

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

CIENA CORPORATION

CORIAN T OPERATIONS, INC., and

CORIAN T (USA) INC.,

Petitioner v.

CAPELLA PHOTONICS, INC.

Patent Owner

---

*Inter Partes* Review Case No. Unassigned  
Patent No. RE42,678

---

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

Mail Stop Patent Board Patent  
Trial and Appeal Board  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**I. STATEMENT OF PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED**

Coriant Operations, Inc. (“COI”), Coriant (USA) Inc. (“CUSA”), and Ciena Corporation (“Ciena”) (collectively, “Petitioner”) submit this Motion for Joinder concurrently with a Petition for *Inter Partes* Review (IPR) of U.S. Patent No. RE42,678 (“the ‘678 Patent”) (“Petition”) under 35 U.S.C. § 315(c) and 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.22 and 42.122(b), of claims 1-4, 9, 10, 13, 17, 19-23, 27, 29, 44-46, 53 and 61-65 of U.S. Patent No. RE42,678 (Ex. 1001).

Petitioner requests institution of IPR and party joinder with the pending, instituted IPR titled, *Fujitsu Network Communications, Inc. v. Capella Photonics, Inc.*, Case No. IPR2015-00727 (“the FNC IPR”), based on identical grounds that form the basis for a pending, instituted IPR proceeding. FNC initiated its proceeding by petitioning the Board on February 12, 2015; the Board instituted the FNC IPR on August 24, 2015. Petitioner timely filed this Petition and this motion within one month of the institution of the FNC IPR. 37 C.F.R. § 42.122(b).

Joinder will efficiently resolve the challenges presented in the Petition and the instituted grounds of the FNC IPR and will not prejudice the patent owner or the first-petitioner FNC. Intentionally, the Petition is nearly word-for-word identical to the petition in the FNC IPR for the instituted grounds in an effort to avoid multiplication of issues before the Board.<sup>1</sup> Further, the expert declaration

---

<sup>1</sup> The only differences between the FNC IPR Petition and this Petition are shown

submitted with the Petition is from the same declarant and is essentially identical to the declaration submitted in the FNC IPR.<sup>2</sup>

Should the panel join the parties, Petitioner agrees to subordinate itself, allowing FNC to lead the joined proceedings absent settlement by FNC, in line with common Board practice. Joinder with the FNC IPR would minimally affect its procedure and substance. FNC has stated to Petitioner that it does not oppose joinder.

## II. BACKGROUND AND RELATED PROCEEDINGS

The '678 patent is assigned on its face to Capella Photonics, Inc. (“Capella” or “Patent Owner”). Capella asserted the '678 patent against Petitioner (Ciena Corporation, Coriant Operations, Inc. (formerly Tellabs Operations, Inc.), and Coriant (USA) Inc.), Fujitsu Network Communications, Inc., (FNC), Cisco, and other parties in S.D. Fla.: *Capella Photonics, Inc. v. FNC Systems, Inc.*, filed February 12, 2014 as 1:14-cv-20529 (transferred July 24, 2014 to N.D. Cal. as 3:14-cv-03348), *Capella Photonics, Inc. v. Fujitsu Network Communications, Inc.*, filed February 12, 2014 as 1:14-cv-20531 (transferred July 24, 2014 to N.D. Cal.

---

in redline in Ex. 1037.

<sup>2</sup> The only differences between the declaration supporting FNC’s IPR Petition and the declaration supporting this Petition are shown in redline in Ex. 1038.

Motion for Joinder  
U.S. Reissue Patent No. 42,678

as 3:14-cv-03349) , *Capella Photonics, Inc. v. Tellabs, Inc. et al.*, filed February 12, 2014 as 0:14-cv-60350 (transferred July 24, 2014 to N.D. Cal. as 3:14-cv-03350), *Capella Photonics, Inc. v. Ciena Corporation et al.*, filed February 12, 2014 as 1:14-cv-20530 (transferred July 24, 2014 to N.D. Cal. as 5:14-cv-03351), *Capella Photonics, Inc. v. Columbus Networks USA, Inc.*, filed July 15, 2014 as 0:14-cv-61629 (stayed), and *Capella Photonics, Inc. v. Telefonica International Wholesale Services USA, Inc.*, filed July 21, 2014 as 1:14-cv-22701. Each district court case is currently stayed. The '678 patent is currently being challenged by FNC in IPR2014-00727, as noted above, and by various parties including parties of Petitioner in IPR2014-01276, IPR2015-00894 (joined with IPR2014-01276), and IPR2014-00739.

### **III. STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR RELIEF REQUESTED**

#### **A. Legal Standard**

The Leahy–Smith America Invents Act (AIA) allows an IPR party to be joined with a preexisting IPR. See generally Pub. L. No. 112-29, 125 Stat. 284 (2011). The statutory provision governing IPR joinder, 35 U.S.C. § 315(c), reads:

(c) JOINDER.--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.

Under its discretion, the Board considers how joinder will affect the substance and procedure of the preexisting proceeding. *See, e.g.*, Decision on Motion for Joinder, *Motorola Mobility LLC v. Softview LLC*, IPR2013-00257, Paper 10 (P.T.A.B. June 20, 2013). In its response to comments on the Board’s proposed joinder rule, 37 C.F.R. § 42.122, the PTO indicated that “joinder would allow the Office to consolidate issues and to account for timing issues that may arise” when instituting multiple proceedings involving the same patent. Changes to Implement Inter Partes Review Proceedings, 77 Fed. Reg. 48,680, 48,707 (Aug. 14, 2012). Here, joining Petitioner to the FNC IPR is appropriate.

**B. Joinder will not affect the Board’s ability to timely complete the review.**

Intentionally, the Petition is identical to the petition in the FNC IPR for the instituted grounds in an effort to avoid multiplication of issues. For simplicity and efficiency, Petitioner has copied FNC’s IPR petition. Petitioner does not seek to reintroduce grounds or combinations of prior art, or claims not instituted in the FNC IPR and seeks only to join the proceeding as instituted. Petitioner is retaining the same expert as FNC, Dr. Timothy Drabik. The supporting declaration of Dr. Drabik is essentially identical to the declaration he previously submitted in the

# 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.