

Filed on behalf of: Snap Inc.

By: Yar Chaikovsky (Snap-Blackberry-PH-IPR@paulhastings.com)
Chad Peterman (Snap-Blackberry-PH-IPR@paulhastings.com)
Paul Hastings LLP

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SNAP INC.,
Petitioner

v.

BLACKBERRY LIMITED
Patent Owner

U.S. Patent No. 8,209,634
IPR2019-00938

MOTION FOR JOINDER TO *INTER PARTES* REVIEW IPR2019-00925

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. STATEMENT OF THE PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED	1
II. STATEMENT OF MATERIAL FACTS	2
III. STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR RELIEF REQUESTED	3
A. Legal Standard.....	3
B. Each of the Factors Weighs in Favor of the Board Granting the Motion for Joinder.....	3
1. Joinder with the Facebook Petition is Appropriate.....	4
2. Petitioner Does Not Propose New Grounds of Unpatentability.....	5
3. Joinder Will Not Negatively Impact the Facebook Proceeding Trial Schedule	5
4. Procedures to Simplify Briefing and Discovery.....	6
IV. CONCLUSION.....	8

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Dell, Inc. v. Network-1 Security Sols., Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00385, Paper 17 (July 29, 2013)	3
<i>Facebook, Inc., Instagram, LLC and WhatsApp Inc. v. BlackBerry Limited</i> , IPR2019-00925	1
<i>HTC v. Parthenon Unified Memory Architecture LLC.</i> , IPR2017-00512, Paper No. 12 (June 1, 2017).....	1
<i>LG v. Memory Integrity, LLC.</i> , IPR2015-01353, Paper No. 11 (Oct. 5, 2015)	3, 5, 7
<i>Noven Pharm., Inc. v. Novartis AG</i> , IPR2014-00550, Paper No. 38 (Apr. 10, 2015).....	7
<i>Par Pharm., Inc. v. Novartis AG</i> , IPR2016-01023, Paper No. 20 (Oct. 27, 2016)	5
<i>Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd. v. Raytheon Co.</i> , IPR2016-00962, Paper No. 12 (Aug. 24, 2016)	4
Statutes	
35 U.S.C. § 315(c)	1, 3
Other Authorities	
37 C.F.R.	
§ 42.1(b)	1, 4
§ 42.22.....	1
§ 42.53.....	7
§ 42.122(b).....	1

I. STATEMENT OF THE PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED

Pursuant to the Board's Order (Paper 9), Snap Inc. ("Petitioner" or "Snap") respectfully submits this Motion for Joinder to join its previously filed petition in the instant proceeding (Paper 2) ("the Snap petition") with Facebook's petition (IPR2019-00925) ("the Facebook petition") for *inter partes* review of U.S. Patent U.S. Patent No. 8,209,634 ("the '634 patent").

Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 315(c), 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.22 and 42.122(b), Snap requests institution of the Snap petition and joinder with *Facebook, Inc., Instagram, LLC and WhatsApp Inc. v. BlackBerry Limited*, IPR2019-00925 ("the Facebook proceeding"), which concerns the same claims 1, 4-7, 10-13, and 16-18 of the '634 patent. This request is being submitted within the time set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 42.122(b).

Snap submits that the request for joinder is consistent with the policy surrounding *inter partes* reviews, as it is the most expedient way to "secure the just, speedy, and inexpensive resolution of every proceeding." See 37 C.F.R. § 42.1(b); see also *HTC v. Parthenon Unified Memory Architecture LLC.*, IPR2017-00512, Paper No. 12 at 5–6 (June 1, 2017). The Snap petition and the Facebook petition are substantially identical; they contain the same grounds (based on the same prior art combinations and supporting evidence) against the same claims. Further, upon joining the Facebook proceeding, Snap will act as an "understudy"

and will not assume an active role unless the current petitioners cease to participate in the instituted IPR. Accordingly, the proposed joinder will neither unduly complicated the Facebook proceeding nor delay its schedule. As such, the joinder will promote judicial efficiency in determining the patentability of the '634 patent without prejudice to Patent Owner.

II. STATEMENT OF MATERIAL FACTS

1. The '634 patent is at issue in infringement actions against Snap and Facebook in the Central District of California, Case No. 2:18-cv-01844.
2. On April 4, 2019, Facebook filed a petition for *inter partes* review (IPR2019-00925) requesting cancelation of claims 1, 4-7, 10-13, and 16-18 of the '634 patent.
3. On April 5, 2019, Facebook filed a petition for *inter partes* review (IPR2019-00938) requesting cancelation of claims 1, 4-7, 10-13, and 16-18 of the '634 patent.
4. The Snap petition and the Facebook petition are substantially identical; they contain the same grounds (based on the same prior art combinations and supporting evidence) against the same claims. Paper 2, 2; Paper 9, 1.

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.