

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. FACTUAL BACKGROUND.....	2
A. Alacritech’s Claims Have Been Pending Since June 2016.....	2
B. Intel Has Been Aware Of This Litigation For Months	2
C. Negotiation, Briefing, and Judicial Decisions on Case-Governing Orders Has Taken Place That Should Not Be Interrupted By Intel’s Request To Intervene	3
D. Intel Delayed Filing Its Motion To Intervene	4
II. LEGAL STANDARD.....	5
III. ARGUMENT	6
A. Intel’s Motion Is Untimely If It Will Disrupt The Existing Schedule	6
1. Intel Failed To Apply For Intervention As Soon As It Knew Of Its Purported Interest In This Case.....	6
2. The Circumstances Of Intel’s Intervention Demonstrate That It Is Untimely If It Executes Its Plan to Derail The Case.....	9
B. Intel Is Not An Intervenor Of Right.....	10
1. Intel Does Not Have A Sufficient Interest In The Litigation.....	10
2. Any Interest Intel May Have Is Already Adequately Protected	12
C. Intel’s Permissive Intervention Is Appropriate As Long As Intel Can Show Its Intervention Will Not Prejudice Alacritech	13
IV. CONCLUSION.....	15

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

<u>Cases</u>	<u>Page</u>
<i>Amicus, Inc. v. Post-Tension of Texas, Inc.</i> , Civ. A. No. H-85-5849, 1986 WL 13012 (S.D. Tex. 1986)	12
<i>Bush v. Viterna</i> , 740 F.2d 350 (5th Cir. 1984)	12, 13
<i>Chandler & Price v. Brandtjen & Kluge</i> , 296 U.S. 53 (1935).....	10
<i>Corely v. Jackson Police Dep't</i> , 755 F.2d 1207 (5th Cir. 1985)	1, 5, 6, 9
<i>Deus v. Allstate Ins. Co.</i> , 15 F.3d 506 (5th Cir. 1994)	10
<i>Edwards v. City of Houston</i> , 78 F.3d 983 (5th Cir. 1996) (<i>en banc</i>)	5
<i>Frazier v. Map Oil Tools, Inc.</i> , Civil Action No. C-10-4, 2010 WL 2352056 (S.D. Tex. 2010)	7, 8, 13
<i>Honeywell Int'l, Inc. v. Audiovox Commc'ns Corp.</i> , Civ. A. 04-1337-KAJ, 2005 WL 2465898 (D. Del. May 18, 2005)	8, 11
<i>Intellectual Ventures I LLC v. AT&T Mobility LLC</i> , C.A. No. 12-193-LPS, 2014 WL 4445953 (D. Del. Sept. 8, 2014).....	11
<i>Katz v. Lear Siegler, Inc.</i> , 909 F.2d 1459 (Fed. Cir. 1990).....	11
<i>Kneeland v. Nat'l Collegiate Athletic Ass'n</i> , 806 F.2d 1285 (5th Cir. 1987)	7, 9, 12, 13
<i>Peoples v. Aldine Indep. Sch. Dist.</i> , 2008 WL 2571900 (S.D. Tex. Jun. 19, 2008).....	14
<i>Reid v. General Motors Corp.</i> , 240 F.R.D. 257 (E.D. Tex. 2006).....	8
<i>Ross v. Marshall</i> , 426 F.3d 745 (5th Cir. 2005)	12
<i>Sierra Club v. Espy</i> , 18 F.3d 1202 (5th Cir. 1994)	6
<i>Staley v. Harris Cnty.</i> , 223 F.R.D. 458 (S.D. Tex. 2004).....	1, 2, 5, 6, 7

Stallworth v. Monsanto Co.,
558 F.2d 257, 264-66 (5th Cir. 1977)5, 9

Tegic Communications Corp. v. Board of Regents,
296 U.S. 53 (1935); 458 F.3d 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....10

TiVo, Inc. v. AT&T, Inc.,
Civil Action No. 2:09-CV-259, 2010 WL 10922068 (E.D. Tex. Mar. 31, 2010)8, 13

TravelSource Corp. v. Old Republic Int’l,
No. 85 C 8116, 1986 WL 3848 (N.D. Ill. Mar. 14, 1986)8

Statutes

Fed. R. Civ. P. 24.....1, 4, 5, 7, 10, 13

Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(a)5, 10

Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(b)5, 13, 15

Other Authorities

A. Wright & Arthur R. Miller, Federal Practice and Procedure § 192215

Alacritech does not oppose intervention by Intel so long as it is timely and non-prejudicial – *i.e.*, it does not undermine the existing orders and schedule already adopted by the Court. But neither Rule 24 nor fundamental considerations of fairness permit a putative intervenor to manipulate the timing of its intervention in order to disrupt or delay the case schedule in a pending lawsuit to the detriment of the plaintiff. Indeed, the Fifth Circuit has characterized the timeliness of a movant’s request to intervene as a “threshold” issue and denied intervention when a movant’s delay threatened to derail the orderly progress of the litigation.¹ Thus, as Alacritech told Intel, Alacritech does not oppose Intel’s intervention, so long as Intel would agree to be bound by orders currently governing this case. Intel would have acceded to this reasonable request if its interest in intervention were simply to protect its alleged financial interest in the litigation. But Intel refused. As its Motion indicates, it wants to intervene **and** attempt to re-do the case schedule and other orders governing the case. This is not allowed.

Intel cannot have it both ways: either intervention is timely and appropriate because it will not disrupt the existing case schedule and other orders, or it is not timely and not appropriate because it will. More simply, Intel should not be able to intervene **and**, through its intervention, create the prejudice Rule 24 is designed to protect against, namely, the parties’ and Court’s interests in the efficient, expeditious resolution of the issues in dispute.² For this reason, Alacritech respectfully requests that the Court condition Intel’s intervention on Intel’s agreement to abide by the existing orders, including the Protective Order (Dkt. 75), Docket Control Order (Dkt. 43), and Discovery Order (Dkt. 50), and not revisit briefing or otherwise seek to delay the proceedings or undermine this Court’s authority.

¹ *Corely v. Jackson Police Dep’t*, 755 F.2d 1207, 1209 (5th Cir. 1985).

² *Staley v. Harris Cnty.*, 223 F.R.D. 458, 463 (S.D. Tex. 2004).

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.