

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

IXI IP, LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case Nos.
IPR2019-00124, IPR2019-00125,
IPR2019-00139, IPR2019-00140,
IPR2019-00141, IPR2019-00181.
Patent 7,039,033 B2

Before JANET A. GONGOLA, MICHAEL P. TIERNEY, and
WILLIAM M. FINK, *Vice Chief Administrative Patent Judges.*

TIERNEY, *Vice Chief Administrative Patent Judge.*

DECISION
Denying Institution of *Inter Partes* Review
35 U.S.C. § 314(a)

IPR2019-00124, IPR2019-00125,
IPR2019-00139, IPR2019-00140,
IPR2019-00141, IPR2019-00181
Patent 7,039,033 B2

I. Introduction

On November 8, 2018, Apple Inc. (“Petitioner”) filed six petitions for *inter partes* review of U.S. Patent No. 7,039,033 (Ex. 1001, “the ’033 patent”), issued on May 2, 2006. Paper 2, 67 (“Pet.”).¹ Accompanying the petitions for each proceeding, Petitioner filed identical motions for joinder and/or consolidation under 35 U.S.C. § 315(c). Paper 3 (“Motion”).² Specifically, Petitioner seeks to join and/or consolidate the six *inter partes* reviews with previously filed IPR2015-01444. Motion 1.

IXI IP, LLC (“Patent Owner”) opposes Petitioner’s request for joinder and/or consolidation and contends that Petitioner’s six petitions are time barred under 35 U.S.C. § 315(b). Paper 9 (“Opposition”). Patent Owner also filed a Preliminary Response (Paper 12, “Prel. Resp.”), repeating its contention that the six petitions are time barred under 35 U.S.C. § 315(b). Prel. Resp. 1, 7.

We have reviewed the parties’ contentions and, for the reasons discussed in detail below, deny Petitioner’s request for joinder and/or consolidation and deny its six petitions for institution.

II. Background

On October 2, 2014, Patent Owner filed a patent infringement suit against Petitioner in district court, alleging infringement of the ’033 patent.

¹ Unless otherwise specified, all papers referred to herein are from IPR2019-00124.

² Upon Patent Owner’s request for an extension of the time to file an opposition to Petitioner’s motions for joinder, on December 7, 2018, we granted a two-month extension by email.

IPR2019-00124, IPR2019-00125,
IPR2019-00139, IPR2019-00140,
IPR2019-00141, IPR2019-00181
Patent 7,039,033 B2

On June 19, 2015, Petitioner, together with two Samsung entities, filed an IPR petition (IPR2015-01444) challenging every claim in the '033 patent asserted in the district court litigation. *Id.* at 45; Motion 2. The Board instituted review and ultimately issued a final written decision on December 21, 2016, holding every challenged claim unpatentable. Ex. 1030. The Board's decision was appealed and subsequently upheld by the Federal Circuit. *IXI IP, LLC v. Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd.*, 903 F.3d 1257 (Fed. Cir. 2018). Thereafter, on January 16, 2019, the Board issued a trial certificate cancelling all claims challenged in the IPR, specifically, claims 1, 4–7, 12, 14, 15, 22, 23, 25, 28, 34, 39, 40, 42, and 46. Ex. 2001.

On March 24, 2017, while the previously filed IPR2015-01444 was on appeal, Patent Owner sought *ex parte* reexamination of the '033 patent. Prosecution History of Reexamination Control No. 90013925, Ex. 1032, 3. The Office granted the reexamination request on May 17, 2017. *Id.* at 180–197. A reexamination certificate issued on February 1, 2018, cancelling original claims 48–55, amending claim 56, and adding claims 57–124. *Id.* at 5–9.

IPR2019-00124, IPR2019-00125,
IPR2019-00139, IPR2019-00140,
IPR2019-00141, IPR2019-00181
Patent 7,039,033 B2

III. The Motion for Joinder and/or Consolidation is Denied

Joinder to an already-instituted proceeding may be authorized when warranted, but the decision to grant joinder is discretionary. 35 U.S.C. § 315(c). As provided for by the trial rules, any request for joinder must be filed as a motion under 37 C.F.R. § 42.22 no later than one month after the institution date of any *inter partes* review for which joinder is requested. See 37 C.F.R. § 42.122(b). Consolidation, like joinder, is discretionary and may occur “during the pendency of an *inter partes* review, if another proceeding or matter involving the patent is before the Office.” 35 U.S.C. § 315(d). When exercising discretion, the Board is mindful that the trial regulations, including the rules for joinder, must be construed to secure the just, speedy, and inexpensive resolution of every proceeding. See 37 C.F.R. § 42.1(b).

As a moving party, Petitioner has the burden of proof in establishing entitlement to the requested relief. 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.20(c), 42.122(b). A motion for joinder should, among other things, set forth the reasons why joinder is appropriate. See, e.g., *Kyocera Corp. v. Softview LLC*, Case IPR2013-00004, slip op. at 4 (PTAB Apr. 24, 2013) (Paper 15); FAQ H5 on the Board’s website at <https://go.usa.gov/xmwXS>.

Previously filed IPR2015-01444 was instituted on December 30, 2015. Petitioner filed its six petitions on November 8, 2018—more than 34 months after IPR2015-01444 was instituted. As such, Petitioner’s motion requesting joinder was filed several years after the one-month deadline set by rule for joinder and thus was untimely.

IPR2019-00124, IPR2019-00125,
IPR2019-00139, IPR2019-00140,
IPR2019-00141, IPR2019-00181
Patent 7,039,033 B2

We recognize that the '033 patent reexamination certificate adding claims 57–124 was not issued until February 1, 2018. Assuming for the sake of argument that the rules provide for joinder within one month of the issuance of the reexamination certificate, which the rules do not expressly cover, Petitioner still was several months late in filing its request for joinder. Therefore, under either possible trigger date—institution of IPR2015-01444 or issuance of the reexamination certificate—Petitioner's motion for joinder is time barred under our rules.

Notwithstanding the time bar, in previously filed IPR2015-01444, a trial certificate issued on January 16, 2019, cancelling all challenged claims in the '033 patent. Ex. 2001. As such, that *inter partes* review is no longer pending before the Office. Accordingly, the previously filed IPR cannot serve as a base proceeding to which another proceeding may be joined or consolidated. In other words, there is nothing to join to and, therefore, for this additional and independent reason, the motion is denied.

Based on the record presented, we determine that Petitioner has not met its burden to show that joinder and/or consolidation would be appropriate.

IV. The Petitions are Time Barred and thus Denied

Petitioner filed the six petitions on November 8, 2018, well more than a year after being served with a complaint alleging infringement of the '033 patent on October 2, 2014. An *inter partes* review may not be instituted if the petition requesting the proceeding was filed more than one year after the date on which the petitioner was served a complaint alleging infringement 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.