

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

CANON INC.; CANON U.S.A., INC.; CANON FINANCIAL  
SERVICES, INC.; NIKON CORPORATION; NIKON INC.;  
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.; SAMSUNG  
ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.; SANYO ELECTRIC CO., LTD.,

Petitioner,

v.

PAPST LICENSING GMBH & CO., KG,

Patent Owner.

---

CASE: IPR2018-00410

Patent No. 6,895,449 B2

---

**PETITIONER'S MOTION FOR JOINDER UNDER  
37 C.F.R. §§ 42.22 AND 42.122(b)**

**CONTENTS**

I. Relief Requested..... 1

II. Statement of Material Facts.....3

III. Statement of Reasons for Relief Requested .....6

    A. Joinder is Appropriate .....8

    B. No new grounds of unpatentability are asserted in this Petition.....9

    C. Joinder will have, at most, a minimal impact on the trial  
        schedule and costs for the Pending IPR .....9

    D. Briefing and discovery .....11

IV. Conclusion .....12

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Cases**

*Dell Inc. v. Network-1 Sec. Solutions, Inc.*, IPR2013-00385, Paper 17 (PTAB July 29, 2013) .....7, 8

*In re Papst Licensing Digital Camera Patent Litig.*, 778 F.3d 1255 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....3

*Kyocera Corp. v. Softview, LLC*, IPR2013-00004, Paper 15 (PTAB Apr. 24, 2013).....9

*Motorola Mobility LLC v. Softview LLC*, IPR2013-00256, Paper 10 (PTAB June 20, 2013) .....12

*Olympus Corp. v. Papst Licensing GmbH & Co. KG*, IPR2017-01617, Paper 3 (PTAB June 16, 2017).....4

*Olympus Corp. v. Papst Licensing GmbH & Co. KG*, IPR2017-01617, Paper 7 (PTAB Oct. 17, 2017) .....5

*Papst Licensing GmbH & Co. KG v. Apple*, No. 6:15-cv-01095, 2017 WL 897172 (E.D. Tex. Mar. 7, 2017) .....4

*Samsung Elecs. Co. Ltd. v. Unifi Sci. Batteries, LLC*, IPR2013-00236, Paper 22 (PTAB Oct. 17, 2013) .....9

*Trulia, Inc. v. Zillow, Inc.*, CBM2014-00115, Paper 8 (PTAB May 1, 2014) .....8

**Statutes**

35 U.S.C. § 315 .....7

**Other Authorities**

157 CONG. REC. S1376 (Mar. 8, 2011).....8

77 Fed. Reg. at 48,758 .....8

**Rules**

37 C.F.R. § 42.1 .....8

37 C.F.R. § 42.122 .....7

**I. RELIEF REQUESTED**

Canon Inc., Canon U.S.A., Inc., and Canon Financial Services, Inc. (Canon); Nikon Corporation and Nikon Inc. (Nikon); Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. and Samsung Electronics America, Inc. (Samsung); and Sanyo Electric Co., Ltd. (Sanyo) (Canon, Nikon, Samsung, and Sanyo collectively, Petitioner) respectfully request to join, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 315(c) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.122(b), the concurrently filed Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 6,895,449 (the '449 patent) (the Instant Petition) with pending *inter partes* review, IPR2017-00415 (the Pending IPR), which was instituted by the Board on May 17, 2017. IPR2017-00415, Paper 8.

Petitioner acknowledges that the Instant Petition and Motion for Joinder are being filed outside the one-month time period set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 42.122(b). As more fully explained in the accompanying Petitioner's Motion to Waive or Suspend Rule 37 C.F.R. § 42.122, it is in the interest of justice, and good cause exists for Petitioner to be allowed to join the Pending IPR. Specifically, Papst has attempted to manipulate the PTAB's efficient determination of patentability as Congress intended by giving Olympus, purportedly the last petitioner in the Pending IPR,<sup>1</sup> a

---

<sup>1</sup> Papst settled with Huawei and LG and moved to terminate the Pending IPR with respect to those parties. Papst apparently has reached a settlement in principle

“sweetheart deal” so that the instituted claims (which have already been deemed likely unpatentable) do not reach a Final Written Decision. Papst embarks on this effort after the Board has already found unpatentable *every instituted claim* in two related, continuation patents.

In this unprecedented situation, joinder is appropriate because it will promote the efficient resolution of the validity of the '449 patent despite Papst's efforts to avoid such efficient resolution and to continue its protracted and expensive litigation campaign that has spanned a decade (constituting over 100 years' worth of litigation for the manufacturers, collectively) and cost tens of millions of dollars. The Instant Petition involves the same '449 patent, covers the same claims instituted, and relies on the same arguments and evidentiary record as in the Pending IPR.<sup>2</sup> To avoid any impact on the trial schedule for the Pending IPR, Petitioner suggests several procedures the Board may adopt to simplify briefing and discovery. *See, infra*, Section III.D. Therefore, joinder would neither complicate the issues nor unduly delay the existing schedule of IPR2017-00415.

---

with ZTE and is working to finalize a settlement agreement. No motion to terminate has yet been filed with respect to ZTE.

<sup>2</sup> Petitioner's Exhibits are identical to the corresponding Pending IPR Exhibits.

# 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.