

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

United States Patent No.: 8,532,641	§	Attorney Docket No.:
Inventors: Russell W. White,	§	110797-0004-659
Kevin R. Imes	§	Customer No. 28120
Formerly Application No.: 13/673,391	§	Petitioners:
Issue Date: Sept. 10, 2013	§	Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd.;
Filing Date: Nov. 9, 2012	§	Samsung Electronics America, Inc.
Priority Date: March 28, 2000	§	
	§	
Former Group Art Unit: 2646	§	
Former Examiner: Erika Washington	§	
	§	
	§	

For: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR MANAGING MEDIA

MAIL STOP PATENT BOARD  
Patent Trial and Appeal Board  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Post Office Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

**PETITIONERS' MOTION FOR JOINDER  
UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 315(c) AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.122(b) AND  
REQUEST FOR SHORTENED RESPONSE TIME FOR PATENT  
OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

## I. RELIEF REQUESTED

Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 315(c) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.122(b), Petitioners Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. and Samsung Electronics America, Inc. (“Petitioners”) hereby move for joinder of the limited grounds raised in its new Petition for *Inter Partes* Review (“IPR”) of United States Patent No. 8,532,641 (“the ‘641 patent”)—filed concurrently with this Motion—with the already-instituted IPR for the ‘641 patent, *Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. and Samsung Electronics America, Inc. v. Affinity Labs of Texas, LLC* (“*Affinity*”), IPR2014-01181, which involve the same patent, same parties, and overlapping prior art references.

In conjunction with this request for joinder, Petitioners respectfully request that the Board specify a shortened response period of six (6) weeks (until April 10, 2015) in which Patent Owner Affinity (“Patent Owner”) may file a Preliminary Response to the Petition.

## II. STATEMENT OF MATERIAL FACTS

1. On July 28, 2014, Petitioners filed a petition for *inter partes* review of the ‘641 patent for claims 1-3 and 5-14 based on the Ito reference in view of the Haartsen, Nokia, Rydbeck, and/or Galensky references. See IPR2014-01184, Paper 2.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> On July 28, 2014, Petitioners also filed two other petitions for *inter partes* review of the ‘641 patent challenging claims 1-3 and 5-14 (IPR2014-01182 and IPR2014-01184) based on different grounds and different prior art references. The Board instituted

2. On January 30, 2015 the Board instituted trial in that proceeding on claims 8 and 11-14. See IPR2014-01181, Paper 10 at 19.

3. The prior art relied on for the grounds instituted in IPR2014-01181 is Ito in view of Haartsen, Nokia, Rydbeck and/or Galensky. See IPR2014-01181, Paper 10 at 19.

4. The same patent, Petitioners, and Patent Owner are involved in the already-instituted IPR2014-01181 and the new Petition filed concurrently with this Motion, and it is Petitioners' understanding that the same counsel for each party from the already-instituted IPR will represent Petitioners and Patent Owner in the new Petition proceedings.

5. The new Petition challenges claims 1-3, 5-7, 9 and 10 ("Challenged Claims") on prior art grounds. Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9 and 10 were challenged in the earlier petition in IPR2014-01181 but were not instituted for trial. See IPR2014-01181, Paper 10 at 19.

---

for trial in IPR2014-01182, claims 1-3 and 5-14 (based on the primary prior art reference "Abecassis") and in IPR2014-01184, claims 8, 11, 13 and 14 (based on the primary prior art reference "Ohmura"). See IPR2014-01182, Paper 10 and IPR2014-001184, Paper 10. Petitioners are also concurrently filing a new Petition for *inter partes* review of claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-10 and 12 of the '641 patent based on the Hu reference.

6. In particular, the new Petition asserts grounds based on 35 U.S.C. § 103 for the Challenged Claims using the same primary prior art reference Ito in view of Nokia, Haartsen, Rydbeck, and/or Galensky, and further in view of new references, Ushiroda and Bork. Petitioners were not aware of the Ushiroda reference at the time the earlier IPR2014-01181 petition was filed, and instead located that reference only after the institution decision in IPR2014-01181.

7. Petitioners rely in their new Petition on a supporting declaration from the same expert who submitted a declaration in the already-instituted IPR2014-01181.

### **III. DISCUSSION**

The requested joinder will serve to secure the just, speedy, and inexpensive resolution of these proceedings. Under 35 U.S.C. § 315(c):

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.

In addition, 37 C.F.R. § 42.122(b) provides that:

Joinder may be requested by a patent owner or petitioner. Any request for joinder must be filed, as a motion under §42.22, no later than one month after the institution date of any inter partes review for which joinder is requested. The time period set forth in §42.101(b) shall not apply when the petition is accompanied by a request for joinder.

This Motion is timely under § 42.122(b) because Petitioners are filing it within one month after the January 30, 2015 institution date for IPR2014-01181.

The Board has further provided that a motion for joinder should: (1) set forth the reasons why joinder is appropriate; (2) identify any new grounds of unpatentability asserted in the petition; (3) explain what impact (if any) joinder would have on the trial schedule of the existing proceeding; and (4) address specifically how briefing and discovery may be simplified. *See, e.g., Kyocera Corp. v. Softview LLC*, IPR2013-00004, Paper 15 at 4 (Apr. 24, 2013). Analysis of these factors here warrants the Board's use of its discretion to grant the requested joinder.

The existence of several significant similarities between the already-instituted IPR2014-01181 and the new Petition supports application of joinder. The same patent, parties, and counsel are involved in both proceedings. The same expert for Petitioners is involved in both proceedings—and, presumably, Patent Owner may use a common expert in both proceedings. Patent Owner has already responded to, and the Board has already analyzed for institution, prior petitions challenging every claim now at issue in the new Petition, which contain overlapping subject matter with claims already instituted for trial. And Petitioners assert here overlapping prior art references as in the original petition for which trial has been instituted (IPR2014-01181).

Petitioners believed, in submitting their original petitions, that they had made the required showing to invalidate claims 1-3, 5-7, 9 and 10 of the '641 patent. In its January 30, 2015 Institution Decision, however, the Board determined that Petitioners

# 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.