

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

SHOPIFY, INC.

Petitioner

v.

DDR HOLDINGS, LLC

Patent Owner

Case IPR2018-01011

Patent No. 9,639,876

**MOTION TO CORRECT MISTAKES IN PETITION UNDER  
37 C.F.R. § 42.104(c)**

## I. INTRODUCTION

Petitioner Shopify, Inc. (“Petitioner”) moves to correct errors in the petition for *inter partes* review (“IPR”) in IPR2018-01011, and seeks leave to file a replacement version of the originally-filed petition, which replacement has been concurrently filed as Exhibit 1023. The Board authorized the filing of this motion in an email dated August 1, 2018.

The proposed replacement petition corrects typographical errors consisting of incorrect exhibit citations. The original petition erroneously included citations to Exhibit 1010 rather than Exhibit 1007, as intended and as evidenced by the Petition’s Exhibit List.

## II. FACTS AND CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE ERRORS

On May 2, 2018, Petitioner filed its original Petition (Paper No. 1) challenging various claims of U.S. Pat. No. 9,639,876 (the “876 Patent”). Shortly thereafter, Petitioner realized that the body of the Petition incorrectly cited to evidence within Exhibit 1010 (U.S. Patent No. 6,330,575; “Moore”) rather than Exhibit 1007 (Web Page of Corel; “Corel”).

On May 4, 2018, counsel for Petitioner notified counsel for DDR Holdings, LLC (“Patent Owner”) of the errors and Petitioner’s intention to file a motion to correct them. On May 7, 2018, Petitioner provided a redline version of the petition

to Patent Owner's counsel. Patent Owner informed Petitioner on May 30, 2018, that they do not oppose this motion.

On August 1, 2018, Petitioner sent an email to [trials@uspto.gov](mailto:trials@uspto.gov) requesting authorization from the Board to file a motion to correct the errors in the originally filed Petition.

### **III. STATEMENT OF RELIEF REQUESTED**

The original Petition mistakenly cites to Exhibit 1010 in its analysis of the challenged claims, rather than Exhibit 1007, though from the context it is clear that Exhibit 1007 should have been cited. Petitioner respectfully requests that it be allowed to correct its Petition by revising the citations so that they read as "Exhibit 1007", and thereby accurately reflect the conducted expert analysis. The requested revision will not alter the substance of the Petition. A redlined proposed Corrected Petition tracking the proposed corrections has been filed as Ex. 1023.

### **IV. ARGUMENT IN SUPPORT OF RELIEF REQUESTED**

The proposed changes should be applied because they relate to a non-substantive, clerical transcription error that was not identified prior to filing, and Petitioner promptly sought to correct its mistakes after discovering them the day after filing. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(c) ("A motion may be filed that seeks to correct a clerical or typographical mistake in the petition."). The proposed changes seek to correct the Petition to accurately reflect the analysis discussed in the expert

declaration. That is, Petitioner's requested corrections seek to identify the prior art exhibit to which the analysis properly applies. The Petitioner is not seeking to make changes to the arguments applied to the prior art – the grounds for the challenged claims will rise or fall based on the analysis already present in the Petition, other than correcting the cited exhibit numbers. *See, e.g. Amkor Technology, Inc. v. Tessera Inc.*, IPR2013-00242, Paper 32, at 5-6 (PTAB Aug. 29, 2013) (allowing correction of copying and pasting error by subordinate attorney where no new analysis was added by correction).

Correction of these errors will not prejudice Patent Owner or destroy the notice function of the Petition. Petitioner notified Patent Owner of the errors and Petitioner's intent to file a motion to correct promptly after filing the Petition, and provided the Patent Owner with redline versions of the proposed corrections. Petitioner does not seek to alter substantive arguments, and Patent Owner has not yet submitted a response to the Petition. Patent Owner will retain its opportunity to address Petitioner's same substantive arguments regarding the art specifically applied to the challenged claims of the '876 Patent.

The original Petition was filed before the one-year time bar. The proposed corrections would not implicate the one-year time bar, as the grant of such motions under 37 C.F.R. § 104(c) does not change the filing date.

Given the clerical nature of the typographical errors, lack of prejudice to the Patent Owner, and Petitioner's prompt efforts to correct the issues on their discovery, the proposed corrections are appropriate under Rule 104(c). *See, e.g., ABB Inc. v. ROY-G-BIV Corp.*, IPR2013-00063, Paper 21, at 7 (PTAB Jan. 16, 2013) (Rule 104(c) is "remedial in nature" and should be "liberally applied") (citing *Tcherepnin v. Knight*, 389 U.S. 332, 336 (1967)).

## V. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Petitioner respectfully requests that the Board apply the above-proposed corrections to Petitioner's Petition for *Inter Partes* Review. Further, Petitioner certifies that the suggested corrections will not cause the Petition to exceed the word count limit of 37 C.F.R. § 42.24.

Dated: August 6, 2018

/Michael J. McNamara/

Michael J. McNamara (Reg. No. 52,017)  
Mintz, Levin, Cohn, Ferris, Glovsky  
and Popeo, P.C.  
One Financial Center  
Boston, MA 02111  
Telephone: (617) 348-1884  
Facsimile: (617) 542-2241  
E-mails: MMcNamara@mintz.com;  
DDR\_IPR\_Service@mintz.com

# 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.