of which we are aware all weigh in favor of granting this motion.

## V. ORDER

In view of the foregoing, it is, therefore,

**ORDERED** that Petitioner's Motion for Joinder is granted;

**FURTHER ORDERED** that this proceeding is joined with IPR2012-00026;

**FURTHER ORDERED** that the Revised Scheduling Order entered concurrently with this Decision shall hereafter govern the schedule of the joined proceedings;

**FURTHER ORDERED** that this proceeding is terminated under 37 C.F.R. § 42.72 and all further filings in the joined proceedings shall be made in IPR2012-00026;

**FURTHER ORDERED** that the case caption in IPR2012-00026 shall be changed to reflect the joinder with this proceeding in accordance with the attached example.

# 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.