Trials@uspto.gov
571-272-7822

Paper 8
Entered: May 30, 2019

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

INVT SPE LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2019-00959
Patent 7,848,439 B2

Before THU A. DANG, KEVIN F. TURNER, and BARBARA A. BENOIT, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

BENOIT, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION
Institution of *Inter Partes* Review
35 U.S.C. § 314(a)
Petitioner's Motion for Joinder
37 C.F.R. § 42.122(b)

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

I. INTRODUCTION

Apple Inc. (“Petitioner” or “Apple”) filed a petition (Paper 1, “Pet.”) seeking *inter partes* review of claim 8 of U.S. Patent No. 7,848,439 B2 (Ex. 1001, “the ’439 patent” or “the challenged patent”). On the same day, Petitioner filed a Motion for Joinder with *HTC Corp. v. INVT SPEC LLC*, IPR2018-01581 (“the HTC IPR”). Paper 3 (“Mot.”). Patent Owner, INVT SPE LLC, filed a Preliminary Response and Response in Opposition to Petitioner’s Motion for Joinder. Paper 7 (“Prelim. Resp.”).

For the reasons described below, we institute an *inter partes* review of claim 8 of the challenged patent and grant Petitioner’s Motion for Joinder.

A. Related Matters

As required by 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2), each party identifies various judicial or administrative matters that would affect or be affected by a decision in this proceeding. Pet. 1; Paper 5 (Patent Owner’s Mandatory Notice), 2–3. The parties identify several district court proceedings and a U.S. International Trade Commission Investigation involving the challenged patent. Pet. 1; Paper 5, 2. Patent Owner additionally identifies various proceedings involving petitions for *inter partes* review. Paper 5, 2–3.

B. The Asserted Ground of Unpatentability

Petitioner challenges claim 8 of the ’439 patent as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103[1] over the following references:

---

[1] The Leahy-Smith America Invents Act (“AIA”), Pub. L. No. 112–29, 125 Stat. 284, 287–88 (2011), revised 35 U.S.C. § 103 effective March 16, 2013. Because the challenged patent was filed before March 16, 2013, we refer to the pre-AIA version of § 103.

DOCKET ALARM Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

U.S. Patent No. 6,904,283 B2, filed April 17, 2001, issued June 7, 2005 (Ex. 1003, "Li");

U.S. Patent No. 7,221,680 B2, filed September 1, 2004, issued May 22, 2007 (Ex. 1004, "Vijayan");

U.S. Patent No. 6,721,569 B1, filed September 29, 2000, issued April 13, 2004 (Ex. 1005, "Hashem"); and

U.S. Patent No. 5,596,604, filed August 17, 1993, issued January 21, 1997 (Ex. 1006, "Cioffi").

Pet. 3. In its challenges, Petitioner cites to the references and declaration testimony from Zhi Ding, Ph.D. (Exhibit 1007). Pet. 3, 15–63.

II. DISCUSSION

A. Three Petitions Challenging Claims of the '439 Patent

In addition to the instant Petition challenging claim 8 of the '439 Patent, Petitioner and ZTE (USA) Inc. filed a petition in IPR2018-01477 challenging claims 1–11 of the '439 Patent and relying on Li, Vijayan, and U.S. Patent No. 7,885,228 B2 ("Walton"). IPR2018-01477, Paper 1 ("1477 Dec."), 9.[2] On March 7, 2019, we denied institution after concluding that the information presented in the petition did not show a reasonable likelihood that Petitioner would prevail with respect to claims 1–11. 1477 Dec. 37. A few weeks later on April 1, 2019, we instituted an *inter partes* review of claim 8 of the '439 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Li, Vijayan, Hashem, and Cioffi in IPR2018-01581 ("the HTC IPR") based on a

[2] Specifically, Apple and ZTE (USA) Inc. asserted claims 1, 3, and 5–11 would have been obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Li and Walton and claims 2 and 4 would have been obvious over Li, Walton, and Vijayan. 1477 Dec. 9.

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

petition filed by HTC Corp. and HTC America, Inc. (collectively, "the HTC Petitioner"). IPR2018-01581, Paper 1 ("HTC Petition" or "HTC Pet."), Paper 9 ("HTC Dec.").

B. Reasonable Likelihood of the Instant Petition

Institution of an *inter partes* review is authorized by statute when "the information presented in the petition . . . and any response . . . shows that there is a reasonable likelihood that the petitioner would prevail with respect to at least 1 of the claims challenged in the petition." 35 U.S.C. § 314(a); *see* 37 C.F.R § 42.4(a) (delegating authority to institute trial to the Board). We address whether the Petition in this proceeding reaches the institution threshold before turning to Petitioner's Motion for Joinder and considering whether to exercise our discretion under 35 U.S.C. § 314(a).

The Petition in this proceeding asserts the same ground of unpatentability as the ground on which we instituted review in the HTC IPR. *Compare* Pet. 3, 15–63, *with* HTC Pet. 3, 17–68; *see also* HTC Dec. 7–8, 12–43 (discussing asserted grounds). The Petition relies on the same expert declaration relied on in the HTC Petition. Mot. 4; Pet. 3 (relying on declaration testimony of Zhi Ding, Ph.D. (Ex. 1007)); HTC Dec. 8 (noting petition relies on declaration testimony of Zhi Ding, Ph.D. (Ex. 1007)). Indeed, Petitioner contends that the Petition "is substantively identical to the HTC Petition, containing only minor differences related to formalities of a different party filing the petition as well as" arguments related to discretionary denial of the Petition. Mot. 4.

Patent Owner's Preliminary Response does not address Petitioner's prior art, arguments, or evidence. *See generally* Prelim. Resp.

DOCKET ALARM Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

For the reasons set forth in our institution decision in the HTC IPR, we determine the information presented in the instant Petition shows a reasonable likelihood that Petitioner would prevail in showing claim 8 would have been obvious over Li, Vijayan, Hashem, and Cioffi. *See* HTC Dec. 12–43.

C. Petitioner's Motion for Joinder

We have authority under 35 U.S.C. § 315(c) to join a properly filed *inter partes* review petition to an instituted *inter partes* review. A motion for joinder must be filed "no later than one month after the institution date of any *inter partes* review for which joinder is requested." 37 C.F.R. § 122(b).

The Petition in this proceeding was accorded a filing date of April 8, 2019. Paper 4 (Notice of Filing Date Accorded). The HTC IPR was instituted on April 1, 2019. HTC Dec. 1. We agree with Petitioner that its Motion for Joinder is timely. Mot. 3.

Both parties recognize, as do we, that the one-year bar set forth in 35 U.S.C. § 315(b) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.101(b) would bar institution of the Petition except for the request for joinder. Mot. 3 ("Further, the one-year bar set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 42.101(b) does not apply to the Apple Petition because this Motion for Joinder is filed concurrently with the Apple Petition. 37 C.F.R. § 42.122(b)."); Prelim. Resp. 2; *see* 35 U.S.C. § 315(b) ("The time limitation . . . shall not apply to a request for joinder under subsection (c)."); 37 C.F.R. § 42.122(b) ("The time set forth in §42.101(b) shall not apply when the petition is accompanied by a request for joinder.").

In its Motion, Petitioner contends that its narrowly tailored petition would "not unduly burden or prejudice the parties to the HTC IPR while

DOCKET ALARM Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKET ALARM

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.

WHAT WILL YOU BUILD? | sales@docketalarm.com | 1-866-77-FASTCASE

fastcase®
Smarter legal research.