

Paper No. _____

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

VERIZON SERVICES CORP. AND
VERIZON BUSINESS NETWORK SERVICES INC.
Petitioners

v.

STRAIGHT PATH IP GROUP, LLC
Patent Owner

Case IPR2015-01406
U.S. PATENT NO. 6,108,704
CLAIMS 1, 11-12, 14, 16, 19, 22-23, 27, and 30-31
Title: Point-to-Point Internet Protocol

PETITIONERS' MOTION FOR JOINDER UNDER
35 U.S.C. § 315(c) AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.22 AND § 42.122(b)

I. INTRODUCTION

Petitioners Verizon Services Corp. and Verizon Business Network Services Inc. submit the present Motion for Joinder pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.122(b), which authorizes the filing of a “motion under § 42.22, no later than one month after the institution date of any *inter partes* review for which joinder is requested.” 37 C.F.R. § 42.122(b). Petitioners submit that the present Motion for Joinder is timely filed because it is being filed no later than one month after institution of the *inter partes* review proceeding with which joinder is sought.

Petitioners hereby move for joinder of the present petition for *inter partes* review **IPR2015-01406** (the “PETITIONERS’ IPR”) with **IPR2015-00209** (the “LG IPR”), LG Electronics, Inc. (“LGE”), Toshiba Corp. (“Toshiba”), VIZIO, Inc. (“VIZIO”), and Hulu, LLC (“Hulu”) (collectively, “LG/Hulu”). The PETITIONERS’ IPR is identical to the LG IPR in all substantive respects, includes identical exhibits to the LG IPR, and relies upon the same expert declarant as the LG IPR. LG/Hulu does not oppose this motion, based on Petitioners’ and LG/Hulu’s agreement that LG/Hulu will continue to maintain the lead role in the proceedings so long as LG/Hulu are parties.

II. BACKGROUND AND RELATED PROCEEDINGS

The PETITIONERS’ IPR and the LG IPR are among a family of *inter partes* review proceedings relating to U.S. Patent Nos. 6,108,704 and 6,131,121 that have

been asserted by Straight Path IP Group, LLC (“Straight Path”) against numerous defendants.

The complaint in *Straight Path IP Group, Inc. v. Verizon Communications, Inc.*, Civ. No. 1:14-cv-07798 (S.D.N.Y.), was first served on October 2, 2014. Accordingly, all petitions for *inter partes* review that have been filed by Petitioners are timely as prescribed by 35 U.S.C. § 315(b). Further, neither Petitioner has filed a civil action challenging the validity of a claim of the ’704 patent.

Currently, the family of *inter partes* review proceedings relating to the above identified Straight Path patents consists of the following proceedings that involve Petitioners and LG/Hulu:

PETITIONERS’ IPRs			LG IPRs		
Patent	Reference	Filed	Reference	Filed	Claims in IPR
6,108,704	IPR2015-01406	6/15/2015	2015-00209	10/31/2014	1, 11-12, 14, 16, 19, 22-23, 27, 30-31
6,131,121	IPR2015-01407	6/15/2015	2015-00196	10/31/2014	3-4, 6-14

In addition to the present Motion for Joinder, Petitioners are presently filing Motions for Joinder for the other above-mentioned Petitioners’ petitions with the corresponding petitions filed by LG/Hulu, subject to the same conditions sought by this motion. LG/Hulu does not oppose the motions.

III. DISCUSSION

If the Director institutes an *inter partes* review, Petitioners respectfully requests that the Board exercise its discretion to grant joinder of the PETITIONERS' IPR and LG IPR proceedings pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 315(c), 37 C.F.R. § 42.22, and 37 C.F.R. § 42.122(b). In support of this motion, Petitioners propose consolidated filings and other procedural accommodations designed to streamline the proceedings.

1. Reasons Joinder Is Appropriate

Joinder is appropriate in this case because it is the most expedient way to secure the just, speedy, and inexpensive resolution of the related proceedings. *See* 35 U.S.C. § 316(b); 37 C.F.R. § 42.1(b). Intentionally, the PETITIONERS' IPR is substantively identical to the corresponding LG IPR in an effort to avoid multiplication of issues before the Board. Given the duplicative nature of these petitions, joinder of the related proceedings is appropriate. As discussed below, Petitioners will agree to consolidated filings and discovery, and procedural concessions, which LG/Hulu does not oppose and which do not prejudice Straight Path.

a. Substantively Identical Petitions

Petitioners represent that the PETITIONERS' IPR is identical to the LG IPR in all substantive respects. It includes identical grounds, analysis, and exhibits, and relies upon the same expert declarant and declaration as the LG IPR. The only

differences are in the introduction section, to identify the correct set of Petitioners, and in the mandatory notices section. Accordingly, if instituted, maintaining the PETITIONERS' IPR proceeding separate from that of the LG IPR would entail needless duplication of effort.

b. Consolidated Filings and Discovery

Because the grounds of unpatentability in the PETITIONERS' IPR and LG IPR are the same, the case is amenable to consolidated filings. Petitioners will agree to consolidated filings for all substantive papers in the proceeding (*e.g.*, Reply to the Patent Owner's Response, Opposition to Motion to Amend, Motion for Observation on Cross Examination Testimony of a Reply Witness, Motion to Exclude Evidence, Opposition to Motion to Exclude Evidence and Reply). Specifically, Petitioners will agree to incorporate its filings with those of LG/Hulu in a consolidated filing, subject to the ordinary rules for one party on page limits. LG/Hulu and Petitioners will be jointly responsible for the consolidated filings.

Petitioners agree not to advance any arguments separate from those advanced by Petitioner and LG/Hulu in the consolidated filings. These limitations avoid lengthy and duplicative briefing. Petitioners also agree that, so long as LG/Hulu are parties, LG/Hulu will maintain the lead role in the proceedings.

Consolidated discovery is also appropriate given that Petitioners and LG/Hulu are using the same expert declarant who has submitted the same, identical

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.