

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

AMX LLC,
Petitioner,

v.

CHRIMAR SYSTEMS, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2016-00573 (Patent 9,019,838)

**PETITIONER'S OPPOSITION TO
PATENT OWNER'S MOTION FOR ADDITIONAL DISCOVERY**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	The Requested Discovery Is Futile and Not in the Interest of Justice	2
A.	<i>Garmin</i> Factor 1: Chrimar Offers Nothing More Than Speculation That Something Useful Will Be Discovered.....	3
B.	<i>Garmin</i> Factor 3: Patent Owner Has the Ability to Obtain the Information by Other Means	8
C.	<i>Garmin</i> Factor 5: Chrimar’s Requested Discovery is Overly Burdensome.....	9
III.	Conclusion	10

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Apple Inc. v. Achates Reference Publ'g, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00080, Paper 18 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 3, 2013)	1
<i>Broadcom Corp. v. Telefonaktiebolaget LM Ericsson (PUBL)</i> , IPR2013-00601, Paper 23 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 24, 2014)	5
<i>CaptionCall, L.L.C. v. Ultratec, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00636, Paper 42 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 23, 2016).....	8
<i>Garmin Int'l, Inc. v. Cuozzo Speed Techs. LLC</i> , IPR2012-00001, Paper 26 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 5, 2013).....	3
<i>Wavemarket Inc. v. Locationet Sys. Ltd.</i> , IPR2014-00199, Paper 34 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 11, 2014).....	5, 6, 7, 10

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 316(a)(5).....	1
----------------------------	---

Other Authorities

Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48756 (Aug. 14, 2012)	3, 7
---	------

Rules

37 C.F.R. § 42.51(b)(2)(i).....	1
---------------------------------	---

I. Introduction

Chrimar's Motion for Additional Discovery should be denied because (1) Petitioner AMX is not in privity with Hewlett-Packard Co. ("HP"), Cisco Systems, Inc. ("Cisco"), Ruckus Wireless ("Ruckus") and/or any other third-parties, and (2) Chrimar has not demonstrated that the requested additional discovery is "necessary in the interest of justice." 35 U.S.C. § 316(a)(5); 37 C.F.R. § 42.51(b)(2)(i).

Discovery in *inter partes* review ("IPR") is "less than what is normally available in district court patent litigation" because "Congress intended *inter partes* review to be a quick and cost effective alternative to litigation." *Apple Inc. v. Achates Reference Publ'g, Inc.*, IPR2013-00080, Paper 18 at 3 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 3, 2013). The Board must therefore be "conservative in authorizing additional discovery." *Id.* Additional discovery, like that requested in Chrimar's Motion, should only be permitted where such discovery is "necessary in the interest of justice." *Id.* at 4. And the necessity for discovery must be premised on more than speculation or a "mere possibility." *Id.* There must be "factual evidence or support" underlying a request for additional discovery that demonstrates "something useful [to the proceeding] will be found." *Id.* Chrimar fails to satisfy this standard and the Board should reject Chrimar's Motion.

II. The Requested Discovery Is Futile and Not in the Interest of Justice

AMX does not have any information responsive to proposed Interrogatory Nos. 2-6 or Document Request Nos. 2 and 4. (*See Ex. 2002*). AMX and its parent company Harman International Industries have not taken any “steps or actions” to prevent third-parties from being named real parties-in-interest (Interrogatory No. 2). Similarly, there are no third-parties who have contributed monetarily to, have the right to control aspects of, or have received updates about the IPR proceedings (Interrogatory Nos. 3-4, 6). In addition, there are no third-parties for which AMX has the right to control activities in litigation (Interrogatory No. 5). Finally, there are no agreements or other documents with third parties relating to the IPR proceedings (Document Request Nos. 2 and 4). As a result, no information of documents exist that are responsive to Interrogatory Nos. 2-6 or Document Request Nos. 2 and 4.

The remaining discovery requests relate to indemnification agreements (Interrogatory No. 1 and Document Request No. 1) and joint defense agreements (Document Request No. 3). (*See Ex. 2002*). As set forth below, Chrimar has failed to establish, beyond mere speculation, that the requested discovery will contain any useful information. Moreover, the requested discovery is overly burdensome.

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.