

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ZTE (USA) INC.,

Petitioner

v.

FUNDAMENTAL INNOVATION SYSTEMS INTERNATIONAL LLC,

Patent Owner

**MOTION TO RETROACTIVELY ADD A REAL PARTY IN INTEREST
OR TERMINATE THIS PROCEEDING**

Case No. IPR2018-00111

Patent 8,624,550 B2

Before RAE LYNN P. GUEST, JO-ANNE M. KOKOSKI, and
JON B. TORNQUIST, *Administrative Patent Judges*

Table of Authorities

Cases

<i>Applications in Internet Time, LLC v. RPX Corporation</i> 897 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	passim
<i>Aruze Gaming Macau, Ltd. v. MGT Gaming, Inc.</i> IPR2014-01288, Paper 13 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 20, 2015).....	3, 5
<i>Dep't of Justice v. IRIS Corp. Berhad</i> IPR2016-00497, Paper 7 (P.T.A.B. Jul. 25, 2016).....	4
<i>Elekta, Inc. v. Varian Med. Sys., Inc.</i> IPR2015-01401, Paper 19 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 31, 2015)	10, 11
<i>GEA Process Eng'g. Inc. v. Steuben Foods, Inc.</i> IPR2014-00041, Paper 140 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 11, 2015).....	4
<i>Gillig v. Nike, Inc.</i> 602 F.3d 1354 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	5
<i>In re Micron Tech., Inc.</i> 875 F.3d 1091 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	12
<i>LG Display Co., Ltd. v. Innovative Display Techs. LLC</i> IPR2014-01362, Paper 12 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 2, 2015)	5
<i>Lumentum Holdings, Inc. v. Capella Photonics, Inc.</i> IPR2015-00739, Paper 38 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 4, 2016).....	10
<i>Mobile Tech., Inc. v. Sennco Solutions, Inc.</i> IPR2017-02199 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 10, 2018).....	5
<i>Puzhen Life USA, LLC v. Esip Series 2, LLC</i> IPR2017-02197 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 11, 2018).....	5
<i>Taylor v. Sturgell</i> 553 U.S. 880 (2008).....	4
<i>TRW Auto. U.S. LLC v. Magna Elecs. Inc.</i> IPR2014-01351, Paper 7 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 10, 2015).....	5
<i>Wi-Fi One, LLC v. Broadcom Corp.</i> 887 F.3d 1329 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	6
<i>Zerto, Inc. v. EMC Corp.</i> IPR2014-01254, Paper 32 (P.T.A.B. Feb 12, 2015).....	4
<i>Zoll Lifecor Corp. v. Philips Elec.N. Am. Corp.</i> IPR2013-00606, Paper 13 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 20, 2014)	4

IPR2018-00111
Motion To Add Real Party In Interest Retroactively

Statutes

35 U.S.C. §312(a)(2).....12

Rules

37 C.F.R. § 42.115
37 C.F.R. § 42.72 6, 17

Other Authorities

Patent and Trademark Office Patent Trial Practice Guide
77 Fed. Reg. 48756 (Aug. 14, 2012).....4, 6
Practice Guide for Proposed Trial Rules
77 Fed. Reg. 6868 (Feb. 9, 2012)4
Revision of Patent Term Adjustment Provisions Relating to Appellate
Review
Fed. Reg. 49,354 (Aug. 16, 2012).....12

I. Introduction

Petitioner ZTE (USA) Inc. (“Petitioner”) respectfully requests leave to name an additional real party in interest (“RPI”) in this proceeding, or to the extent this request is denied, to seek termination of this proceeding. *See* Paper 45 (“Order”) at 1. For the reasons that follow, Petitioner respectfully requests that the Board enter the amended mandatory notice submitted herewith and maintain the original filing date of the instant instituted Petition for Inter Partes Review (“IPR”).

Section 312, 35 U.S.C. requires that “[a] petition [for IPR] may be considered only if . . . (2) the petition identifies all real parties in interest.” [please INSERT factual background – want to take care with affirmative statements]

II. Argument

Amendment of the named RPIs in this proceeding is only necessitated by the intervening change in law from the July 9, 2018 Federal Circuit decision in *Applications in Internet Time, LLC v. RPX Corporation*, 897 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2018) (“AIT”). There is no prejudice because Patent Owner has known about the to-be-named entity, ZTE (TX), Inc. (“ZTE TX”) all along. Retroactive amendment of the named RPIs in this proceeding would satisfy the two aims of the statutory requirement while protecting the public interest.

A. The Intervening Change In Law Merits Retroactive Identification of ZTE TX As A Real Party In Interest

ZTE TX never contributed to the control or funding of this IPR proceeding, nor did it make or sell allegedly infringing products (and at most practiced *de minimis* test use) and therefore Petitioner did not name ZTE TX as an RPI in the petition. However, the Federal Circuit’s intervening decision in *AIT* changes the law in a way that suggests ZTE TX may be an RPI. Under these circumstances, petitioners request leave to retroactively identify ZTE TX as an RPI, particularly where, as here, Patent Owner would suffer no prejudice.

1. The Federal Circuit’s RPX Decision Changed The Law

ZTE (TX), Inc. (“ZTE TX”) is a subsidiary of ZTE Corporation and thus an affiliate corporation of Petitioner ZTE (USA), Inc. Like ZTE (USA), Inc. and ZTE Corporation, ZTE TX was sued by Patent Owner in the Eastern District of Texas Case No. 3:17-cv-01827-N filed July 12, 2017. As an affiliate of Petitioner ZTE (USA), Inc. ZTE TX does not control or financially influence ZTE (USA), Inc.

Prior to *AIT*, RPI determination followed common law understanding of “real party in interest” considerations. Both the Supreme Court case *Taylor v. Struggell* and the USPTO Patent Trial Practice Guide, Fed. Reg. 48,756 (Aug. 14, 2012) (“Trial Practice Guide”) provided guidance to practitioners. According to the Trial Practice Guide:

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.