

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.,

Petitioner,

v.

DANIEL L. FLAMM,

Patent Owner.

Case No. IPR2017-01751
U.S. Patent No. RE40,264 E

Before CHRISTOPHER L. CRUMBLEY and KIMBERLY McGRAW,
Administrative Patent Judges

**INTEL CORPORATION, MICRON TECHNOLOGY, INC., AND
GLOBALFOUNDRIES U.S., INC.'S PARTIAL OPPOSITION TO
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.'S MOTION FOR JOINDER**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. STATEMENT OF MATERIAL FACTS	2
III. ARGUMENT	3
IV. CONCLUSION.....	5

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Dell, Inc. v. Network-1 Security Solutions, Inc., IPR2013-00385,
Paper 17 (July 29, 2013)4

HTC Corp. v. Parthenon Unified Memory Architecture LLC.,
IPR2017-00512, Paper No. 12 (June 1, 2017).....4

I. INTRODUCTION

Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. (“Samsung”) has moved to join *Inter Partes* Review No. IPR2017-00281, which the Board instituted based on a Petition jointly filed by Intel Corporation (“Intel”), Micron Technology, Inc. (“Micron”), and GLOBALFOUNDRIES U.S., Inc. (“Global”). Samsung seeks to join IPR2017-00281 as an “understudy,” purportedly with no active role, unless Intel, Micron, and Global withdraw from the trial the Board has instituted. While Intel, Micron and Global do not object to joinder if Samsung is limited to a truly passive role, they do object to the extent Samsung’s terms go beyond such a role.

Specifically, Samsung proposes to coordinate on consolidated filings and deposition examination. Because Samsung had the earliest deadline to petition for *inter partes* review of the ’264 patent, Intel, Micron and Global have carefully avoided such coordination to avoid any appearance of privity with Samsung. If Intel, Micron and Global change course now and begin coordination with Samsung, the Patent Owner may be prompted to litigate privity, an issue that has no bearing on the current record. Thus, unless Patent Owner waives the issue or the Board rules that coordinating with Samsung, if joined, will not justify raising a privity challenge, Intel, Micron and Global should not be required to coordinate with Samsung in the manner the motion suggests. Moreover, given that three

petitioners (Intel, Micron and Global) already are coordinating in IPR2017-00281, adding a fourth would create additional and unnecessary work.

In short, if Samsung is permitted to join, it should be limited to a purely passive role and should not file any papers, participate in discovery, present oral argument or otherwise actively participate unless Intel, Micron and Global withdraw. Alternatively, if the Board is inclined to permit Samsung to join on the terms set out in the motion, Intel, Micron and Global respectfully request an opportunity to speak with the Board about how to make clear that any required coordination with Samsung will not give rise to an allegation of privity further unnecessarily burdening the Board, the courts, and the parties.

II. STATEMENT OF MATERIAL FACTS

1. Patent Owner sued Samsung for alleged infringement of the '264 patent in July 2015 (the "Samsung Case"). *Flamm v. Samsung Elec. Co., Ltd.*, No. 1:15-cv-613-LY (W.D. Tex.).
2. Patent Owner did not sue Intel, Micron and Global for alleged infringement of the '264 patent until January 2016, approximately six months after filing the Samsung Case. *Lam Research Corp. v. Flamm*, No. 5:15-cv-01277-BLF, Dkts. 50, 58, 60 & 61 (N.D. Cal.).
3. In order to avoid any question regarding privity or the applicability of Samsung's earlier bar date under 35 U.S.C. § 315(a), Intel, Micron and Global

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.