

2019-1202

**IN THE
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR
THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT**

POLARIS INNOVATIONS LIMITED,
Appellant

v.

KINGSTON TECHNOLOGY COMPANY, INC.,
Appellee

ANDREI IANCU, Director, U.S. Patent And Trademark Office,
Intervenor

APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK
OFFICE, PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD NO. IPR2016-01622

APPELLANT POLARIS INNOVATIONS LIMITED'S REPLY BRIEF

Matthew D. Powers
Jennifer Robinson
TENSEGRITY LAW GROUP, LLP
555 Twin Dolphin Drive, Suite 650
Redwood Shores, CA 94065
Telephone: (650) 802-6000
Facsimile: (650) 802-6001

Kenneth Weatherwax
Nathan Nobu Lowenstein
LOWENSTEIN & WEATHERWAX LLP
1880 Century Park East, Suite 815
Los Angeles, California 90067
Telephone: (310) 307-4500
Facsimile: (310) 307-4509

Azra Hadzimehmedovic
Aaron M. Nathan
TENSEGRITY LAW GROUP, LLP
8260 Greensboro Drive, Suite 260
McLean, VA 22102
Telephone: (703) 940-5032
Facsimile: (650) 802-6001

*Counsel for Appellant Polaris
Innovations Limited*

September 24, 2019

CERTIFICATE OF INTEREST

Counsel for Appellant Polaris Innovations Limited (“Polaris”) in Appeal No. 2019-1202 certifies the following:

1. The full name of every party or amicus represented by me is:

Polaris Innovations Limited.

2. The name of the real party in interest (if the party named in the caption is not the real party in interest) represented by me is:

Quarterhill Inc.

3. All parent corporations and any publicly held companies that own 10 percent or more of the stock of the party or amicus curiae represented by me are:

Wi-LAN Inc.

4. The names of all law firms and the partners or associates that appeared for the party or amicus now represented by me in the trial court or agency or are expected to appear in this court (and who have not or will not enter an appearance in this case) are:

Parham Hendifar, Lowenstein & Weatherwax LLP

5. The title and number of any case known to counsel to be pending in this or any other court or agency that will directly affect or be directly affected by this court’s decision in the pending appeal are:

Polaris Innovations Limited v. Kingston Technology Company, Inc., 8:16-cv-00300 (C.D. Cal).

Dated: September 24, 2019

/s/ Matthew D. Powers
Matthew D. Powers

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	THE BOARD VIOLATED POLARIS’S PROCEDURAL RIGHTS.....	2
A.	Polaris’s “Strategy” Was to Rely Properly on the Board’s Decisions and Follow the Rules	2
B.	The Right to Respond <i>Before</i> Claim 4 Was Instituted Did Not Afford Polaris Adequate Process <i>After</i> Claim 4 Was Instituted	4
C.	The IPR Estoppel Rules Do Not Support Kingston’s Improper and Untimely Expansion of the Record.....	7
D.	Kingston’s Argument That the Board Did Not Err in Denying Polaris the Same Due Process Given in <i>AC Technologies</i> and <i>Broad Ocean</i> Has No Basis.....	9
E.	Kingston Fails to Address Its Concessions Before the Board	12
F.	“The Collateral Estoppel Context” Is Inapposite	12
G.	Kingston’s Argument That There Was No “Surprise” When the Board Found Claim 4 Unpatentable Is Meritless	14
H.	The Board Erred in Refusing Polaris’s Noncontingent Request to Cancel Claim 1.....	15
I.	Kingston Was Not Entitled to Submit in Its MTA Opposition New Evidence and Arguments to Fill Gaps in Its <i>Prima Facie</i> Case	17
J.	The Board’s Merits Rulings on Claims 4 and 9 Were Defective.....	20
III.	APJS ARE UNCONSTITUTIONALLY APPOINTED PRINCIPAL OFFICERS.....	22
A.	APJs Are Principal Officers Because No Executive Principal Officer Directs Their Work	22
B.	APJs Are Not At-Will Employees.....	25
C.	The Director’s Authority Over Other Aspects of APJs’ Performance Is Irrelevant	26

D. The Court Should Hear Polaris’s Appointments Clause Challenge... 27

E. This Court Should Dismiss..... 29

IV. CONCLUSION..... 29

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Abbott Labs. v. Andrx Pharms., Inc.</i> , 473 F.3d 1196 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	13
<i>Abrams v. SSA</i> , 703 F.3d 538 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	26
<i>AC Techs., S.A. v. Amazon.com, Inc.</i> , 912 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	9
<i>Aptheker v. Sec’y of State</i> , 378 U.S. 500 (1964).....	25
<i>Aqua Prods. v. Matal</i> , 872 F.3d 1290 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	19
<i>Ass’n of Am. R.R. v. United States DOT</i> , 821 F.3d 19 (D.C. Cir. 2016).....	23
<i>Automated Merch. Sys., Inc. v. Lee</i> , 782 F.3d 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	29
<i>Beard v. Gen. Servs. Admin.</i> , 801 F.2d 1318 (Fed. Cir. 1986).....	28
<i>Bourns, Inc. v. United States</i> , 537 F.2d 486 (Ct. Cl. 1976).....	13
<i>Brennan v. HHS</i> , 787 F.2d 1559 (Fed. Cir. 1986).....	26
<i>Broad Ocean Techs., LLC v. NIDEC Motor Corp.</i> , IPR2015-01617, Paper 44 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 10, 2018).....	10, 11
<i>DOT v. Ass’n of Am. R.R.</i> , 135 S. Ct. 1225 (2015).....	22, 26
<i>Edmond v. United States</i> , 520 U.S. 651 (1997).....	23, 25, 26

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.