

a motion to intervene as a defendant on March 8, 2019, on the basis that it “sells base stations to AT&T that implement the accused LTE-LAA feature.” (Dkt. No. 17 at 1.) Ericsson moves to intervene as a matter of right, Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(a), or alternatively, requests permission to intervene pursuant to the Court’s discretion, Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(b). AT&T does not oppose intervention, but Uniloc does. (Dkt. No. 20 at 3; Dkt. No. 24.)

II. LEGAL STANDARD

A. Mandatory Intervention

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 24(a)(2) provides that “[o]n timely motion, the court must permit anyone to intervene who . . . claims an interest relating to the property or transaction that is the subject of the action, and is so situated that disposing of the action may as a practical matter impair or impede the movant’s ability to protect its interest, unless existing parties adequately represent that interest.” Thus, a prospective intervenor is entitled to intervention if each of the following elements is satisfied:

(1) the application for intervention must be timely; (2) the applicant must have an interest relating to the property or transaction which is the subject of the action; (3) the applicant must be so situated that the disposition of the action may, as a practical matter, impair or impede his ability to protect that interest; and (4) the applicant’s interest must be inadequately represented by the existing parties to the suit.

Texas v. United States, 805 F.3d 653, 657 (5th Cir. 2017) (citing *New Orleans Pub. Serv., Inc. v. United Gas Pipe Line Co.*, 732 F.2d 452, 463 (5th Cir. 1984) (en banc)). “Failure to satisfy one requirement precludes intervention of right.” *Haspel & Davis Milling & Planting Co. v. Bd. Of Levee Comm’rs of the Orleans Levee Dist.*, 493 F.3d 570, 578 (5th Cir. 2007). However, “[t]he rule ‘is to be liberally construed,’ with ‘doubts resolved in favor of the proposed intervenor.’” *Entergy Gulf States Louisiana, L.L.C. v. U.S. E.P.A.*, 817 F.3d 198, 203 (5th Cir. 2016) (quoting *In re Lease Oil Antitrust Lit.*, 570 F.3d 244, 248 (5th Cir. 2009)). Intervention in patent cases is

reviewed under regional circuit law. As such, Fifth Circuit law controls. *Stauffer v. Brooks Brothers, Inc.*, 619 F.3d 1321, 1328 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (“We review the district court’s denial of intervention under Rule 24 under regional circuit law. . .”).

B. Permissive Intervention

Even if intervention is not mandated as a matter of right, a court may nonetheless permit intervention if the party “[o]n timely motion . . . has a claim or defense that shares with the main action a common question of law or fact.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(b)(1)(B). “In exercising its discretion, the court must consider whether the intervention will unduly delay or prejudice the adjudication of the original parties’ rights.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(b)(3). A court has full discretion to deny permissive intervention even where there is a common question of law or fact. *New Orleans Pub. Serv., Inc.*, 732 F.3d at 471.

III. DISCUSSION

A. Mandatory Intervention

Ericsson argues that it meets each of the four requirements to intervene as a matter of right. (Dkt. No. 17 at 5–11.) The Court addresses each requirement in turn.

i. Timeliness

A party may intervene as a matter of right if the motion is timely. Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(a). When evaluating timeliness, courts consider four factors: (1) “[t]he length of time during which the would-be intervenor actually knew or reasonably should have known of his interest in the case before he petitioned for leave to intervene;” (2) “[t]he extent of the prejudice that the existing parties to the litigation may suffer as a result of the would-be intervenor’s failure to apply for intervention as soon as he actually knew or reasonably should have known of his interest in the case;” (3) “[t]he extent of the prejudice that the would-be intervenor may suffer if his petition for

leave to intervene is denied;” and (4) “[t]he existence of unusual circumstances militating either for or against a determination that the application is timely.” *Edwards v. City of Houston*, 78 F.3d 983, 1000 (5th Cir. 1996) (citing *Stallworth v. Monsanto, Co.*, 558 F.2d 257, 264 (5th Cir. 1977)). “[T]hese factors merely comprise a framework for the analysis of this threshold inquiry.” *Id.* Timeliness is assessed from the totality of the circumstances, in which no one factor is dispositive or exhaustive. *Id.*

Ericsson argues that its Motion is timely because (1) it seeks intervention in the early stages of the case: after AT&T answered Uniloc’s complaint and before the scheduling conference or start of discovery; (2) intervention will streamline discovery because Ericsson designs and sells the accused products to AT&T; (3) denying intervention will prejudice Ericsson, as it possesses the most knowledge to defend its products against Uniloc’s infringement claims; and (4) there are no unusual circumstances militating against such a finding. (Dkt. No. 20 5–7.)

Given that Ericsson filed its Motion before the start of discovery, intervention would not materially prejudice any of the existing parties. *See Edwards*, 78 F.3d at 1001 (“[M]ost of our case law rejecting petitions for intervention as untimely concern motions filed after judgment was entered in the litigation.”); *Team Worldwide Corp. v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.*, No. 2:17-cv-00235-JRG, 2017 WL 6059303, at *4 (E.D. Tex. Dec. 7, 2017) (finding motion filed after the scheduling conference, but before claim construction and trial as timely because intervenors moved as soon as possible after learning of their interest in the case). Moreover, Uniloc does not dispute that Ericsson’s Motion is timely, (Dkt. No. 24 at 7), and the Court is not aware of any unusual circumstances that would suggest otherwise. Accordingly, the Court finds that the timeliness requirements of Rule 24 have been met.

ii. Interest in the Case

Mandatory intervention also requires the intervenor to have “an interest relating to the property or transaction that is the subject of the action.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(a)(2). The interest must be “direct, substantial, [and] legally protectable,” *Texas*, 805 F.3d at 657, and “go[] beyond a generalized preference that the case come out a certain way.” *Sierra Club v. Espy*, 18 F.3d 1202, 1207 (5th Cir. 1994).

Ericsson argues that it has a significant interest in this lawsuit because it is “the designer and manufacturer of the Accused Ericsson Base Stations” and Uniloc’s allegations against its products “could negatively affect future sales.” (Dkt. No. 20 at 7.) In addition, Uniloc has brought a similar lawsuit against Verizon, alleging that Ericsson’s base stations infringe the same patent. *See Uniloc 2017 LLC v. Verizon Commc’ns Inc., et al.*, No. 2:18-cv-00513-JRG (E.D. Tex. Nov. 29, 2018). Ericsson has sought intervention in both cases to reduce the likelihood of inconsistent judgments against its products. (Dkt. No. 28 at 4.) While Uniloc has not provided its infringement contentions to Ericsson, Ericsson claims that it has no reason to believe that the two suits would accuse different products and Uniloc has not admitted as much. (*Id.*) Finally, Ericsson is obligated to indemnify AT&T for any damages resulting from a finding that Ericsson’s base stations infringe the ’676 patent. (*Id.* at 3; Dkt. No. 28–2.)

Uniloc argues that Ericsson is not entitled to intervention because it only provides *some* of the base stations in Verizon’s network and those stations comprise only part of the network accused of infringement. (Dkt. No. 24 at 3–4.) Uniloc also points out that Ericsson represents that it “*likely* possesses documents related to the design and function of the Accused Ericsson Base Stations,” which contradicts Ericsson’s assertion that it has an interest as the manufacturer of the accused base stations. (*Id.* at 5 (emphasis in original); *see also* Dkt. No. 33 at 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.