

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD. and
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.,
Petitioners,

v.

AFFINITY LABS OF TEXAS, LLC
Patent Owner

Case IPR2015-00821
Patent 8,532,641

Before the Honorable KEVIN F. TURNER, LYNNE E. PETTIGREW, and
JON B. TORNQUIST, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

**PETITIONERS' REPLY IN SUPPORT OF
THEIR MOTION FOR JOINDER
UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 315(c) AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.122(b)**

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
<i>Abb Inc. v. Roy-G-Biv Corp.</i> , Case IPR2013-00282, Paper 15 (Aug. 9, 2013)	2
<i>Amneal Pharms LLC v. Endo Pharms., Inc.</i> , Case IPR2014-01365, Paper 13 (Feb. 4, 2015)	2
<i>Ariosa Diagnostics v. Isis Innovation Ltd.</i> , Case IPR2012-00022, Paper 166 (Sept. 2, 2014)	2, 3, 4
<i>Ariosa Diagnostics v. Isis Innovation Ltd.</i> , Case IPR2013-00250, Paper 24 (Sept. 3, 2013)	2
<i>Butamax Advanced Biofuels LLC. v. Gevo, Inc.</i> , Case IPR2014-00581, Paper 8 (Oct. 14, 2014)	5
<i>Conopco, Inc. v. The Procter & Gamble Co.</i> , Case IPR2014-00628, Paper 21 at 11 (Oct. 20, 2014)	5
<i>Medtronic, Inc. v. Endotach LLC.</i> , Case IPR2014-00695, Paper 18 (Sept. 25, 2014)	5
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Proxyconn Inc.</i> , Case IPR2013-00109, Paper 15 (Feb. 25, 2013)	2
<i>Reloaded Games, Inc. v. Parallel Networks LLC.</i> , Case IPR2014-00950, Paper 12 (Oct. 22, 2014)	4-5
<i>Samsung Elecs. Co. v. Affinity Labs of Texas, LLC.</i> , Case IPR2014-00209, Paper 36 (Sept. 9, 2014)	1
<i>Samsung Elecs. Co. v. Affinity Labs of Texas, LLC.</i> , Case IPR2014-00407, Paper 27 (Sept. 9, 2014)	1
<i>Samsung Elecs. Co. v. Affinity Labs of Texas, LLC.</i> , Case IPR2014-00407, Paper 29 (Oct. 9, 2014)	5
<i>Samsung Elec. Co. v. Rembrandt Wireless Tech., Lp.</i> , Case IPR2015-00118, Paper 14 (Jan. 28, 2015)	4

Samsung Elecs. Co. v. Virginia Innovation Scis., Inc.,
Case IPR2014-00557, Paper 10 (June 13, 2014)2, 3

Skyhawk Techs. v. L&H Concepts,
Case IPR2014-01485, Paper 13 (Mar. 20, 2015) 1

Sony Corp. v. Yisum Research Dev. Co. of the Hebrew Univ. of Jerusalem,
Case IPR2013-00327, Paper 15 (Sept. 24, 2013)2

Standard Innovation Corp. v. Lelo, Inc.,
Case IPR2014-00907, Paper 10 (Dec. 1, 2014)5

Target Corp. v. Destination Maternity Corp.,
Case IPR2014-00508, Paper 18 (Sept. 25, 2014)1, 2

Target Corp. v. Destination Maternity Corp.,
Case IPR2014-00508, Paper 20 (Sept. 25, 2014)1, 2

Target Corp. v. Destination Maternity Corp.,
Case IPR2014-00508, Paper 28 (Feb. 12, 2015)1, 2

Target Corp. v. Destination Maternity Corp.,
Case IPR2014-00508, Paper 31 (Feb. 12, 2015) 1, 2, 4

Target Corp. v. Destination Maternity Corp.,
Case IPR2014-00508, Paper 32 (Feb. 12, 2015) 1, 2, 4

Unilever, Inc. v. The Procter & Gamble Company,
Case IPR2014-00506, Paper 17 (July 7, 2014)5

Zimmer Holdings, Inc. v. Bonutti Skeletal Innovations, LLC,
Case IPR2014-01080, Paper 17 (Oct. 31, 2014)4

ZTE Corp. v. Contentguard Holdings Inc.,
Case IPR2013-00454, Paper 13 (Sept. 25, 2013)4

STATUTES

35 U.S.C.
§ 315 (c).....1, 2
§ 316 (a)(11).....5

OTHER AUTHORITIES

37 C.F.R.
 § 42.100 (c).....5

H. R. Rep. No. 112-98, pt. 12

Final Rule, 77 Fed. Reg. 48,680 (Aug. 14, 2012)2

157 Cog. Rec. S 1376 (daily ed. Mar. 8, 2011)3

PO's Opposition (Pap. 8, "Opp.") fails to address the clear reasons for joinder here, and the Board should exercise its discretion to grant joinder.

I. ISSUE JOINDER IS PROPER

PO's *current* argument that "§ 315(c) does not permit a party to join a proceeding in which it is already a party" to allow for joinder of issues (Opp. 2) should be rejected, as it flies in the face of the statute, PO's *own prior admission* that issue joinder is appropriate, and the decisions of multiple Board panels—including the recent expanded panel decision on rehearing in IPR2014-508, Pap. 28 ("*Target II*")—that issue joinder under § 315(c) is entirely proper. *See also Target II*, Paps. 31, 32. Indeed, in related proceedings between the same parties before this Board, PO *consented* to Petitioners' motion for joinder under § 315(c), agreeing that issue joinder was proper there. *See* IPR2014-407, Pap. 18 at 1. The Board, granting joinder, exercised its discretion to "join and consolidate the proceedings in their entirety," finding that "[s]ubstantively, [the proceedings] involve[d] the same patent, the same claims, the same parties, and overlapping prior art references." *Id.*, Pap. 27; *see also* IPR2014-209, Pap. 36. The Board should again exercise its discretion to grant joinder here, where PO does not dispute these proceedings involve the same patent, parties, and counsel, the same expert for Petitioners, and a significant overlap in the asserted prior art.

While PO cites *Skyhawk Techs. v. L&H Concepts*, IPR2014-1485, Pap. 13 (Opp. 3), to suggest issue joinder is forbidden under § 315(c), that decision denied joinder *relying on the now-reversed Target I decision*. *See id.* (citing IPR2014-508, Paps. 18, 20, *rev'd on*

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.