

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

LG ELECTRONICS, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

FASTVDO LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2017-00683
Patent 5,850,482

Before KARL D. EASTHOM, JEFFREY S. SMITH, and
PATRICK M. BOUCHER, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

SMITH, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION

Granting Joinder; Terminating *Inter Partes* Proceeding
37 C.F.R. §§ 42.108, 42.122

I. INTRODUCTION

Petitioner LG Electronics, Inc. (“LGE”) filed a Petition for *inter partes* review of claims 1–3, 5–14, 16, 17, 22–26, 28, and 29 of U.S. Patent No. 5,850,482 (Ex. 1001, “the ’482 patent”). Paper 2 (“Petition”). Petitioner also filed a Motion for joinder with *Apple, Inc. v. FastVDO LLC*, IPR2016-01203. Paper 4 (“Motion”). Patent Owner filed an Opposition to the Motion for joinder. Paper 10 (“Opposition”). Petitioner filed a Reply to the Opposition. Paper 11 (“Reply”).

Upon consideration of the Petition, Motion, Opposition, and Reply, we grant the Motion for joinder.

II. JOINDER

A party may be joined to an *inter partes* review, subject to the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 315(c), which governs joinder of *inter partes* review proceedings:

(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.

As the moving party, LGE bears the burden of proving that it is entitled to the requested relief. 37 C.F.R. § 42.20(c). A motion for joinder should (1) set forth the reasons joinder is appropriate; (2) identify any new grounds of unpatentability asserted in the petition; and (3) explain what impact (if any) joinder would have on the trial schedule for the existing

review. *Kyocera Corp. v. Softview LLC*, Case IPR2013-00004, slip. op. at 4 (PTAB April 24, 2013) (Paper 15).

LGE filed its Motion on January 13, 2017. Paper 4. The Board instituted *inter partes* review in IPR2016-01203 on December 16, 2017. IPR2016-01203, Paper 14. Accordingly, the filing date of the Motion for Joinder satisfies the joinder filing requirement, as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 42.122. *See id.* (“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”). The Petition asserts the same grounds as those on which the Board instituted review in IPR2016-01203. *Compare* Pet. 19–66 with IPR2016-01203 at 44 (Paper 14); *see also* Motion 1 (“LGE’s Petition in all material respects presents the same grounds as the petition in [IPR2016-01203] – no new arguments, no new claims and no new grounds of unpatentability are added by LGE’s Petition.”)

The Board instituted a trial in IPR2016-01203 on the following grounds:

Reference(s)	Basis	Challenged Claims
Kato ¹	§ 103	1–3, 5–14, 16, 17, 22–26, 28, and 29
Fiala, ² Fazel, ³ and Fazel ’622 ⁴	§ 103	1–3, 5–14, 16, 17, 22–26, 28, and 29

¹ US 5,392,037, Feb. 21, 1995.

² Fiala et al., *Data Compression with Finite Windows*, Communications of the ACM, Vol. 32, No. 4, 490–505 (1989).

³ Fazel et al., *Application of Unequal Error Protection Codes on Combined Source-Channel Coding of Images*, International Conference on Communications, Including SuperComm Technical Sessions (IEEE), Atlanta, Vol. 3, 898–903 (April 15–19, 1990).

⁴ US 5,218,622, June 8, 1993.

IPR2016-01203, Paper 14 at 44.

In its Motion, LGE agreed to take an understudy role to Petitioner Apple, Inc. (“Apple”), and agreed to adhere to the existing trial schedule in IPR2016-01203. Motion 8. LGE also demonstrates sufficiently that joinder will promote efficiency. *See* Motion 1–3.

In its Opposition, Patent Owner contends that the Motion (1) does not limit Petitioner’s right to submit its own filing on the condition that Apple settles with Patent Owner or is otherwise terminated; (2) does not require Petitioner to seek authorization from the Board to file a separate paper, and only where the filing involves an issue unique to Petitioner or states a point of disagreement related to the consolidated filing; (3) does not preclude Petitioner from using its own expert in support of future filings; and (4) does not restrict Petitioner’s right to seek additional time for depositions or oral argument. Opp. 2–5. In Reply, Petitioner states that it has no objection to seeking permission of the Board before filing an alternative pleading. Reply. Petitioner also states that it will submit to whatever procedures the Board requires. *Id.*

Given the following: 1) the challenges in the instant Petition are identical to the grounds instituted in IPR2016-01203; 2) joinder will not impact the existing trial schedule in IPR2016-01203; and 3) joinder will promote efficiency, we determine the Petition warrants institution on the same grounds as those on which the Board instituted *inter partes* review in IPR2016-01203 and join LGE to IPR2016-01203.

After considering Patent Owner’s Opposition and Petitioner’s Reply, we limit Petitioner’s right to submit its own filing on the condition that Apple settles with Patent Owner or is otherwise terminated; we require

Petitioner to seek authorization from the Board to file a separate paper, and only where the filing involves an issue unique to Petitioner or states a point of disagreement related to the consolidated filing; we preclude Petitioner from using its own expert in support of future filings; we preclude Petitioner from seeking additional time for depositions or oral argument; and we bind Petitioner to the Scheduling Order already of record in IPR2016-01203.

LGE is bound by any discovery agreements, including any deposition arrangements, between Patent Owner and Apple in IPR2016-01203, and LGE shall not seek any discovery beyond that sought by Apple. Patent Owner shall not be required to provide any additional discovery or deposition time as a result of the joinder. Apple in the joined proceeding shall designate attorney(s) to conduct the collective cross-examination of any witness produced by Patent Owner and the collective redirect examination of any other witness within the timeframes set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 42.53(c) or as otherwise agreed by Patent Owner and Apple. No individual party will receive any additional cross-examination or redirect examination time. Moreover, if an oral hearing is requested and scheduled, Apple in the joined proceeding shall designate attorney(s) to present a consolidated argument at the oral hearing.

The Board expects LGE, Apple, and Patent Owner to meet and confer regarding any disputes between them and to contact the Board only if such matters cannot be resolved.

Under these circumstances, it is likely that joining Petitioner as a party to IPR2016-01203 will not unduly delay or detrimentally affect IPR2016-01203. We exercise our discretion to join the instant proceeding to IPR2016-01203. Accordingly, the Motion is granted.

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.