

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ZHONGSHAN BROAD OCEAN MOTOR CO., LTD.;
BROAD OCEAN MOTOR LLC; and
BROAD OCEAN TECHNOLOGIES, LLC

Petitioners

v.

NIDEC MOTOR CORPORATION

Patent Owner

U.S. Patent No. 7,626,349

Issue Date: December 1, 2009

Title: LOW NOISE HEATING, VENTILATING AND/OR
AIR CONDITIONING (HVAC) SYSTEMS

**PETITIONER'S MOTION FOR REHEARING
PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. §42.71(d)**

Case No. IPR2015-00762

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF RELIEF REQUESTED	1
II.	LEGAL STANDARDS	3
III.	BASIS FOR RELIEF REQUEST	4
	A. The Board’s Decision Is Contrary To The Consistent Interpretation Of 35 U.S.C. §315(c) Sought To Be Maintained By The Patent Office	4
	B. Petitioner’s Second Petition Complied With 35 U.S.C. §§311 & 312(a)(3)(B)	8
	C. The Board Should Exercise Its Discretion And Grant The Joinder Motion	10
IV.	REQUEST FOR EXPANDED PANEL ON REHEARING	11
V.	CONCLUSION	13

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>ABB Inc. v. Roy-G-Biv Corp.</i> , IPR2013-00288	5
<i>Ariosa Diagnostics v. Isis Innovation Ltd.</i> , IPR2012-00022	4
<i>Chevron, U.S.A., Inc. v. Natural Res. Def. Council, Inc.</i> , 467 U.S. 837 (1984)	7
<i>Lacavera v. Dudas</i> , 441 F.3d 1380 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	4, 8
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Proxyconn, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00109	4
<i>Samsung Elecs. Co. v. Virginia Innovation Scis., Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00557	4
<i>Skyhawk Technologies, LLC v. L&G Concepts, LLC</i> , Case IPR2014-01485 (PTAB Mar. 20, 2015)	3, 7, 8, 12
<i>Sony Corp. v. Yissum Research Dev. Co.</i> , IPR2013-00327	5
<i>Target Corp. v. Destiny Maternity Corp.</i> , IPR2014-00508	passim
<i>Volkswagen v. EmeraChem</i> , IPR2014-01555	9
<i>Yissum Research Dev. Corp. v. Sony Corp.</i> , Appeal No. 2015-1342	2
<i>Zhongshan Broad Ocean v. Nidec Motor</i> , IPR2014-01121	1

Statutes

35 U.S.C. §311	8
35 U.S.C. §312(a)(3)(B)	8, 9
35 U.S.C. §314(d)	12
35 U.S.C. §315(b)	8, 9
35 U.S.C. §315(c)	passim

Other Authorities

PTAB Std. Oprt'g Proc. 1 §III(A)(2) (Rev. 14, May 8, 2015)	12
--	----

Regulations

37 C.F.R. §42.101(b)	8
37 C.F.R. §42.122(b)	1, 8, 9
37 C.F.R. §42.63(b)	9
37 C.F.R. §42.71(d)	1, 4

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §42.71(d), the Petitioner, Zhongshan Broad Ocean Motor Co., Ltd. et al. (“Petitioner”), requests rehearing of the Decision (Paper 12) denying Petitioner’s Motion for Joinder and the resulting denial of the institution of an *inter partes* review of U.S. Patent No. 7,626,349 (“the ‘349 patent”) based on the sole ground raised in the Second Petition.

I. INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF RELIEF REQUESTED

In the copending *Zhongshan Broad Ocean v. Nidec Motor*, IPR2014-01121, on January 21, 2015, the Board declined to institute an *inter partes* review of claims 1-3, 8-9, 12, 16 and 19 of the ‘349 patent under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) based on Hideji Japanese Patent Publication JP 2003-348885 (“Hideji”) due to a lack of an affidavit attesting to the accuracy of the filed English translation thereof, but did institute an *inter partes* review of those same claims under §103 based on Bessler and Kocybik. See IPR2014-01121, Paper 20 (Decision) at pp. 13 & 17. Within one month of that Decision, on February 20, 2015, Petitioner timely filed the subject Second Petition for *inter partes* review (IPR2015-00762) and an accompanying motion for joinder with IPR2014-01121. See 35 U.S.C. §315(c); 37 C.F.R. §42.122(b). The Board concluded that there is a reasonable likelihood that claims 1-3, 8, 9, 12, 16 and 19 are anticipated by Hideji. See Decision (Paper 12) at p. 11. Nevertheless, the Board denied Petitioner’s motion for joinder because the Board narrowly interpreted the phrase “join as a party” in 35 U.S.C.

§315(c) to exclude a person who is already a party in the previously instituted IPR. See Decision (Paper 12) at pp. 12-13. Consequently, the Second Petition was denied and no *inter partes* review was instituted. See Decision (Paper 12) at p. 15.

On June 25, 2015, after Petitioner filed its Reply in support of its motion for joinder (Paper 11) but before the Board’s July 20, 2015 Decision (Paper 12), the Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office (“Patent Office”) filed an Intervenor’s Brief with the Federal Circuit in *Yissum Research Dev. Corp. v. Sony Corp.*, Appeal No. 2015-1342, which is attached hereto as Attachment A. In its Intervenor Brief, the Patent Office told the Federal Circuit that “the Board has consistently held [that] it has the discretion to join IPR proceedings, even if §315(b) would otherwise bar the later-filed petition, and ***even if the petitions are filed by the same party.***” Attachment A at p. 18 (emphasis added). More importantly, the Patent Office further told the Federal Circuit that by the *Target* Decision Granting Petitioner’s Request for Rehearing (by expanded panel), “[t]he USPTO thus has acted to ensure that its pronouncements remain consistent on this issue, which is the antithesis of Yissum’s suggestion that the USPTO ‘can’t make up its mind about the proper interpretation’ of §315(c).” Attachment A at p. 20 (quoting Appellant’s Br. at 33 (citing *Skyhawk*)). Lastly, in a footnote, the Patent Office distinguished the *SkyHawke* Decision which was also cited by the Board in the subject Decision (paper 12 at p. 12):

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.