

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

CAVIUM, INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

ALACRITECH, INC.,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2018-00403  
Patent 8,805,948 B2

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

FISHMAN, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION

Institution of *Inter Partes* Review and  
Granting Petitioner's Motion for Joinder  
*35 U.S.C. § 314(a), 37 C.F.R. § 42.122*

## I. INTRODUCTION

Cavium, Inc. (“Petitioner”), filed a Petition (Paper 1, “Pet.”) for *inter partes* review of claims 1, 3, 6–8, 17, 19, 21, and 22 of U.S. Patent No. 8,805,948 B2 (Ex. 1001) pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §§ 311–319. On the same day as filing the Petition, Petitioner filed a Motion for Joinder. Paper 3 (“Joinder Motion” or “Mot.”). The Joinder Motion seeks to join Cavium as a petitioner in *Intel Corp. v. Alacritech*, Case IPR2018-00234 (“the 234 IPR”). Mot. 1. The Joinder Motion indicates Intel Corp., Petitioner in the 234 IPR, does not oppose Cavium’s request to join that proceeding. *Id.* However, the Joinder Motion is silent regarding Patent Owner’s position regarding the Joinder Motion.

Alacritech, Inc. (“Patent Owner”) did not file an Opposition to the Joinder Motion. Patent Owner filed a Preliminary Response that is silent regarding the Joinder Motion. Paper 8 (“Prelim. Resp.”).

As explained further below, we institute trial in this *inter partes* review on the same ground as instituted in IPR2018-00234 and we grant Petitioner’s Motion for Joinder.

## II. DISCUSSION

### A. *Institution of Trial*

In IPR2018-00234, Petitioner Intel challenges the patentability of claims 1, 3, 6–8, 17, 19, 21, and 22 as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

IPR2018-00403  
Patent 8,805,948 B2

over the combined disclosures of Thia,<sup>1</sup> Tanenbaum96,<sup>2</sup> and Stevens2.<sup>3</sup> IPR2018-00234 Paper 2, 18. After considering the Petition and the Patent Owner's Preliminary Response in IPR2018-00234, we instituted trial for the above-identified ground of unpatentability. *See* IPR2018-00234, Paper 7.

Petitioner here (Cavium) represents that this Petition is substantively identical to the Petition in IPR2018-00234 challenging the same claims based on the same ground. Mot. 1. We have considered the relevant Petitions and we agree with Petitioner's representation that this Petition is substantially identical to the Petition in IPR2018-00234. *Compare* Pet., with IPR2018-00234, Paper 2.

Patent Owner's Preliminary Response does not point out any differences from its Preliminary Response in the 234 IPR. After reviewing Patent Owner's Preliminary Response here and in the 234 IPR, we find the two responses to be substantially identical. *Compare* Prelim. Resp., with IPR2108-00234 Paper 6.

Accordingly, for essentially the same reasons stated in our Decision to Institute in IPR2018-00234, we conclude Petitioner has established a reasonable likelihood of prevailing with respect to at least one challenged claim and we institute trial in this proceeding for claims 1, 3, 6–8, 17, 19, 21, and 22 on the same ground as in IPR2018-00234.

---

<sup>1</sup> Y.H. Thia and C.M. Woodside, *A Reduced Operation Protocol Engine (ROPE) for a Multiple-Layer Bypass Architecture*, 1995 ("Thia," Ex. 1015).

<sup>2</sup> Andrew S. Tanenbaum, *Computer Networks*, Third Edition, 1996 ("Tanenbaum96," Ex. 1006).

<sup>3</sup> W. Richard Stevens *et al.*, *TCP/IP Illustrated, Volume 2*, 1995 ("Stevens2," Ex. 1013).

*B. Motion for Joinder*

Based on authority delegated to us by the Director, we have discretion to join an *inter partes* review to a previously instituted *inter partes* review. 35 U.S.C. § 315(c). Section 315(c) provides, in relevant part, that “[i]f the Director institutes an inter partes review, the Director, in his or her discretion, may join as a party to that inter partes review any person who properly files a petition under section 311.” *Id.*

Without opposition to the Joinder Motion from any party, we grant Petitioner’s Motion for Joinder with the 234 IPR subject to the condition that:

In the joined proceeding, Petitioner here (i.e., Cavium, Inc.) will be bound by all substantive and procedural filings and representations of current Petitioner in IPR2018-00234 (i.e., Intel Corp.), without a separate opportunity to be heard, whether orally or in writing, unless and until the joined proceeding is terminated with respect to Petitioner Intel in IPR2018-00234.

In view of the foregoing, we determine that joinder based upon the above-noted condition will have little or no impact on the timing, cost, or presentation of the trial on the instituted ground. Moreover, discovery and briefing will be simplified if the proceedings are joined.

### III. ORDER

After due consideration of the record before us, and for the foregoing reasons, it is:

ORDERED that pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 314, an *inter partes* review is hereby instituted for claims 1, 3, 6–8, 17, 19, 21, and 22 of the '948 patent as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over the combined disclosures of Thia, Tanenbaum96, and Stevens2;

FURTHER ORDERED that Petitioner's Motion for Joinder with IPR2018-00234 is *granted*, and Cavium, Inc. is joined as a petitioner in IPR2018-00234;

FURTHER ORDERED that the ground on which an *inter partes* review was instituted in Case IPR2018-00234 remain unchanged, and no other grounds are instituted in the joined proceedings;

FURTHER ORDERED that Petitioner here (i.e., Cavium, Inc.) will be bound by all substantive and procedural filings and representations of current Petitioner in IPR2018-00234 (i.e., Intel Corp.), without a separate opportunity to be heard, whether orally or in writing, unless and until the proceeding is terminated with respect to Intel Corp;

FURTHER ORDERED that the schedule for this proceeding shall be governed by the current schedule and any changes in the schedule for IPR2018-00234;

FURTHER ORDERED that IPR2018-00403 is terminated under 37 C.F.R. § 42.72, and that all future filings are to be made only in IPR2018-00234;

FURTHER ORDERED that the case caption in IPR2019-00234 for all further submissions shall be changed to add Petitioner (Cavium, Inc.) as a

# 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.