

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

ARUBA NETWORKS, INC., HEWLETT PACKARD ENTERPRISE  
COMPANY, AND HP INC.,  
Petitioner

v.

MOBILE TELECOMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGIES, LLC  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2016-00769  
Patent 5,915,210

---

**PATENT OWNER MOBILE TELECOMMUNICATIONS  
TECHNOLOGIES, LLC'S RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION TO  
PETITIONER'S MOTION FOR JOINDER**

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

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. STATEMENT OF MATERIAL FACTS .....	2
III. ARGUMENT.....	3
A. Patent Owner Punished For Focusing On Settlement.....	3
B. Aruba And ARRIS Have Not Agreed To Consolidate Filings.....	6
C. Motion Filed Only To Prevent Termination Of Samsung IPR.....	6
D. Patent Owner Prejudiced by Aruba’s Delay .....	8
E. Bad Policy - Legal Extortion.....	10
F. Joinder Should Be Denied Because It Creates An Impossible Scheduling Conflict.....	11
IV. CONCLUSION.....	13

## I. INTRODUCTION

Patent Owner, Mobile Telecommunications Technologies, LLC, (“Patent Owner”) files this Response in Opposition to Petitioner Aruba Networks, Inc., Hewlett Packard Enterprise Company, and HP Inc.’s (“Aruba”) motion (the “Aruba Motion”) to join this IPR proceeding, No. IPR2016-00769 (the “Aruba IPR”) with the pending *inter partes* review in IPR2014-01724 (the “Samsung IPR”), filed by Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. (“Samsung”), involving U.S. Patent No. 5,915,210 (“the ’210 Patent”). In short, granting joinder in this case would unduly burden the Patent Owner, because in the time period between institution of the Samsung IPR and the due date of the Patent Owner’s Response, the Patent Owner and Samsung have in good faith sought and achieved settlement. As a result, if the Aruba motion is granted the Patent Owner will be prejudiced in that it will have much less time to depose Aruba’s expert and prepare its own expert declaration and response. In addition, ARRIS Group, Inc. (“ARRIS”) has also filed a motion (the “ARRIS Motion”) to join IPR proceeding, No. IPR2016-00765 (the “ARRIS IPR”) with the Samsung IPR. As a result, if the ARRIS motion is also granted the Patent Owner will further be prejudiced in that it will have to coordinate with two parties in a shortened time period.

## II. STATEMENT OF MATERIAL FACTS

1. On February 16, 2016, the Samsung IPR was instituted. *See* Paper 9 of the Samsung IPR.

2. In the Samsung IPR, Patent Owner's Response was scheduled for May 18, 2016. *See* Paper 12 of the Samsung IPR.

3. The co-pending district court case trial between the Patent Owner and Samsung involving the '210 Patent was scheduled to begin before May 18, 2016.

4. On March 16, 2016, Aruba filed the petition of the Aruba IPR and the Aruba Motion.

5. On April 11, 2016, the Patent Owner and Samsung settled their dispute regarding the '210 Patent.

6. On April 12, 2016, the Patent Owner and Samsung requested permission to file a joint motion to terminate the Samsung IPR.

7. On April 13, 2016, the Patent Owner and Samsung filed a joint stipulation of due dates moving the due date of Patent Owner's response to June 18, 2016 and Petitioner's reply to September 10, 2016.

8. On April 13, 2016, Patent Owner and Samsung received permission to file a joint motion to terminate the Samsung IPR.

9. On April 14, 2016, Patent Owner and Samsung filed a joint motion to terminate the Samsung IPR.

### **III. ARGUMENT**

Patent Owner opposes the Aruba motion as follows.

#### **A. Patent Owner Punished For Focusing On Settlement**

As described above, if the Aruba Motion is granted the Patent Owner will be prejudiced in that it will have much less time to depose Aruba's expert and prepare its own expert declaration and response. In other words, if the Aruba Motion is granted, the Patent Owner will be punished for focusing on seeking and achieving settlement with Samsung in the Samsung IPR.

On February 16, 2016, the Samsung IPR was instituted. *See* Paper 9 of the Samsung IPR. In general, an IPR proceeding regarding a patent is instituted to affect: (1) the public's interest in this patent; (2) the resolution of disputes involving the patent in other jurisdictions; or (3) the construction of claim terms of the patent.

In the Samsung IPR, Patent Owner's Response was scheduled for May 18, 2016. *See* Paper 12 of the Samsung IPR. Because the co-pending district court case trial between the Patent Owner and Samsung involving the '210 Patent was scheduled to begin before May 18, 2016, the district court case was going to resolve the three factors mentioned above long before the Samsung IPR. As a result, the Patent Owner and Samsung focused on settling the Samsung IPR.

# 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.