

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

GOOGLE LLC,
Petitioner,

v.

UNILOC USA, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2017-02083
Patent No. 7,535,890

**PETITIONER'S REPLY
TO PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

I. THE PETITION IS NOT REDUNDANT UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 314(a) OR 325(d), AND PETITIONER HAS A DUE PROCESS INTEREST

Patent Owner (“PO”) cites a pair of recent Board decisions that gained significance only after the instant Petition was filed. *See General Plastic Indus. Co., Ltd. v. Canon Kabushiki Kaisha*, IPR2016-01357, Paper No. 19 (PTAB Sept. 6, 2017) (designated “precedential” after the instant Petition was filed); *TCL Corp. v. Lexington Luminance LLC*, IPR2017-01780, Paper No. 8 (PTAB Jan. 2, 2018) (decided after the instant Petition was filed). Petitioner (“Google”) already explained how it “is not duplicative or substantially similar to earlier IPR petitions against the ’890 patent” (Petition, 7), but Google now addresses these decisions.

The *General Plastic* factors 1-7 do not weigh in favor of an exercise of “discretion” that would deprive Google of its only opportunity to seek IPR. *General Plastic*, pp. 9-10. Factor 1 weighs heavily in favor of Google because this is the first and only petition that Google—the only Petitioner in this case (*infra* Section II)—has filed against at least claims 15, 28-34, 37, 39, 62-65, 68, and 70 of the ’890 patent. Previous petitions were all filed by different parties. Google’s Petition also challenges a different subset of claims than any previous petition. None of the earlier-filed petitions challenged claims 16, 24, 26, 30, 39, 58, 60, and 70 of the ’890 patent, a fact that “weigh[s] overwhelmingly against a discretionary denial.” *Weatherford Int’l, LLC v. Packers Plus Energy Servs., Inc.*, IPR2017-01232, Paper No. 10 at 9-10 (PTAB Oct. 17, 2017). Factors 2, 4, and 5 (relating to

the timing and substance of a follow-on petition) do not tip the balance against institution because this Petition is not a follow-on petition (e.g., Google has not previously been party to any earlier petition where it “could have raised” the grounds cited here). In addition, with respect to Factor 5, Google expeditiously filed its Petition less than 6-months after Patent Owner served its complaint on Google. Factor 3 weighs in favor of institution because the earlier proceedings involved different art and/or issues. With respect to earlier petitions relying on Zydney, where institution was denied, those denials were based on Facebook’s analysis of Zydney rather than any defect in Zydney itself. Regardless, those institution decisions issued after Google filed this Petition, meaning they never provided a substantive “roadmap” for the instant Petition. Finally, factors 6 and 7 “do not weight significantly for or against” exercising discretion to deny institution, as held by the Board under similar facts. *Fisher & Paykel Healthcare Ltd. v. ResMed Ltd.*, IPR2017-01789, Paper No. 7 at 15 (PTAB Jan. 25, 2018).

With respect to *TCL*, the facts here differ, rendering the case inapposite. The PO’s preliminary response (“POPR”) ignores the fact that (1) Zydney was not previously before the Examiner in a reexamination, and that (2) the Board has not previously considered how Zydney applies to at least claims 16, 24, 26, 30, 39, 58, 60, and 70. *See TCL Corp.* at pp. 6-9. The Board has recognized when, as here, a “case presents a different Petitioner challenging claims that have not been

challenged previously,” that “those facts weigh overwhelmingly against a discretionary denial of [a] proceeding.” *Weatherford Int’l*, IPR2017-01232, Paper No. 10 at pp. 9-10; *see also Unified Patents Inc. v. Silver State Intellectual Tech., Inc.*, IPR2017-01198, Paper No. 6 at pp. 20-21 (PTAB Sept. 28, 2017).

In sum, this Petition bears none of the hallmarks of a typical “follow-on Petition” under *General Plastic* or *TCL*. Google has a due process interest to be heard on the merits, and the Board should not wrongly deprive Google of such interest based on 35 U.S.C. §§ 314(a) or 325(d).

II. LG ELECTRONICS IS NOT A REAL PARTY-IN-INTEREST (RPI)

PO has raised false allegations that the Google did not list all RPIs—new contentions that Petitioner could not have previously addressed. Contrary to PO’s incorrect assertions, Google is the sole “Petitioner” here. The Motorola and Huawei entities were properly listed as RPIs, but they are not “co-petitioners.” All of PO’s arguments based on “co-Petitioners” were made without any evidence and are flatly wrong.

Also, PO’s allegation that “joint-defendant LG Electronics” should be named as a RPI is wrong. LG Electronics provided neither funding nor control over the Petition, had no opportunity to review/provide input during preparation of the Petition, and is simply unrelated to this case. PO also ignores that litigation activities among co-defendants “are not suggestive of control” or an RPI

relationship. *Intel Corp. v. Alacritech, Inc.*, IPR2017-01410, Pap. 8 at 15 (PTAB Nov. 21, 2017).

Finally, even if PO's false assumptions were true, they would not lead to dismissal of the Petition because the RPI listing can be corrected. *Proppant Express v. Oren Tech.*, IPR2017-01917, Pap. 8 at 2-3 (PTAB Jan. 8, 2018) ("real parties in interest can be corrected"); *Lumentum Holdings, Inc. v. Capella Photonics, Inc.*, Case IPR2015-00739, Pap. 38 at 4-5 (PTAB Mar. 4, 2016) (Precedential) (§ 312(a) not jurisdictional).

III. OTHER BOARD DECISIONS BASED ON ZYDNEY DO NOT COMPEL DENIAL OF INSTITUTION HERE

PO's "substantive" arguments are premised on institution denials addressing different arguments/petitions filed by different parties—*i.e.*, IPR2017-01523, -01524, -01257. Each of the cited decisions issued after Google filed this Petition, and PO's arguments based on these decisions introduce new issues that Google could not have addressed in the Petition.

First, the cited institution decisions do not point to fault in Zydney, but rather to another petitioner's (Facebook's) allegedly inconsistent mapping of Zydney's elements to the claim elements. *See, e.g.*, IPR2017-01524, Paper 7, 10-14 (PTAB Dec. 4, 2017). This Petition and this record plainly provides different analysis that consistently maps Zydney's elements to the claims—and is supported by different expert testimony and corroborating evidence.

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.