

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

CAVIUM, INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

ALACRITECH, INC.,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2017-01732  
Patent 7,673,072 B2

---

Before STEPHEN C. SIU, DANIEL N. FISHMAN, and  
CHARLES J. BOUDREAU, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

SIU, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION

Denying Institution of *Inter Partes* Review

*37 C.F.R. § 42.108*

Dismissing Petitioner's Motion for Joinder

*37 C.F.R. § 42.122(b)*

## I. INTRODUCTION

Cavium, Inc. (“Petitioner”) requests *inter partes* review of claims 1–21 of U.S. Patent No. 7,673,072 B2 (“the ’072 patent,” Ex. 1001) pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §§ 311 *et seq.* Paper 1 (“Pet.”). Alacritech, Inc. (“Patent Owner”) filed a preliminary response. Paper 7 (“Prelim. Resp.”).

Within a few days of filing the Petition, Petitioner filed a Motion for Joinder. Paper 3 (“Joinder Motion.”). The Joinder Motion seeks to join this proceeding with *Intel Corp. v. Alacritech*, Case IPR2017-01705 (“the 1705 IPR”). Joinder Motion 1.

At the time Petitioner filed its Petition and Joinder Motion, the Board had not yet decided whether to institute *inter partes* review of the ’072 patent in the 1705 IPR. On December 19, 2017, however, we entered a Decision in the 1705 IPR denying the Petitioner as to all challenges. 1705 IPR, Paper 7 (“1705 Institution Decision” or “Decision”).

For the reasons that follow, we determine that the Joinder Motion should be dismissed as moot and the Petition for *inter partes* review denied.

## II. DISMISSAL OF MOTION FOR JOINDER

Because the petition in IPR2017-01705 was denied and *inter partes* review was not instituted, Petitioner’s Joinder Motion is dismissed as moot. 35 U.S.C. § 315(c).

## III. DENIAL OF *INTER PARTES* REVIEW

Petitioner states that the Petition is “based on the identical grounds that form the basis for the pending *inter partes* review initiated by Intel Corporation” in the 1705 IPR. Joinder Motion 1. As Petitioner states,

[t]he Petition asserts only grounds that are awaiting the Board’s institution in the Intel [1705] IPR, supported by the same

technical expert and the same testimony. There are no new arguments for the Board to consider. Likewise, the Petition relies on the same exhibits.

*Id.* at 4.

As noted above, on December 19, 2017, we denied institution of *inter partes* review on the grounds of obviousness over Connery.<sup>1</sup> 1705 Institution Decision 6–7. Here, Petitioner presents grounds and arguments identical to those we found insufficient in our previous Decision. Accordingly, for the reasons discussed in our Decision in IPR2017-01705 (*id.* at 4–6), we deny the Petition in this proceeding.

#### IV. ORDER

Accordingly, it is:

ORDERED that the Motion for Joinder is *dismissed* as moot; and  
FURTHER ORDERED that the Petition is *denied* and no *inter partes* review is instituted.

---

<sup>1</sup> US Patent 5,937,169, issued August 10, 1999 (“Connery”).

IPR2017-01732  
Patent 7,673,072 B2

IPR2017-01732  
Patent 7,673,072 B2

PETITIONER:

Patrick McPherson  
David Xue  
Duane Morris LLP  
pdmcpherson@duanemorris.com  
dtxue@duanemorris.com

PATENT OWNER:

Jim Glass  
Josph Paunovich  
Brian Mack  
Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan  
jimglass@quinnemanuel.com  
joepaunovich@quinnemanuel.com  
brianmack@quinnemanuel.com