

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 IPR2018-00690
Patent No. 6,314,289

PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR REHEARING

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. Introduction.....	1
II. Legal Standard.....	2
III. The Board Should Grant Petitioner's Request	2
A. The Board Misapprehended Federal Circuit Law	2
B. The Board Ignored The PTAB's Precedential <i>Lumentum</i> Decision.....	7
C. Good Cause Exists to Amend Petitioner's RPI Designations.....	9
1. Good Cause Exists When There Is No Attempt to Circumvent the AIA's Time Bar and Estoppel Rules	10
2. Good Cause Exists When There Is No Prejudice	12
3. Good Cause Exists Because Petitioner Made Good Faith Arguments That Holdings Is Not An RPI.....	13
4. The Board Erred in Finding No Good Cause for Petitioner Not Updating Its RPI Designations.....	14
D. The Interests of Justice Would be Served by Permitting Amendment of the RPI Designations.....	15
IV. Relief Requested.....	15

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page(s)</u>
Federal Cases	
<i>Applications in Internet Time, LLC, v. RPX Corp.</i> , 897 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Daifuku Co., Ltd., et al. v. Murata Machinery, Ltd.</i> , IPR2015-01538, Paper 11 (PTAB Jan. 19, 2016)	6
<i>Global Tel*Link Corp. v. Securus Techs., Inc.</i> , IPR2015-01225, Paper 44 (PTAB Dec. 14, 2016)	6
<i>Lumentum Holdings, Inc. v. Capella Photonics, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00739, Paper 38 (PTAB Mar. 4, 2016)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp. v. Mayne Pharma Int'l PTY Ltd.</i> , IPR2016-01186, Paper 70 (PTAB Dec. 13, 2017)	11, 15
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. DataTern, Inc.</i> , 755 F. 3d 899 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	5
<i>Mobile Tech, Inc. v. Sennco Sol'ns, Inc.</i> , IPR2017-02199, Paper 9 (PTAB Apr. 10, 2018)	7
<i>Puzhen Life USA, LLC v. Esip Series 2, LLC</i> , IPR2017-02197, Paper 13 (PTAB Apr. 11, 2018)	7
<i>Reflectix, Inc. v. Promethean Tech</i> , IPR2015-00039, Paper 18 (PTAB Apr. 24, 2015)	13
<i>Rubicon Comms., LP, v. Lego</i> , IPR2016-01187, Paper 40 (PTAB Dec. 16, 2016)	11, 13, 15
<i>Star Fruits S.N.C. v. U.S.</i> , 393 F. 3d 1277 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	3, 9
<i>Wi-Fi One, LLC, v. Broadcom Corp</i> , 878 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	8, 9
<i>ZOLL Lifecor Corp. v. Philips Elecs. N. Am. Corp.</i> , Case IPR2013-00606, Paper 13 (PTAB Mar. 20, 2014)	8, 9

Federal Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 312(a)1, 7, 9
35 U.S.C. § 315(b)5, 9, 10

Rules

Fed. R. Civ. P. 7.112

Regulations

37 C.F.R. § 42.1(b)12
37 C.F.R. § 42.1114, 15
37 C.F.R. § 42.71(c).....2
37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d)2
37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d)(2).....2

I. INTRODUCTION

On September 6, 2018, the Board denied institution of *inter partes* review of U.S. Patent No. 6,314,289 (“the ‘289 Patent”), finding that “Petitioner has not satisfied its burden of establishing that Holdings has been properly omitted as an RPI in this proceeding.” Paper 16 (the “Decision”).¹ Petitioner respectfully requests that the Board grant this Request for Rehearing (the “Request”) and consider the merits of the Petition for several reasons.

First, the Board misapprehended the Federal Circuit’s decision in *Applications in Internet Time, LLC, v. RPX Corp.*, 897 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2018) (“*RPX*”) by ignoring the two critical questions that lie at the heart of the RPI inquiry. Had the Board conducted the full inquiry outlined by the Federal Circuit, Holdings would not be considered an RPI.

Second, the Board ignored the PTAB’s precedential decision in *Lumentum Holdings, Inc. v. Capella Photonics, Inc.*, IPR2015-00739, Paper 38 (Mar. 4, 2016), which explains that 35 U.S.C. § 312(a) is *not jurisdictional* and makes an error under § 312(a) rectifiable. Rather than follow this precedential opinion, the Board incorrectly relied on decisions that pre-date and are inconsistent with

¹ The Board did not address whether Liberty Media Corp. is an RPI. However, the arguments presented herein with respect to Holdings apply to Liberty as well.

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.