

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

LG ELECTRONICS, INC., HTC CORPORATION, and HTC AMERICA, INC.
Petitioners

v.

UNILOC LUXEMBOURG S.A.,
Patent Owner

INTER PARTES REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 8,712,723
Case IPR No.: *IPR2018-01458*

MOTION FOR JOINDER TO *INTER PARTES* REVIEW
(35 U.S.C. § 315(c) AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.122(b))

I. STATEMENT OF THE PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED

Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 315(c) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.122(b), Petitioners LG Electronics, Inc. (“LG”), HTC Corporation, and HTC America, Inc. (together “HTC”) (collectively “Petitioners”) move for joinder with the *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 8,712,723 (“the ’723 patent”), *Apple Inc. v. Uniloc USA, Inc.*, IPR2018-00389 (“the Apple IPR”), for which trial was recently instituted on June 27, 2018. IPR2018-00389, paper 7. This motion is timely because it is filed within one month of institution of the Apple IPR. 37 C.F.R. § 42.122(b). Petitioners understand that the petitioner in the Apple IPR (“the Apple Petitioner”) does not oppose Petitioners’ requests for joinder.

Petitioners request institution of the concurrently filed Petition for *Inter Partes* Review. The Petition is a carbon copy of the original Apple IPR petition in all material respects. The only substantive changes are in the introduction to identify the correct Petitioners and the mandatory notices under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b). The concurrently filed Petition and the Apple IPR petition challenge the same claims of the ’723 patent on the same grounds relying on the same prior art and evidence, including a declaration identical in substance from the same expert.¹

¹ The declaration has been updated only to reflect retention by Petitioners and is otherwise identical to the declaration submitted in the Apple IPR.

Petitioners agree to proceed solely on the grounds, evidence, and arguments advanced, or that will be advanced, in the Apple IPR as instituted. Thus, the Petition warrants institution under 35 U.S.C. § 314, and 35 U.S.C. § 315(c) permits Petitioners' joinder to the Apple IPR.

Further, if joined, Petitioners agree to adhere to all applicable deadlines in the Apple IPR and coordinate all filings with Apple Petitioner in the Apple IPR. The Apple Petitioner will maintain the lead role in the proceedings so long as it is a party to the proceedings and is not estopped under § 315(e)(1). Petitioners will only assume the lead role in the proceedings if the Apple Petitioner is no longer a party to the proceedings or unable to advance arguments for one or more claims, or grounds, for example, because of § 315(e)(1). Petitioners agree to consolidated filings for all substantive papers in the proceeding. The Apple Petitioner and Petitioners will be jointly responsible for the consolidated filings. Absent a Board order precluding the Apple Petitioner from making arguments that would otherwise be available to Petitioners, Petitioners will not advance any arguments separate from those advanced by the Apple Petitioner in the consolidated filings. These limitations will avoid lengthy and duplicative briefing. Also, Petitioners will not seek additional depositions or deposition time, and will coordinate deposition questioning and hearing presentations with the Apple Petitioner.

Petitioners agree to the foregoing conditions even in the event that other IPRs filed by other, third-party petitioners are joined with the Apple IPR.

Joinder will help efficiently resolve the disputes among the parties. By joinder, a single Board decision may dispose of the issues raised in the Apple IPR for all interested parties. Further, the Patent Owner has asserted the '723 patent in district court against LG Electronics U.S.A., Inc., LG Electronics, Inc., and LG Electronics Mobilecomm U.S.A., Inc., as well as HTC America, Inc. Joinder will estop LG and HTC from asserting in district court those issues resolved in a final decision from the Apple IPR, thus narrowing the issues in the district court actions. *See* 35 U.S.C. § 315(e)(2). Finally, joinder would not complicate or delay the Apple IPR, and would not adversely affect any schedule set in that proceeding. In sum, joinder would promote efficient adjudication in multiple forums. On the other hand, if instituted, maintaining the Petitioners' IPR proceeding separate from that of the Apple IPR would entail needless duplication of effort.

Joinder will not unduly prejudice any party. Because joinder will not add any new substantive issues, delay the schedule, burden deponents, or increase needless filings, any additional costs on the Patent Owner would be minimal. On the other hand, denial of joinder would prejudice LG and HTC. Their interests may not be adequately protected in the Apple IPR proceedings, particularly if the

Apple Petitioner settles with the Patent Owner. Petitioners should be allowed to join in a proceeding affecting a patent asserted against them.

II. BACKGROUND AND RELATED PROCEEDINGS

Uniloc Luxembourg S.A. (the “Patent Owner”) is the owner of the ’723 patent. The Patent Owner asserted the ’723 patent against LG in *Uniloc USA, Inc. et al. v. LG Electronics U.S.A., Inc. et al.*, Case No. 4:17-cv-00832-O (N.D. Tex. filed on Oct. 13, 2017) (transferred and is now *Uniloc USA, Inc. et al. v. LG Electronics U.S.A., Inc. et al.*, Case No. 4:18-cv-02918-PJH (N.D. Cal. filed on May 17, 2018)); and against HTC in *Uniloc USA, Inc. et al. v. HTC America, Inc.*, Case No. 2:17-cv-01629 (W.D. Wash. filed on Nov. 1, 2017) (consolidated with *Uniloc USA, Inc. et al. v. HTC America, Inc.*, Case No. 2:17-cv-01558 (W.D. Wash.) (Lead case) on May 3, 2018). In addition, the Patent Owner asserted the ’723 patent against Samsung Electronics America, Inc. et al.; Huawei Device USA, Inc. et al.; and Apple Inc. (“Apple”). See *Uniloc USA, Inc. et al. v. Samsung Electronics America, Inc. et al.*, 2:17-cv-00650 (E.D. Tex. filed on Sept. 15, 2017); *Uniloc USA, Inc. et al. v. Huawei Device USA, Inc. et al.*, 2:17-cv-00737 (E.D. Tex. filed on Nov. 9, 2017); and *Uniloc USA, Inc. et al. v. Apple Inc.*, 2:17-cv-00522 (E.D. Tex. filed on June 30, 2017) (transferred and is now *Uniloc USA, Inc. et al. v. Apple Inc.*, 4:18-cv-00364 (N.D. Cal. filed on Jan. 17, 2018)). On December 22, 2017, Apple filed its IPR petition, IPR2018-00389, against the ’723

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.