

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

RPX CORPORATION,  
Petitioner

v.

APPLICATIONS IN INTERNET TIME LLC,  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2015-01750  
US Patent No. 8,484,111

Case IPR2015-01751  
Case IPR2015-01752  
Patent 7,356,482 B2<sup>1</sup>

---

---

PATENT OWNER'S OPPOSITION:

THE PETITIONS WERE TIME BARRED

PURSUANT TO 35 U.S.C. § 315(b)

---

<sup>1</sup> This paper addresses issues common to all three cases. As required by the Board's December 7, 2018 order in each, the word-for-word identical paper is filed in each proceeding identified in the heading.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION .....	1
II.	LEGAL STANDARDS .....	3
	A. The Flexible Test for RPI.....	3
	B. Privity is a Broad Concept .....	4
	C. The Onus is on RPX.....	6
	D. Attorney Argument is not Evidence.....	7
III.	SALESFORCE IS A REAL PARTY IN INTEREST.....	8
	A. Salesforce is a clear beneficiary in these proceedings .....	8
	B. Salesforce had “a preexisting, established relationship with the petitioner” at the time of filing.....	14
	C. Salesforce Acquiesced in RPX Filing and Pursuing these IPRs .....	17
	D. RPX has an “IPR Practice” in which it Acts on Behalf of its Clients .....	26
	E. RPX is an Incorporated Association that is Not the RPI, but Rather its Members .....	28
	F. Compare this Case to <i>Taylor v Sturgell</i> .....	28
	G. Chuang and Chiang Provide Attorney Argument, Not Facts, and their Testimony is Unreliable.....	31
	H. Overlapping Board Member is an Unusual Relationship .....	34
IV.	SALESFORCE AND RPX ARE IN PRIVITY .....	35
	A. RPX is a Proxy for Salesforce.....	35
	B. RPX is Merely the Attorney-In-Fact or Agent of Salesforce .....	37
	C. RPX should be Precluded from Relitigating Validity on behalf of Salesforce .....	38
	D. The Facts Here are Stronger than in <i>Ventex v. Columbia     Sportswear</i> .....	39

V. Conclusion ..... 41

## Cases

<i>Applications in Internet Time, LLC v. RPX Corp.</i> , 897 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2018) .....	3-4, 8-11, 13-15, 17, 18, 27-28, 30-31, 33, 35-36
<i>ARRIS Int'l PLC v. Chanbond, LLC</i> , IPR2018-00570, (PTAB July 20, 2018) .....	5
<i>Icon Health &amp; Fitness, Inc. v. Strava, Inc.</i> , 849 F.3d 1034 (Fed. Cir. 2017) .....	7
<i>McAbee Const., Inc. v. US</i> , 97 F. 3d 1431 (Fed. Cir. 1996) .....	16
<i>Pfeil v. Rogers</i> , 757 F.2d 850 (7 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1985).....	7
<i>RPX Corp., v. Applications in Internet Time, LLC</i> , Case No. 18-1075 (Supreme Court, March 18, 2019).....	8
<i>State Comp. Ins. Fund v. Drobot</i> , 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 184792 (C.D. Cal. 2016) .....	7
<i>State v. Franklin</i> , 2002-Ohio-2370, 2002 Ohio App. LEXIS 2375 (Court of Appeals Ohio, 2 <sup>nd</sup> App. Dist. 2002).....	7
<i>Taylor v. Sturgell</i> , 553 U.S. 880 (2008).....	4, 28-30
<i>Ventex Co., Ltd. v. Columbia Sportswear North America, Inc.</i> Cases IPR2017-00651 (January 24, 2019).....	38-40
<i>Ventex Co., Ltd. v. Columbia Sportswear North America, Inc.</i> Cases IPR2017-00789 (January 24, 2019).....	6, 39-40
<i>WesternGeco LLC v. ION Geophysical Corp.</i> , 889 F.3d 1308 (Fed. Cir. 2018) .....	4, 35
<i>Worlds Inc. v. Bungie, Inc.</i> , 903 F.3d 1237 (Fed. Cir. 2018) .....	6, 7, 32
<i>Zoll Lifecor Corp. v. Philips Elec. N. Am. Corp.</i> , Case IPR2013-00609 .....	4

...

## Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(2).....	6, 7
35 U.S.C. § 315(b) .....	1, 4-6, 39, 41
37 C.F.R. §§ 42.71(a), 42.72.....	39

## Other Authorities

157 Cong. Rec. S1376 (Mar. 8, 2011) .....	5
18A Charles Alan Wright, Arthur R. Miller, & Edward H. Cooper, Federal Practice & Procedure § 4453 (2d ed. 2018).....	6, 18, 28, 37, 38
Office Patent Trial Practice Guide (“TPG”), 77 Fed. Reg. 48,756, 48,759 (Aug. 14, 2012).....	4, 5
Restatement (Third) of Agency, § 1.01 cmt. c (Am. Law Inst. 2006).....	37

# 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.