

**UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION  
Washington, D.C.**

**Before The Honorable David P. Shaw  
Administrative Law Judge**

**In the Matter of**

**CERTAIN DIGITAL MEDIA DEVICES,  
INCLUDING TELEVISIONS, BLU-RAY  
DISC PLAYERS, HOME THEATER  
SYSTEMS, TABLETS AND MOBILE  
PHONES, COMPONENTS THEREOF  
AND ASSOCIATED SOFTWARE**

**Investigation No. 337-TA-882**

**MOTION TO INTERVENE IN INVESTIGATION  
AND SUPPORTING MEMORANDUM OF GOOGLE INC.**

**MOTION**

Pursuant to Commission Rule 210.19, Google Inc. (“Google”) moves to intervene in this investigation. Google seeks to intervene to protect its significant interests and to defend the Google and YouTube, LLC (“YouTube”) proprietary products and services that are identified in the Complaint and the accompanying claim charts or that are otherwise within the scope of this investigation. YouTube is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Google. As set forth in more detail in the following memorandum, Google respectfully requests that its motion to intervene (“Motion”) be granted.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Google presently seeks to intervene only as an intervenor and not as a respondent. Should its motion be granted, however, Google reserves the right to file a motion to change its status to that of a respondent if additional facts come to light in the investigation that would support such a request.

As required by Ground Rule 5(e), Google has made a reasonable and good-faith effort to contact and seek to resolve the subject matter of this Motion two days prior to filing this Motion. Respondents Samsung Electronics Co., Inc., Samsung Electronics America, Inc., Samsung Telecommunications America, L.L.C., LG Electronics, Inc., LG Electronics, Inc., LG Electronics, U.S.A., Inc., LG Electronics MobileComm U.S.A., Inc., Panasonic Corporation, Panasonic Corporation of America, Toshiba Corporation, Toshiba Corporation America Information Systems, Inc., Sharp Corporation, and Sharp Electronics Corporation (“Respondents”) indicated they do not oppose the Motion. Complainant Black Hills Media, LLC (“Black Hills” or “Complainant”) indicated that it will oppose the Motion. The Commission Investigative Staff has indicated that it will take a position after it reviews the Motion.

### **MEMORANDUM**

#### **I. STATEMENT OF FACTS**

This investigation was instituted on June 18, 2013, as a result of a Complaint that was filed by Black Hills on May 13, 2013, alleging infringement of six patents by one or more of twelve Respondents, including OEMS for Android devices, Samsung Electronics Co., Inc., Samsung Electronics America, Inc., Samsung Telecommunications America, L.L.C., LG Electronics, Inc., LG Electronics, Inc., LG Electronics, U.S.A., Inc., LG Electronics MobileComm U.S.A., Inc., Panasonic Corporation, Panasonic Corporation of America, Toshiba Corporation, Toshiba Corporation America Information Systems, Inc., Sharp Corporation, and Sharp Electronics Corporation.

The claim charts that accompanied the Complaint specifically identify certain proprietary Google and YouTube products and services operating on Android devices

manufactured by each of the Respondents as allegedly infringing or allegedly providing a portion of the infringing functionality of various patent claims. Specifically, Google Maps and Google Latitude were identified in the claim charts for U.S. Patent 6,618,593. Google Play Music was expressly identified in the claim charts for U.S. Patent Nos. 8,045,952 and 8,050,652. YouTube was expressly identified in claim charts for U.S. Patent Nos. 8,028,323, 8,214,873, and 8,230,099.

In addition, Black Hills has served subpoenas on both Google and its wholly-owned subsidiary YouTube, copies of which are attached as Exhibits 1 and 2. The subpoena to Google defines “Google Device Locator Applications” as “software applications that enable device users to identify and locate on a map, via global positioning system data, other wireless communication devices. Device Locator Applications include, without limitation, Google Latitude, AT&T Family Map, and all other reasonably similar applications.” Ex. 1 at 4. The subpoena defines “Google Media Sharing Applications” as “YouTube and applications for managing and sharing digital media and other network connected devices including music sharing applications, such as Google Play Music and reasonably similar applications, as well as, second screen and DIAL video sharing applications, and other reasonably similar applications.” *Id.* The subpoena to YouTube, Google’s wholly owned subsidiary, defines “YouTube Products” as “YouTube software used in conjunction with respondents’ devices including, but not limited to, YouTube applications and services and YouTube discovery and launch (‘DIAL’), second screen, or remote control functionality.” Ex. 2 at 5.

## II. ARGUMENT

### A. Legal Standard

The Commission's rules expressly provide for a third party to intervene in a pending investigation. Rule 210.19; *Certain Sucralose, Sweeteners Containing Sucralose, and Related Intermediate Compounds Thereof*, Inv. No. 337-TA-604, Order No. 7 (July 25, 2007) ("The Commission generally follows the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure in determining whether intervention in a particular matter is appropriate.")<sup>2</sup> The Commission evaluates the following factors in determining whether intervention is appropriate: (1) was the motion timely; (2) does the moving party have "an interest relating to the property or transaction which is the subject of the action;" (3) is the moving party "so situated that the disposition of the action may as a practical matter impair or impede its ability to protect that interest;" and (4) is the moving party "not adequately represented by existing parties." *Id.*

### B. GOOGLE SATISFIES THE STANDARD FOR INTERVENTION

#### 1. Google's Motion is Timely

A motion to intervene is timely if filed at a "relatively early" stage of the investigation. *Id.* Google's motion is timely, as this investigation was only instituted on June 18, 2013, a little more than five weeks ago, and the preliminary hearing before the ALJ will not occur until August 6, 2013. *See Certain Portable Electronic Communication Devices, Including Mobile Phones and Components Thereof*, Inv.

---

<sup>2</sup> Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 24 provides: "On timely motion, the court must permit anyone to intervene who . . . claims an interest relating to the property or transaction that is the subject of the action, and is so situated that disposing of the action may as a practical matter impair or impede the movant's ability to protect its interest, unless existing parties adequately represent that interest."

No. 337-TA-885, Order No. 5 (July 16, 2013) (motion timely when filed “within weeks of the institution of the investigation”); *Certain Cigarettes and Packaging Thereof*, Inv. No. 337-TA-424, Order No. 15 (Nov. 19, 1999) (granting motion to intervene filed less than ninety days after publication of the notice of investigation and prior to the initial conference).

## 2. Google Has a Compelling Interest in This Investigation

Google has a compelling interest in this investigation as a result of Complainant’s assertion that the alleged infringement is based, in part, on Respondents’ devices and their use of proprietary Google products and services, including Google Play Music, Google Maps/Latitude, and YouTube. *See Certain Portable Electronic Communication Devices, Including Mobile Phones and Components Thereof*, Inv. No. 337-TA-885, Order No. 5 (finding Google established that it has a substantial interest due to the alleged infringement of HTC devices that run Google products or services); *Certain Electronic Devices, Including Mobile Phones and Tablet Computers, and Components Thereof*, Inv. No. 337-TA-847, Order No. 3 (Aug. 3, 2012) (finding Google established that it has a substantial interest because “proprietary Android applications developed by Google and imbedded [*sic*] in the accused HTC devices form the basis of Nokia’s infringement allegations”); *see also, Ancora Tech., Inc. v. Toshiba Am. Info. Sys., Inc.*, 2008 WL 4326788 at \*1 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 22, 2008) (granting motion to intervene where “[a]pplicant has a significantly protectable interest because the Defendants are important OEM customers who make and sell computer products equipped with Applicant’s software, and Plaintiff alleges patent infringement based on the Defendants’ use of

# 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.