

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

MATCH.COM LLC and PEOPLE MEDIA, INC.  
Petitioners

v.

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

---

IPR Case No.: To be Assigned

---

**MOTION FOR JOINDER UNDER 35 U.S.C §§ 315(c),  
37 C.F.R. §§ 42.22 AND 42.122(b)**

Mail Stop **Patent Board**  
Patent Trial and Appeal Board  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

Match.com LLC and People Media, Inc. (“Petitioners”) submit concurrently herewith a Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 6,628,314 (“the ’314 Patent”) (“Petition”) based on identical grounds that form the basis for pending IPR proceeding, Case No. IPR2014-00038 (“the Google IPR”).

Pursuant to 35 US.C. § 315(c), Petitioners respectfully move that this Petition be instituted and joined with the Google IPR. Petitioners merely request an opportunity to join with the Google IPR as an “understudy” to Google, only assuming an active role in the event Google settles with B.E. Technology. Thus, Petitioners do not seek to alter the grounds upon which the Board has already instituted the IPR, and joinder will have no impact on the existing schedule in the IPR. Under rule 42.122, this Motion is timely as it was filed within one month of the granting of IPR2014-00038.

## **II. BACKGROUND AND RELATED PROCEEDINGS**

B.E Technology (“B.E. Tech”) is the owner of the ’314 Patent. In 2012, B.E. Tech sued ten different companies for alleged infringement of the ’314 Patent (“Underlying Litigation”). In October of 2013, three of the defendants, Facebook, Microsoft, and Google, filed petitions for *inter partes* review of the ’314 Patent. Facebook filed two separate petitions as well as a request to consolidate both of its petitions which the Board said it would discuss at the initial conference call. All

four petitions were granted on April 9, 2014. *See Facebook v. B.E. Technology, L.L.C.* (Case No. IPR2014-00053); *Microsoft Corporation v. B.E. Technology, L.L.C.* (Case No. IPR2014-00039); *Facebook v. B.E. Technology, L.L.C.* (Case No. IPR2014-00052); and *Google Inc. v. B.E. Technology, L.L.C.* (Case No. IPR2014-00038).

### **III. REQUIREMENTS FOR MOTION FOR JOINDER ARE MET**

Petitioners respectfully submit that joinder is appropriate because: (1) it will promote efficient determination of the validity of the '314 Patent without prejudice to Google or B.E. Tech; (2) this petition raises only the same grounds of unpatentability as Google and for which the Board instituted review; (3) it would not affect the pending schedule in the Google IPR in any way nor increase the complexity of that proceeding in any way; and (4) Petitioners are willing to accept an understudy role to minimize burden and schedule impact. Absent joinder, Petitioners could be prejudiced if the Google IPR is terminated before a final written decision is issued as they would have to litigate the same positions at the District Court under a higher burden of proof. Accordingly, joinder should be granted.

#### **a. Joinder Will Promote the Efficient Determination of Validity Without Prejudice to Google or B.E. Tech.**

Granting joinder and permitting Petitioners to assume the understudy role will not prejudice Google or B.E. Tech. Petitioners raise no issues that are not

already before the Board, such that joinder would not affect the timing of the IPR or the content of B.E. Tech's responses. Petitioners' limited role ensures that Google and B.E. Tech will not suffer any additional costs. Google will not be obligated to cooperate with Petitioners. Likewise, B.E. Tech will not have to coordinate with or respond to arguments by more parties than they already do.

Moreover, a final written decision on the validity of the '314 patent will minimize issues in the Underlying Litigation and potentially resolve the Litigation altogether thereby promoting the efficient determination of validity. If the Board permits Petitioners to join the Google IPR, and the '314 patent is upheld in a final decision, Petitioners will be estopped from further challenging the validity of the patent on these grounds, avoiding duplication of B.E. Tech's efforts at least as to Petitioners. *See* 35 U.S.C. § 315(e)(1). Accordingly, to avoid duplicate efforts and promote efficiency, joinder is appropriate.

**b. No New Arguments Are Presented.**

The petition asserts, verbatim, only the arguments that the Board has already instituted in the Google IPR. Thus, there are no new arguments to consider. Further, the Petition relies on the expert witness, Stephen Gray, who is already involved in Google's IPR. Thus, no new expert depositions are required.

**c. No Schedule Adjustments Are Necessary.**

Joinder in this case will not impact the Board's ability to complete its review in a timely manner. Section 316(a)(11) provides that IPR proceedings should be completed and the Board's final decision issued within one year of institution of the review. *See also* 37 C.F.R. § 42.100(c). Here, joinder will not affect the Board's ability to issue its final determination within one year because Petitioners agree to an understudy role and do not raise any issues that are not already before the Board. Indeed, the Petition includes only those grounds on which the IPR was instituted, and the invalidity grounds were copied verbatim from Google's petition. Given that Petitioners will assume an understudy role, their presence will not introduce any additional arguments, briefing, or need for discovery.

Petitioners submit that B.E. Tech does not need to file a Patent Owner's Preliminary Response, and request that the Board proceed without it. This is consistent with the Board's Order IPR2013-00256 (Paper No. 8), which allowed the Patent Owner to file a preliminary response addressing only those points raised in the new petition that were different from those in the granted petition. Here, because the invalidity grounds are word-for-word identical to those allowed grounds in Google's Petition, there is nothing new for B.E. Tech to address. Moreover, B.E. Tech did not file a Preliminary Response to Google's petition or any of the other four petitions filed against the '314 Patent. Alternatively, the

# 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.