

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ADVANCED MICRO DEVICES, INC., RENESAS ELECTRONICS CORPORATION, RENESAS ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., GLOBALFOUNDRIES U.S., INC., GLOBALFOUNDRIES DRESDEN MODULE ONE LLC & CO. KG, GLOBALFOUNDRIES DRESDEN MODULE TWO LLC & CO. KG, TOSHIBA AMERICA ELECTRONIC COMPONENTS, INC., TOSHIBA AMERICA INC., TOSHIBA AMERICA INFORMATION SYSTEMS, INC., AND TOSHIBA CORPORATION,
Petitioners,

v.

ZOND, LLC,
Patent Owner

Case IPR2014-01037
Patent 7,811,421 B2

Before KEVIN F. TURNER, DEBRA K. STEPHENS, JONI Y. CHANG, SUSAN L.C. MITCHELL, and JENNIFER M. MEYER,
Administrative Patent Judges.

STEPHENS, *Administrative Patent Judge.*

DECISION
Granting Revised Motion for Joinder
37 C.F.R. § 42.122

INTRODUCTION

On June 30, 2014, Advanced Micro Devices, Inc., Renesas Electronics Corporation, Renesas Electronics America, Inc., GLOBALFOUNDRIES U.S., Inc., GLOBALFOUNDRIES Dresden Module One LLC & Co. KG, GLOBALFOUNDRIES Dresden Module Two LLC & Co. KG, Toshiba America Electronic Components, Inc., Toshiba America Inc., Toshiba America Information Systems, Inc., and Toshiba Corporation (collectively, “AMD”) filed a Petition requesting an *inter partes* review of claims 1, 2, 8, 10–13, 15–17, 22–25, 27–30, 33, 34, 38, 39, 42, 43, and 46–48 (“the challenged claims”) of U.S. Patent No. 7,811,421 B2 (“the ’421 patent”). Paper 2 (“Pet.”). Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.122(b), AMD also filed a revised Motion for Joinder, seeking to join the instant proceeding with *Taiwan Semiconductor Manuf. Co., Ltd. v. Zond, LLC.*, Case IPR2014-00800 (PTAB) (“IPR2014-00800”). Paper 9 (“Mot.”).

Taiwan Semiconductor Manufacturing Company, Ltd. and TSMC North America Corporation (collectively, “TSMC”), Fujitsu Semiconductor Limited and Fujitsu Semiconductor America, Inc. (collectively, “Fujitsu”), and The Gillette Company (“Gillette”), the First, Second, and Third Petitioners in IPR2014-00800, do not oppose AMD’s revised Motion for Joinder. Mot. 1, 5–6. Patent Owner, Zond, LLC (“Zond”), filed a Preliminary Response to the Petition (Paper 7, “Prelim. Resp.”) and an Opposition to AMD’s revised Motion for Joinder (Paper 10, “Opp.”). In a separate decision, entered concurrently, we institute an *inter partes* review as to the same claims on the same grounds of unpatentability for which we instituted trial in IPR2014-00800. For the reasons set forth below, AMD’s revised Motion for Joinder is *granted*.

ANALYSIS

The Leahy-Smith America Invents Act, Pub. L. No. 112-29, 125 Stat. 284 (2011) (“AIA”) permits joinder of like review proceedings. The Board, acting on behalf of the Director, has the discretion to join an *inter partes* review with another *inter partes* review. 35 U.S.C. § 315.

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.

Joinder may be authorized when warranted, but the decision to grant joinder is discretionary. 35 U.S.C. § 315(c); 37 C.F.R. § 42.122. When exercising its discretion, the Board is mindful that patent trial regulations, including the rules for joinder, must be construed to secure the just, speedy, and inexpensive resolution of every proceeding. *See* 35 U.S.C. § 316(b); 37 C.F.R. § 42.1(b). The Board considers the impact of both substantive issues and procedural matters on the proceedings.

As the moving party, AMD bears the burden to show that joinder is appropriate. 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.20(c), 42.122(b). In its revised Motion for Joinder, AMD contends that joinder, in this particular situation, is appropriate because: (1) “it is the most expedient way to secure the just, speedy, and inexpensive resolution of the related proceedings” (Mot. 6); (2) AMD’s Petition is substantively identical to TSMC’s Petition filed in

IPR2014-00800 (*id.* at 6–7); (3) AMD agrees to consolidated filings and discovery (*id.* at 7–8); (4) joinder would not affect the schedule in IPR2014-00800 (*id.* at 8); (5) joinder would streamline the proceedings, reduce the costs and burdens on the parties, and increase efficiencies for the Board without any prejudice to Zond (*id.* at 9).

We agree that the substantive issues in IPR2014-00800 would not be affected by joinder, because AMD’s Petition is substantively identical to TSMC’s Petition filed in IPR2014-00800. Notably, AMD’s Petition asserts identical grounds of unpatentability, challenging the same claims of the ’421 patent. *Compare* Pet. 14–59, *with* IPR2014-00800, Paper 1 (“’800 Pet.”), 14–59. AMD also submits identical claim constructions, as well as the same Declaration of Dr. Uwe Kortshagen. *Compare* Pet. 12–14, *with* ’800 Pet. 11–14; *compare* Ex. 1002, *with* ’800, Ex. 1002. Moreover, we institute the instant trial based on the same grounds for which we instituted trial in IPR2014-00800. Therefore, AMD’s Petition raises no new issues beyond those already before us in IPR2014-00800.

In its Opposition, Zond indicates that it is *not opposed to joinder*. Opp. 1. Rather, Zond proposes a procedure for the joined proceeding to consolidate the schedule, filings, and discovery of ALL joined parties. Opp. 1.

We agree with the parties that conducting a single joined proceeding for reviewing claims 1, 2, 8, 10–13, 15–17, 22–25, 27–30, 33, 34, 38, 39, 42, 43, and 46–48 of the ’421 patent is more efficient than conducting multiple proceedings, eliminating duplicate filings and discovery. AMD agrees to consolidated filings for all substantive papers. Mot. 7–8. AMD indicates that it will not file any paper with arguments different from those advanced

by the consolidated filings, eliminating duplicate briefing. *Id.* AMD further agrees to consolidated discovery, as each Petitioner proffers the same Declaration of Dr. Kortshagen. *Id.* AMD indicates that Petitioners collectively will designate an attorney to conduct the cross-examination of any witnesses produced by Zond and the redirect of any witnesses produced by Petitioners, within the timeframe normally allotted by the rules for one party. *Id.* Moreover, joinder will not require any change to the trial schedule in IPR2014-00800, allowing the trial still to be completed within one year. *Id.* at 8. Given that AMD's Petition raises no new issues, and Petitioners agree to consolidated filings and discovery, the impact of joinder on IPR2014-00800 will be minimal, and joinder will streamline the proceedings, reducing the costs and burdens on the parties and the Board.

For the foregoing reasons, AMD has met its burden of demonstrating that joinder of the instant proceeding with IPR2014-00800 is warranted under the circumstances.

ORDER

In consideration of the foregoing, it is hereby:

ORDERED that AMD's Motion for Joinder with IPR2014-00800 is *granted*;

FURTHER ORDERED that the instant proceeding is joined with IPR2014-00800;

FURTHER ORDERED that the grounds of unpatentability on which a trial was instituted in IPR2014-00800 are unchanged;

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.