

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MATCH.COM LLC and PEOPLE MEDIA, INC.
Petitioner

v.

B.E. TECHNOLOGY, L.L.C.
Patent Owner

Case IPR2014-00699
Patent 6,628,314 B1

Before SALLY C. MEDLEY, KALYAN K. DESHPANDE, and
LYNNE E. PETTIGREW, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

PETTIGREW, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

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

INTRODUCTION

Match.com LLC and People Media, Inc. (collectively, “Petitioner”) filed a petition requesting an *inter partes* review of claims 11-13, 15, 18, and 20 of U.S. Patent No. 6,628,314 B1 (Ex. 1001, “the ’314 patent”). Paper 1 (“Pet.”). With the petition, Petitioner filed a motion for joinder (Paper 4, “Mot.”), seeking to join this case with *Google Inc. v. B.E. Technology, L.L.C.*, Case IPR2014-00038 (PTAB Apr. 9, 2014). In a separate decision, entered today, we institute an *inter partes* review as to the same claims and the same grounds of unpatentability for which we instituted trial in *Google Inc. v. B.E. Technology, L.L.C.*, Case IPR2014-00038. For the reasons that follow, Petitioner’s motion for joinder is *granted*.

BACKGROUND

Petitioner filed its petition and motion for joinder on April 25, 2014, within one month after the institution date of IPR2014-00038. On June 2, 2014, the Board held a conference call with counsel for the respective parties and counsel for the Petitioner in IPR2014-00038 (“the -00038 Petitioner”). Paper 10 at 2. During the conference call, counsel for Patent Owner represented that Patent Owner does not oppose the motion for joinder, and counsel for the -00038 Petitioner indicated that the -00038 Petitioner does not oppose the motion for joinder with it in IPR2014-00038. *Id.*

The petition in this case asserts that claims 11-13, 18, and 20 of the ’314 patent are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as anticipated by

Logan¹, and claim 15 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Logan and Robinson². Pet. 13-36. These are the same claims and the same grounds for which we instituted trial in IPR2014-00038. *Google Inc. v. B.E. Technology, L.L.C.*, Case IPR2014-00038, slip op. at 18 (PTAB Apr. 9, 2014) (Paper 9).

ANALYSIS

The Leahy-Smith America Invents Act, Pub. L. No. 112-29 (2011), permits joinder of like review proceedings. Thus, an *inter partes* review may be joined with another *inter partes* review. The statutory provision governing joinder of *inter partes* review proceedings is 35 U.S.C. § 315(c), which provides:

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 the movant, Petitioner bears the burden to show that joinder is appropriate. 37 C.F.R. § 42.20(c). In its motion for joinder, Petitioner contends that joinder is appropriate because (1) “it will promote efficient determination of the validity of the ’314 Patent without prejudice” to Patent Owner or the -00038 Petitioner; (2) the petition raises only the same grounds of unpatentability for which the Board instituted review in IPR2014-00038;

¹ U.S. Patent No. 5,721,827 (Ex. 1002) (“Logan”).

² U.S. Patent No. 5,918,014 (Ex. 1003) (“Robinson”).

(3) joinder would not affect the pending schedule in IPR2014-00038 or increase the complexity of that proceeding; and (4) Petitioner is “willing to accept an understudy role to minimize the burden and schedule impact.”
Mot. 2.

The Board, acting on behalf of the Director, has discretion to join proceedings. 35 U.S.C. § 315(c). In exercising its discretion, the Board considers the impact of both substantive issues and procedural matters on the proceedings.

The substantive issues in IPR2014-00038 would not be affected by joinder because Petitioner asserts only the grounds of unpatentability for which trial was instituted in IPR2014-00038, and makes only the arguments made by the -00038 Petitioner in its petition in that proceeding. *Compare* Pet. 13-36, with *Google Inc. v. B.E. Technology, L.L.C.*, Case IPR2014-00038, Paper 1 at 13-32, 57-60. Further, Petitioner submits the same declaration of Stephen Gray that the -00038 Petitioner submitted in support of its petition. *See* Ex. 1004; *Google Inc. v. B.E. Technology, L.L.C.*, Case IPR2014-00038, Ex. 1004. Thus, the petition in this proceeding raises no new issues beyond those already before the Board in IPR2014-00038.

Regarding procedural matters, Petitioner argues that joinder would not require any change to the trial schedule in IPR2014-00038 because Petitioner “agree[s] to an understudy role and do[es] not raise any issues that are not already before the Board.” Mot. 4. Specifically, Petitioner agrees to “assume a limited ‘understudy’ role” “[a]s long as Google [i.e., the -00038 Petitioner] remains in the joined IPR.” *Id.* at 5. Given that Petitioner will

assume an understudy role, Petitioner states that its presence will not introduce any additional briefing or need for discovery. *Id.* at 4.

CONCLUSION

Under the circumstances, we conclude Petitioner has demonstrated that joinder will not unduly complicate or delay IPR2014-00038, and therefore joinder is appropriate.

ORDER

Accordingly, it is:

ORDERED that Petitioner's motion for joinder with IPR2014-00038 is *granted*;

FURTHER ORDERED that this proceeding is joined with IPR2014-00038;

FURTHER ORDERED that the grounds on which a trial was instituted in IPR2014-00038 are unchanged;

FURTHER ORDERED that the Scheduling Order and adjustments to the Scheduling Order in place for IPR2014-00038 (Papers 10, 21) shall govern the joined proceedings;

FURTHER ORDERED that IPR2014-00699 is instituted, joined, and terminated under 37 C.F.R. § 42.72, and all further filings in the joined proceeding shall be made in IPR2014-00038;

FURTHER ORDERED that unless given prior authorization by the Board, Petitioner is not permitted to file papers, engage in discovery, or participate in any deposition or oral hearing in IPR2014-00038. Petitioner,

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.