

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

FACEBOOK, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

WINDY CITY INNOVATIONS, LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2016-01141¹
Patent 8,458,245 B1

Before KARL D. EASTHOM, DAVID C. McKONE, and J. JOHN LEE,
Administrative Patent Judges.

LEE, *Administrative Patent Judge.*

DECISION
Request for Rehearing
37 C.F.R. § 42.71

¹ IPR2017-00655 has been joined with this proceeding.

INTRODUCTION

On June 3, 2016, Microsoft Corporation (“Microsoft”) filed a petition (Paper 1) in the present case seeking *inter partes* review of claims 1–58 of U.S. Patent No. 8,458,245 B1 (Ex. 1001, “the ’245 patent”). An *inter partes* review was instituted on claims 1–40 on December 12, 2016. Paper 8.

One month later, on January 12, 2017, Facebook, Inc. (“Facebook”) filed a petition in IPR2017-00655 (“655 IPR”) seeking *inter partes* review of claims 1–15, 17, and 18 of the ’245 patent. 655 IPR, Paper 2. Along with that petition, Facebook filed a motion requesting joinder with the present proceeding. 655 IPR, Paper 3.

While Facebook’s petition and joinder motion were pending, Microsoft and Patent Owner Windy City Innovations, LLC (“Windy City”) reached a settlement agreement and filed a Joint Motion to Terminate the present proceeding on April 24, 2017. Paper 25. The Joint Motion did not mention Facebook’s joinder motion or the 655 IPR.

Subsequently, on May 2, 2017, Windy City filed a preliminary response in the 655 IPR. 655 IPR, Paper 7. Windy City did not, however, file an opposition to Facebook’s joinder motion or argue that joinder with the present proceeding would be inappropriate if an *inter partes* review was instituted on Facebook’s petition.

In a May 10, 2017, decision, we granted the Joint Motion to Terminate in the present proceeding, but only with respect to Microsoft. Paper 27 (“1st Term. Dec.”). Noting Facebook’s pending joinder motion, we did not decide at that time whether to grant the motion with respect to the entire proceeding, indicating we would do so after deciding whether Facebook would be joined as a party to this proceeding. *Id.* at 2–3.

On May 31, 2017, we granted Facebook’s joinder motion. Paper 28 (“Joinder Inst. Dec.”). We noted that Facebook challenged claims 1–15, 17, and 18 of the ’245 patent on the same asserted grounds of unpatentability, based on the same arguments and evidence, as in Microsoft’s petition with respect to those claims in the present proceeding. *Id.* at 3, 8. Further, we clarified that, after joinder, Facebook is “the petitioner” in this proceeding for purposes of 35 U.S.C. § 318(a), which in relevant part requires the Board to “issue a final written decision with respect to the patentability of any patent claim challenged by *the petitioner*” (emphasis added). *Id.* at 9. Thus, we made clear that all claims formerly challenged by Microsoft prior to its termination, but which were not challenged by Facebook, were no longer part of this proceeding. *Id.*

After joining Facebook as a party to the present proceeding, we issued a second decision on June 7, 2017, to address the remaining issues with the Joint Motion to Terminate. Paper 29 (“2nd Term. Dec.”). In that decision, we denied the Joint Motion to Terminate with respect to Windy City because Facebook remained as an active petitioner. *Id.* at 2–3. On June 14, 2017, Windy City filed a Request for Rehearing. Paper 35 (“Req. Reh’g”).

DISCUSSION

A party requesting rehearing bears the burden of showing the decision should be modified. 37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d). The party must identify all matters it contends were misapprehended or overlooked by the Board. *Id.* Windy City requests rehearing of two decisions, each of which it contends was an abuse of discretion. First, Windy City contends our decision to terminate as to Microsoft, but not as to the entire proceeding, exceeded our

statutory authority. Req. Reh’g 5–9. Second, Windy City contends we exceeded our statutory authority by joining Facebook to this proceeding despite that Facebook challenges only a portion of the claims originally challenged by Microsoft. *Id.* at 9–12. As explained below, neither contention is supported by the relevant authorities, and the Request for Rehearing is *denied*.

A. *Termination As To Microsoft But Not As To Entire Proceeding*

As an initial matter, our decision to terminate as to Microsoft but not as to the entire proceeding was entered on May 10, 2017. *See* 1st Term. Dec. Windy City’s Request for Rehearing was not filed until June 14, 2017. *See* Req. Reh’g. Thus, with respect to this termination decision, Windy City’s Request was not timely filed. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d)(1). For that reason alone, the Request for Rehearing should be denied as to this issue.

Moreover, even had the Request been timely filed, Windy City’s arguments fail to establish that our decision was improper. It argues that our decision exceeded our statutory authority under 35 U.S.C. § 317(a). Req. Reh’g 5–9. Section 317(a) states the following:

An inter partes review instituted under this chapter shall be terminated with respect to any petitioner upon the joint request of the petitioner and the patent owner, unless the Office has decided the merits of the proceeding before the request for termination is filed. . . . If no petitioner remains in the inter partes review, the Office may terminate the review or proceed to a final written decision under section 318(a).

Pursuant to the statute, we “terminated [the *inter partes* review] with respect to any petitioner upon the joint request of the petitioner and the patent owner” by granting the Joint Motion to Terminate as to Microsoft. *See*

35 U.S.C. § 317(a); 1st Term. Dec. 2. Windy City does not contest that aspect of our decision. Rather, it argues our decision failed to follow the portion of § 317(a) that states, “[i]f no petitioner remains in the inter partes review, the Office may terminate the review or proceed to a final written decision.” Req. Reh’g 6–8.

According to Windy City, once Microsoft was terminated, the Board was obligated to either terminate the entire review or proceed to a final written decision. *Id.* Indisputably, we did not terminate the entire review. Thus, Windy City contends the only other permissible option was to proceed to a final written decision. *Id.* Windy City asserts that our decision to hold in abeyance our ruling as to whether the entire proceeding should be terminated (until after deciding Facebook’s joinder motion) constituted a “suspension of the [*inter partes*] review,” which exceeded our authority under § 317(a) because the Board was obligated instead to “proceed to a final written decision.” *Id.*

Windy City misconstrues the statute and our decision. First, the statute does not mandate that the Board either terminate the entire review or proceed to a final written decision. Rather, it states explicitly that the Board “may” do so. In contrast, as noted above, the same statutory provision states that an *inter partes* review “shall” be terminated with respect to a petitioner upon a joint request. We further note that when, as here, there are multiple cases before the Board involving the same patent, the Board is explicitly granted discretion to “enter any appropriate order,” including “the stay, transfer, consolidation, or termination” of such cases. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.122(a); *see also* 35 U.S.C. § 315(d) (granting discretion to “determine the manner in which the inter partes review or other proceeding or matter

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.