

Filed on behalf of Petitioners
By: Joseph J. Richetti
Kevin E. Paganini
Bryan Cave LLP
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10104
Tel: (212) 541-2000
Fax: (212) 541-4630

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

HYUNDAI MOTOR AMERICA, INC., HYUNDAI MOTOR COMPANY,
KIA MOTORS CORPORATION & KIA MOTORS AMERICA, INC.
Petitioners

v.

PAICE LLC &
ABELL FOUNDATION, INC.
Patent Owners

Case: To Be Assigned
U.S. Patent No. 7,104,347

**MOTION FOR JOINDER UNDER
35 U.S.C. 315(c) AND 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.22 AND 42.122(b)
TO *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF IPR2015-00794**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. STATEMENT OF PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED 1
- II. STATEMENT OF MATERIAL FACTS 2
- III. STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR RELIEF REQUESTED 3
 - A. Legal Standard 3
 - B. Petitioners’ Motion for Joinder is Timely 4
 - C. Each Factor Weighs in Favor of Joinder 4
 - 1. Joinder is Appropriate and Petitioners Present No New Grounds 4
 - 2. Joinder Will Not Negatively Impact the Ford IPR Trial Schedule 6
 - 3. Procedures to Simplify Briefing and Discovery 7
 - D. Joinder Will Not Prejudice the Parties to the Ford IPR 8
- IV. CONCLUSION 9

I. STATEMENT OF PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED

Hyundai Motor America, Inc., Hyundai Motor Company, Kia Motors Corporation and Kia Motors America, Inc. (“Petitioners”) respectfully submit this Motion for Joinder, together with a petition (the “Hyundai-Kia Petition”) for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 7,104,347 (the “347 patent”) filed contemporaneously herewith. Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 315(c) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.122(b), Petitioners request institution of an *inter partes* review and joinder with *inter partes* review in *Ford Motor Co. v. Paice LLC, et al.*, IPR2015-00794 (the “Ford IPR”), which was instituted on November 2, 2015 and concerns the same ‘347 patent. Petitioners timely filed the Hyundai-Kia Petition and this motion within one month of the institution of the Ford IPR. 37 C.F.R. § 42.122(b).

Joinder will efficiently resolve the challenges to the ‘347 patent in the Ford IPR, and will neither impact the substantive issues or schedule in that proceeding, nor prejudice the parties. Intentionally, the Hyundai-Kia Petition is narrowly tailored to the same grounds of unpatentability on which the Ford IPR was instituted, and relies on the same claims, prior art, arguments and evidence presented in Ford’s petition. Indeed, in an effort to avoid multiplication of issues before the Board, the Petition is nearly word-for-word identical to the challenges that are presented on the instituted grounds in the Ford IPR and it relies on the same supporting expert declaration. In addition, Petitioners explicitly agree to consolidated dis-

covery and briefing as described below, and are willing to accept a limited role allowing Ford's counsel to act as the lead counsel as long as Ford remains in the proceeding. Accordingly, Petitioners submit that joinder is appropriate because it will not prejudice the parties or impact the substantive issues and schedule in the Ford IPR, while efficiently resolving in a single proceeding the question of the '347 patent's validity based on the instituted grounds of the Ford IPR.

II. STATEMENT OF MATERIAL FACTS

1. The '347 patent is entitled "Hybrid Vehicles" and lists Alex J. Severinsky and Theodore Louckes as inventors. The '347 patent issued on September 12, 2006. Paice LLC and The Abell Foundation, Inc. (the "Patent Owners") are believed to be co-owners to all right, title, and interest in '347 patent.

2. On February 16, 2012, Patent Owners filed a civil action asserting the '347 patent, along with other patents, against Hyundai Motor America, Inc., Hyundai Motor Company, Kia Motors Corporation and Kia Motors America, Inc. in Civil Action No. 1:12-cv-00499. A jury trial was completed on October 1, 2015 in this action, and the parties are currently engaged in post-trial briefing.

3. On February 19, 2014, Patent Owners filed a civil action asserting the '347 patent, along with other patents, against Ford Motor Company ("Ford") in Civil Action No. 1:14-cv-00492.

4. On February 23, 2015, Ford filed a petition for *inter partes* review re-

questing cancellation of claims 23–30, 32, and 39–41 of the ‘347 patent (the “Ford Petition”), which was subsequently assigned Case No. IPR2015-00794.

5. On November 2, 2015, the Board instituted *inter partes* review in Case No. IPR2015-00794 finding that a reasonable likelihood existed that the Ford Petition would prevail in showing the unpatentability of all challenged claims of the ‘347 patent, with the exception of claim 24.

III. STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR RELIEF REQUESTED

A. Legal Standard

The Board has the authority under 35 U.S.C. § 315(c) to join a properly filed *inter partes* review petition to an instituted *inter partes* review proceeding. *See* 35 U.S.C. § 315(c). Any request for joinder must be filed no later than one month after the institution date of any *inter partes* review for which joinder is requested. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.122(b). In deciding whether to exercise its discretion, the Board considers factors including: (1) the reasons why joinder is appropriate; (2) whether the new petition presents any new grounds of unpatentability; (3) what impact, if any, joinder would have on the trial schedule for the existing review; and (4) how briefing and discovery may be simplified. *See Macronix Int’l Co. v. Span- sion*, IPR2014-00898, paper 13, at 4 (PTAB Aug. 13, 2014) (citing *Kyocera Cor- poration v. Softview LLC*, IPR2013-00004, Paper 15 at 4 (PTAB April 24, 2013)); *Perfect World Entertainment, Inc. v. Uniloc USA, Inc., et al.*, IPR2015-01026, pa-

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.