

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
Patent No. 8,484,111 B2

Case IPR2015-01751
Case IPR2015-01752
Patent 7,356,482 B2¹

PETITIONER'S REPLY BRIEF

¹ The word-for-word identical paper is filed in each proceeding identified in the heading.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
A.	The Undisputed Facts Establish Salesforce Is Neither an RPI Nor RPX’s Privy	1
B.	AIT Misstates the Law on RPI	3
C.	AIT Misstates the Law on Privity	4
D.	AIT Makes Repeated Blatant Misrepresentations.....	5
II.	THE EVIDENCE ESTABLISHES SALESFORCE IS NOT AN RPI OR RPX’S PRIVY	7
A.	Undisputed Facts	7
1.	RPX’s Business Model.....	7
2.	RPX/Salesforce Relationship	7
3.	RPX’s Reasons for Filing These IPRs	8
B.	Disputed Facts	9
1.	RPX’s Services to Salesforce Do Not Include IPRs	9
2.	Salesforce Never Authorized RPX To Pursue IPRs for Salesforce	12
3.	RPX Did Not File These IPRs To Benefit Salesforce	14
4.	Mr. Robertson’s Board Memberships Are Irrelevant	16
III.	AIT’S ATTACKS ON RPX’S WITNESSES ARE BASELESS.....	16
IV.	AIT’S ANALOGIES TO <i>VENTEX</i> FAIL	18
V.	SALESFORCE IS NOT AN RPI	19
A.	“Benefits-Plus-Relationship” Is Not the Law	19
1.	AIT Ignores Contrary Authority	19
2.	AIT Ignores the Federal Circuit’s Instruction That the Board Probe Whether RPX Was Representing Salesforce’s Interests	20
3.	AIT Ignores RPX’s Showing That RPX Is Not Representing Salesforce’s Interests.....	23
B.	AIT Misreads Wright & Miller § 1552	24
C.	AIT’s Acquiescence Theory Fails.....	24

VI. RPX IS NOT IN PRIVACY WITH SALESFORCE IN THESE IPRS.....	24
A. RPX Is Not Salesforce’s Proxy	25
1. RPX Is Not Salesforce’s Attorney-In-Fact or Agent	27
2. AIT’s Acquiescence Theory Fails.....	28
B. RPX’s Contractual Relationship with Salesforce Does Not Establish Privacy.....	30
C. AIT’s Amorphous Privacy Test Is Contrary to Law	33

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

<i>Applications in Internet Time, LLC v. RPX Corp.</i> , 897 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2018) (“AIT”).....	passim
<i>ARRIS Int’l PLC v. ChanBond, LLC</i> , IPR2018-00570, Paper 21 (PTAB July 20, 2018) (“ARRIS”).....	32
<i>Google LLC v. Seven Networks, LLC</i> , IPR2018-01051, Paper 28 (PTAB Jan. 14, 2019) (“Google v. Seven Networks”).....	13
<i>Hybrigenics SA. v. Forma Therapeutics, Inc.</i> , PGR2018-00098, Paper 10 (PTAB Mar. 20, 2019)	19
<i>Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc.</i> , 52 F.3d 967 (Fed. Cir. 1995), <i>aff’d</i> , 517 U.S. 370 (1996)	31
<i>O’Neill v. Dep’t of Hous. & Urban Dev.</i> , 220 F.3d 1354 (Fed. Cir. 2000) (“O’Neil”).....	27
<i>Pac. Gas & Elec. Co. v. United States</i> , 838 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2016) (“Pac. Gas”).....	27
<i>Puzhen Life USA, LLC v. ESIP Series 2, LLC</i> , IPR2017-02197, Paper 24 (PTAB Feb. 27, 2019)	29
<i>Taylor v. Sturgell</i> , 553 U.S. 880 (2008) (“Taylor”)	passim
<i>Unified Patents Inc. v. Barkan Wireless IP Holdings, L.P.</i> , IPR2018-01186, Paper 24 (PTAB Dec. 7, 2018) (“Barkan”).....	20, 22
<i>Ventex Co., Ltd. v. Columbia Sportswear North America, Inc.</i> , IPR2017-00651, Paper 148 (PTAB Jan. 24, 2019) (“Ventex”).....	18, 19
<i>WesternGeco LLC v. ION Geophysical Corp.</i> , 889 F.3d 1308 (Fed. Cir. 2018) (“WesternGeco”)	passim
<i>Wi-Fi One, LLC v. Broadcom Corporation</i> , 887 F.3d 1329 (Fed. Cir. 2018) (“Wi-Fi Remand”)	passim

Worlds Inc. v. Bungie, Inc.,
903 F.3d 1237 (Fed. Cir. 2018) (“*Worlds*”) 3, 29

OTHER AUTHORITIES

18A Charles Alan Wright, Arthur R. Miller, & Edward H. Cooper,
Federal Practice & Procedure (2d ed. 2018)
 (“Wright, Miller & Cooper”)..... 27, 29, 30

6A Charles Alan Wright, Arthur R. Miller, & Mary Kay Kane,
Federal Practice & Procedure (3d ed. 2018) (“Wright & Miller”) 24, 27

77 Fed. Reg. 48,756 (“TPG”)21

Black’s Law Dictionary (10th ed. 2014) 20, 25

Restatement (Third) of Agency (2006).....27

Restatement (Third) of Trusts § 48 (2003)20

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.