

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SIRIUS XM RADIO INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

FRAUNHOFER-GESELLSCHAFT ZUR FÖRDERUNG DER
ANGEWANDTEN FORSCHUNG E.V.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2018-00682
Patent No. 6,931,084

**PETITIONER'S SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITY BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF
ITS REQUEST FOR REHEARING**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. Background.....	1
II. SXM Should Be Permitted To Amend Its RPI Disclosures.....	2
A. The Board’s Recent Precedential Decisions Confirm That SXM’s Request To Amend Its RPI Disclosures Is Not Time Barred	2
B. The Relevant Factors Confirm That SXM Should Be Permitted To Amend Its RPI Designations.....	3
1. There Have Been No Attempts To Circumvent The § 315(b) Bar Or Estoppel Rules.....	3
2. There Has Been No Bad Faith By SXM.....	4
3. There Is No Prejudice To Patent Owner	6
4. There Has Been No Gamesmanship	6

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Federal Cases

Adello Biologics LLC v. Amgen Inc.,
Case PGR2019-00001, Paper 11 (PTAB Feb. 14, 2019)*passim*

Proppant Express Investments, LLC v. Oren Technologies, LLC,
Case IPR2017-01917, Paper 86 (PTAB Feb. 13, 2019).....*passim*

Wi-Fi One, LLC v. Broadcom Corp.,
878 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2018))3

Federal Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 312(a)2, 3

35 U.S.C. § 315(b)2, 3, 7

Regulations

37 C.F.R. § 42.115

Petitioner Sirius XM Radio Inc. (“SXM” or “Petitioner”) respectfully submits this brief setting forth the reasons that two recently designated precedential decisions support SXM’s pending Request for Rehearing – specifically, *Proppant Express Investments, LLC v. Oren Technologies, LLC*, Case IPR2017-01917 (PTAB Feb. 13, 2019) (Paper 86) (“*Proppant*”) and *Adello Biologics LLC v. Amgen Inc.*, Case PGR2019-00001 (PTAB Feb. 14, 2019) (Paper 11) (“*Adello*”).

I. BACKGROUND

On September 6, 2018, the Board denied institution of the Petition because it found that Sirius XM Holdings Inc. (“Holdings”) should have been named a real party-in-interest (“RPI”) and that Petitioner had not shown good cause to permit a modification to the RPI designations without changing the Petition’s filing date. Paper 12 (the “Institution Decision”).¹ On October 5, 2018, SXM filed a Request for Rehearing (Paper 13, “Request”) setting forth reasons why the Institution Decision should be reconsidered, including the fact that the Board overlooked the good cause for allowing SXM to amend its disclosures to designate Holdings as an RPI without impacting the Petition’s filing date. Request at 12-15. Subsequently, SXM informed the Board of newly issued decisions supporting SXM’s position

¹ The Institution Decision did not address whether Liberty Media Corp. (“Liberty”) is an RPI, but the arguments presented here apply to both Holdings and Liberty.

that Holdings should not be considered an RPI, and SXM's requests to modify its RPI designations in the event that the Board continued to disagree with SXM. Exs. 1019-1022. After the Board designated the *Proppant* and *Adello* decisions precedential, the panel permitted SXM to submit this brief, which demonstrates that SXM should be permitted to amend its RPI disclosures without impacting the Petition's filing date and have its Petition decided on the merits.

II. SXM SHOULD BE PERMITTED TO AMEND ITS RPI DISCLOSURES

A. The Board's Recent Precedential Decisions Confirm That SXM's Request To Amend Its RPI Disclosures Is Not Time Barred

The Board recently confirmed in *Proppant* (at 7) and *Adello* (at 3) that the requirements under 35 U.S.C. § 312(a) are not jurisdictional, making any alleged error or omission rectifiable without impacting the filing date of the Petition. More specifically, *Proppant* explained that “the Board may, under 35 U.S.C. § 312(a), accept updated mandatory notices as long as the petition would not have been time-barred under 35 U.S.C. § 315(b) if it had included the real party in interest.” *Proppant* at 7; *see also Adello* at 3-4. These decisions are consistent with SXM's arguments throughout this proceeding based on *Lumentum* (precedential) and other decisions. *See Request* at 1, 7-9; *see also Paper 9* (“Reply”) at 3-4.

In *Proppant* and *Adello*, the Board emphasized that where “none of the now named real parties in interest was subject to the § 315(b) time bar, *i.e.*, none of

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.