

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SL CORPORATION,
Petitioner,

v.

ADAPTIVE HEADLAMP TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
Patent Owner.

INTER PARTES REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,241,034
INTER PARTES REVIEW No.: 2016-01368

MOTION FOR JOINDER PURSUANT TO
35 U.S.C. § 315(c), 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.22 AND 42.122(b)

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. STATEMENT OF THE PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED	1
II. STATEMENT OF MATERIAL FACTS	2
III. STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR RELIEF REQUESTED	3
A. Joinder will not impact the Board’s ability to complete the review in a timely manner	5
B. Joinder will promote efficiency by consolidating issues, avoiding duplicate efforts, and preventing inconsistencies	6
C. Joinder will not prejudice AHT or Koito	6
D. Timeliness of Joinder	7
IV. CONCLUSION.....	8

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Dell, Inc. v. Network-1 Security Solutions, Inc.</i> , Case IPR2013-00385, Paper No. 17 (PTAB Jul. 29, 2013)	4
<i>Kyocera Corp. v. SoftView LLC</i> , IPR2013-00004, Paper No. 15, (PTAB Apr. 24, 2013)	1
<i>Sony Corporation of America and Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Network-1 Security Solutions, Inc.</i> , IPR 2013-00495, Paper 13 (PTAB Sep. 16, 2013).....	8
Statutes	
35 U.S.C. § 103	2
35 U.S.C. § 315(c)	1, 3, 9
35 U.S.C. § 316(a)(1).....	6
35 U.S.C. § 316(a)(11).....	4
Other Authorities	
37 C.F.R. § 42.6(e).....	9
37 C.F.R. §§ 42.22 and 42.122(b).....	1, 2, 9
37 C.F.R. § 42.100(c).....	4, 6
37 C.F.R. § 42.122(a).....	3

I. STATEMENT OF THE PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED

SL Corporation ("Petitioner" or "SL Corp.") respectfully submits this Motion for Joinder, together with a Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 7,241,034 ("the '034 Patent") ("Petition"). Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 315(c), 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.22 and 42.122(b), SL Corp. requests institution of an *inter partes* review and joinder with the *inter partes* review concerning the same patent in *Koito Manufacturing Co., Ltd. v. Adaptive Headlamp Technologies, Inc.*, Case No. IPR2016-00079 (the "Koito IPR"), which was instituted on May 5, 2016.

In accordance with the Board's Representative Order identifying matters to be addressed in a motion for joinder (*Kyocera Corp. v. SoftView LLC*, IPR2013-00004, Paper No. 15, (PTAB Apr. 24, 2013)), SL Corp. submits that: (1) joinder is appropriate because it will promote efficient determination of the validity of the '034 Patent without prejudice to the Patent Owner, Adaptive Headlamp Technologies ("AHT"); (2) SL Corp.'s Petition includes grounds that are identical to the ground instituted in the Koito IPR; (3) joinder would not affect the pending schedule in the Koito IPR nor increase the complexity of that proceeding, minimizing costs; and (4) SL Corp. is willing to agree to consolidated filings with Koito, that is, to accept an understudy role, to minimize burden and schedule impact.

Accordingly, joinder should be granted.

II. STATEMENT OF MATERIAL FACTS

1. AHT is the owner of the '034 Patent.
2. On July 6, 2015, AHT served a complaint against real party-in-interest Hyundai Motor America, Inc. ("Hyundai") for infringement of the '034 Patent (the "Underlying Litigation").
3. Hyundai is indemnified by SL Corp. in the Underlying Litigation.
4. On October 23, 2015, Koito filed its petition for *inter partes* review of claims 3-26 and 28-35 of the '034 Patent (IPR2016-00079).
5. On November 13, 2015, SL Corp. filed a petition for *inter partes* review of claims 3-39 of the '034 Patent (IPR2016- 00193).
6. 5. On May 5, 2016, a decision instituting *inter partes* review of claims 3-26, 28-32, and 35 of the '034 Patent was entered in the Koito IPR (Paper No. 11, IPR2016-00079).
7. On June 7, 2016, a decision instituting *inter partes* review of claims 7-10, 12-21, 23, 24, and 28-39 of the '034 Patent was entered in the SL Corp. IPR (Paper No. 10, IPR 2016-00193).
8. The only event that has occurred in the Koito IPR schedule is the Initial Conference Call; every other date on the scheduling order is in the future. (Paper No. 12, IPR2016-00079),

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.