Trials@uspto.gov
571-272-7822

Paper 8
Entered: August 29, 2016

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

INTEL CORPORATION
and
QUALCOMM INCORPORATED, GLOBALFOUNDRIES INC., GLOBALFOUNDRIES U.S. INC., GLOBALFOUNDRIES DRESDEN MODULE ONE LLC & CO. KG, GLOBALFOUNDRIES DRESDEN MODULE TWO LLC & CO. KG,
Petitioner,

v.

DSS TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2016-00287
Case IPR2016-01311
Patent 6,784,552 B2

Before BRYAN F. MOORE, BRIAN J. McNAMARA, and MINN CHUNG, *Administrative Patent Judges.*

CHUNG, *Administrative Patent Judge.*

DECISION GRANTING MOTION FOR JOINDER
37 C.F.R. § 42.22 AND 42.122(b)

I. BACKGROUND

On July 1, 2016, Qualcomm Incorporated, Globalfoundries Inc., Globalfoundries U.S. Inc., Globalfoundries Dresden Module One LLC & Co. KG, and Globalfoundries Dresden Module Two LLC & Co. KG (collectively, "Petitioner" or "Qualcomm") filed a Petition (Paper 3, "Pet.") requesting an *inter partes* review of claims 1–7 (the "challenged claims") of U.S. Patent No. 6,784,552 B2 ("the '552 patent") owned by DSS Technology Management, Inc. ("Patent Owner"). 35 U.S.C. § 311. Petitioner also timely filed a Motion for Joinder (Paper 4, "Mot. for Joinder") of this proceeding with *Intel Corporation v. DSS Technology Management, Inc.*, IPR2016-00287 ("Intel IPR2016-00287"), which is the subject of a Decision to Institute entered on June 8, 2016. Petitioner represents that the instant Petition "is identical to the petition in [Intel IPR2016-00287]."[1] Mot. for Joinder 6. In a separate decision, entered today, we instituted *inter partes* review in this proceeding on the same grounds as those in Intel IPR2016-00287. For the reasons that follow, we also grant Petitioner's Motion for Joinder.

II. DISCUSSION

The Director has discretion to join as a party to an *inter partes* review any person who properly files a petition that, after receiving a preliminary

[1] We understand Petitioner to mean identical in all substantive matters, as the identity of the parties is different. Petitioner also acknowledges that it relies on the testimony of a different expert than the expert witness in Intel IPR2016-00287, but states that the testimony is essentially the same. Mot. for Joinder 4, 6.

response, the Director determines warrants the institution of *inter partes* review. 35 U.S.C. § 315(c). Petitioner argues that we should exercise our discretion under 35 U.S.C. § 315(c) to authorize joinder in this case.

Petitioner states that the instant Petition challenges the same claims, under the same grounds, advances the same arguments, and relies on substantially the same expert declaration (albeit from a different expert) as those on which we instituted *inter partes* review in Intel IPR2016-00287. Mot. for Joinder 4, 6–7. Having not advanced any new grounds or theories of unpatentability in this proceeding, Petitioner contends that joinder will avoid inefficiencies that could result from parallel proceedings. *Id.* at 7.

Noting that its positions are identical to those advanced by Intel in Intel IPR2016-00287, Petitioner also proposes consolidated discovery and consolidated filings of all substantive papers. *Id.* at 9. Petitioner agrees not to file any separate briefs. *Id.* at 7–8. Petitioner also agrees not to request additional cross-examination or re-direct time. *Id.* at 8. Further, Petitioner proposes that Intel be responsible for presentation of argument before the Board at oral hearing and agrees not to submit any demonstratives of its own. *Id.* at 9.

During a teleconference on August 11, 2016, both Intel and Patent Owner stated that they have no objection to the proposed joinder. Petitioner also stated that, while Intel participates in the proceeding, Petitioner will rely on the testimony of Intel's expert. In the event that Intel's involvement in this proceeding is terminated, Petitioner agreed that it would make its own expert available for cross-examination by Patent Owner.

We agree that joinder in this case would promote the just, speedy, and inexpensive resolution of IPR2016-01311 and IPR2016-00287. Therefore, we GRANT Petitioner's unopposed Motion for Joinder and authorize the joinder in accordance with the following order.

III. ORDER

In consideration of the foregoing, it is hereby:

ORDERED that IPR2016-01311 is joined with IPR2016-00287;

FURTHER ORDERED that the grounds on which trial was instituted in Intel IPR2016-00287 remain unchanged and that no other grounds are authorized;

FURTHER ORDERED that the Scheduling Order entered in Intel IPR2016-00287 is unchanged and shall govern the joined proceeding;

FURTHER ORDRED that throughout the proceeding Qualcomm and Intel will file papers, except for motions that do not involve the other party, e.g., *pro hac vice* motions, as consolidated filings and that all rules concerning filing papers, e.g., page and word limits, apply to such consolidated filings;

FURTHER ORDERED that each authorized cross-examination of Patent Owner's witnesses shall be conducted as though this matter concerned only a single petitioner;

FURTHER ORDERED that Qualcomm shall rely on the testimony of Intel's expert witness and, should Intel's involvement in the proceeding be terminated, Qualcomm shall make its own expert available to Patent Owner for cross-examination;

FURTHER ORDERED that IPR2016-01311 is terminated under 37 C.F.R. § 42.72 and all further filings in the joined proceeding shall be made in IPR2016-00287; and

FURTHER ORDERED that the case caption in IPR2016-00287 shall be changed to reflect joinder with this proceeding in accordance with the attached example (Attachment A).

DOCKET ALARM

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.