

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

RUCKUS WIRELESS, INC., BROCADE COMMUNICATION  
SYSTEMS, INC., and NETGEAR, INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

CHRIMAR SYSTEMS, INC.,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2017-00719  
Patent 8,902,760 B2

---

Before KARL D. EASTHOM, GREGG I. ANDERSON, and  
ROBERT J. WEINSCHENK, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

WEINSCHENK, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION  
Institution of *Inter Partes* Review  
Grant of Motion for Joinder  
37 C.F.R. §§ 42.108, 42.122(b)

## I. INTRODUCTION

Ruckus Wireless, Inc., Brocade Communication Systems, Inc., and Netgear, Inc. (collectively, “Ruckus”) filed a Petition (Paper 1, “Pet.”) requesting an *inter partes* review of claims 1, 31, 37, 59, 69, 72, 73, 106, 112, 134, 142, and 145 (“the challenged claims”) of U.S. Patent 8,902,760 B2 (Ex. 1001, “the ’760 patent”). Ruckus also filed a Motion for Joinder (Paper 3, “Mot.”) requesting that it be joined to IPR2016-01399, *Juniper Networks, Inc. v. Chromar Systems, Inc.*, a pending *inter partes* review involving the ’760 patent. Mot. 1. Chromar Systems, Inc. is the Patent Owner in both proceedings.

In a joint email from the parties in this proceeding and the parties in IPR2016-01399, on February 24, 2017, Patent Owner waived its right to file a preliminary response in this proceeding. Ex. 3001. Patent Owner also indicates that it does not oppose Ruckus’s Motion for Joinder, provided that Ruckus maintains an “understudy” role in IPR2016-01399. Paper 9 (“Resp. to Mot.”), 1. For the reasons discussed below, we institute an *inter partes* review on all of the challenged claims in this proceeding, and we grant Ruckus’s Motion for Joinder.

## II. ANALYSIS

A party may be joined to an *inter partes* review under 35 U.S.C. § 315(c). Section 315(c) states:

(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, Ruckus bears the burden of proving that it is entitled to the relief requested in the Motion for Joinder. 37 C.F.R. § 42.20(c).

We instituted an *inter partes* review in IPR2016-01399 on January 4, 2017. *Juniper Networks, Inc. v. Chromar Sys. Inc.*, Case IPR2016-01399, slip op. at 20–21 (PTAB Jan. 4, 2017) (Paper 8) (“Dec. on Inst.”). Ruckus filed its Motion for Joinder in this case on January 18, 2017. Mot. 7. Thus, Ruckus filed the Motion for Joinder within one month of institution in IPR2016-01399, as required by 37 C.F.R. § 42.122(b).

We instituted an *inter partes* review in IPR2016-01399 on the following grounds of unpatentability:

<b>Claims</b>	<b>Basis</b>	<b>References</b>
1, 31, 37, 59, 69, 72, 73, 106, 112, 134, 142, and 145	35 U.S.C. § 103(a)	Hunter <sup>1</sup> and Bulan <sup>2</sup>
1, 31, 37, 59, 69, 72, 73, 106, 112, 134, 142, and 145	35 U.S.C. § 103(a)	Bloch, <sup>3</sup> Huizinga, <sup>4</sup> IEEE 802.3-1993, <sup>5</sup> and IEEE 802.3-1995 <sup>6</sup>

Dec. on Inst. 20–21. The Petition in this case asserts the same grounds of unpatentability as IPR2016-01399. Pet. 7; Mot. 5 (“The Petition asserts only grounds that the Board has already instituted in [IPR2016-01399].”); Dec. on Inst. 20–21. Further, Ruckus agrees to take an understudy role to Juniper Networks, Inc. (“Juniper”) in IPR2016-01399, and Ruckus agrees to adhere

---

<sup>1</sup> PCT Publication No. WO 96/23377 (Aug. 1, 1996). Ex. 1003.

<sup>2</sup> U.S. Patent No. 5,089,927 (Feb. 18, 1992). Ex. 1004.

<sup>3</sup> U.S. Patent No. 4,173,714 (Nov. 6, 1979). Ex. 1005.

<sup>4</sup> U.S. Patent No. 4,046,972 (Sept. 6, 1977). Ex. 1009.

<sup>5</sup> IEEE Standard 802.3-1993 (1993). Ex. 1006.

<sup>6</sup> IEEE Standard 802.3u-1995 (1995). Ex. 1007; Ex. 1008.

IPR2017-00719  
Patent 8,902,760 B2

to the existing trial schedule in IPR2016-01399. Mot. 5–7; Ex. 3001. Ruckus also shows that joining it to IPR2016-01399 promotes efficiency. Mot. 4–5.

In sum, we find that 1) the asserted grounds of unpatentability in the Petition are identical to the grounds of unpatentability in IPR2016-01399; 2) joinder will not impact the existing trial schedule in IPR2016-01399; 3) joinder will promote efficiency; and 4) Juniper and Patent Owner do not oppose joinder. For the foregoing reasons, we institute an *inter partes* review in this proceeding on the same grounds that we instituted the *inter partes* review in IPR2016-01399, and we join Ruckus to IPR2016-01399.

As a result of joining Ruckus to IPR2016-01399, Ruckus shall adhere to the existing trial schedule in IPR2016-01399. Any future filings by Ruckus in IPR2016-01399 shall be consolidated with the filings of Juniper. If, however, Ruckus has a point of disagreement related to a consolidated filing, Ruckus may request authorization from the Board to file an addendum of no more than five pages. If the Board authorizes Ruckus to file such an addendum, Patent Owner may request authorization from the Board to file a response of no more than five pages to the addendum. The page limits and word counts set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 42.24 otherwise apply to all consolidated filings.

Ruckus is bound by any discovery agreements, including any deposition arrangements, between Patent Owner and Juniper in IPR2016-01399, and Ruckus shall not seek any discovery beyond that sought by Juniper in IPR2016-01399. Patent Owner shall not be required to provide any additional discovery or deposition time as a result of the joinder. In IPR2016-01399, Juniper shall designate attorney(s) to conduct the collective

IPR2017-00719  
Patent 8,902,760 B2

cross-examination of any witness produced by Patent Owner and the collective redirect examination of any other witness within the time frames set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 42.53(c) or as otherwise agreed by Patent Owner and Juniper. Moreover, if an oral hearing is requested and scheduled in IPR2016-01399, Juniper shall designate attorney(s) to present a consolidated argument at the oral hearing.

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

### III. ORDER

In consideration of the foregoing, it is hereby

ORDERED that an *inter partes* review is instituted on all of the challenged claims in IPR2017-00719;

FURTHER ORDERED that Ruckus's Motion for Joinder is *granted*, and Ruckus is joined to IPR2016-01399;

FURTHER ORDERED that the grounds on which IPR2016-01399 were instituted remain unchanged and no other grounds are included in that proceeding;

FURTHER ORDERED that the Stipulated Schedule (Paper 17) and Order (Paper 19) in IPR2016-01399 shall govern the trial schedule of that proceeding;

FURTHER ORDERED that, throughout the proceeding in IPR2016-01399, Juniper shall file all papers as a single, consolidated filing;

FURTHER ORDERED that Ruckus is bound by any discovery agreements between Patent Owner and Juniper in IPR2016-01399, and that Ruckus shall not seek any discovery beyond that sought by Juniper in

# 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.