

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

ELEKTA INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

BEST MEDICAL INTERNATIONAL, INC.,  
Patent Owner.

---

IPR2020-00970  
Patent 6,393,096 B1

---

Before KARL D. EASTHOM, WILLIAM V. SAINDON, and  
JOHN A. HUDALLA, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

HUDALLA, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION  
Granting Institution of *Inter Partes* Review  
35 U.S.C. § 314  
Granting Motion for Joinder  
35 U.S.C. § 315(c); 37 C.F.R. § 42.122

## I. INTRODUCTION

On May 28, 2020, Elekta Inc. (“Petitioner”) filed a Petition (Paper 2, “Petition” or “Pet.”) to institute *inter partes* review of claims 43, 44, and 46 of U.S. Patent No. 6,393,096 B1 (Ex. 1001, “the ’096 patent,”) and a Motion for Joinder (Paper 3, “Motion” or “Mot.”) with *Varian Medical Systems, Inc. v. Best Medical International, Inc.*, IPR2020-00072 (“Varian IPR”).

Subsequently, during a conference call held on June 10, 2020, counsel for Best Medical International, Inc. (“Patent Owner”) represented that Patent Owner does not oppose Petitioner’s Motion and will not file a preliminary response. *See* Paper 7 (Order documenting the conference call).

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; *see* 37 C.F.R. § 42.4. Upon consideration of the Petition and the evidence of record, we determine that Petitioner has established a reasonable likelihood of prevailing with respect to the unpatentability of at least 1 claim of the ’096 patent. Accordingly, we institute *inter partes* review of claims 43, 44, and 46 of the ’096 patent. We also grant Petitioner’s Motion.

### A. *Related Proceedings*

The parties identify the following proceedings related to the ’096 patent (Pet. 3–4; Paper 6, 1–2):

*Best Med. Int’l, Inc. v. Elekta Inc.*, No. 1:19-cv-03409-MLB (N.D. Ga.);

*Best Med. Int’l, Inc. v. Elekta AB*, No. 1:18-cv-01600-MN (D. Del.);

IPR2020-00970  
Patent 6,393,096 B1

*Best Med. Int'l, Inc. v. Varian Med. Sys., Inc.*, No. 1:18-cv-01599 (D. Del.);

*Elekta Inc. v. Best Med. Int'l, Inc.*, IPR2020-00074; and the Varian IPR.

We also note that Petitioner has challenged patents owned by Patent Owner in IPR2020-00067, IPR2020-00070, IPR2020-00073, IPR2020-00956, and IPR2020-00971.

*B. The Asserted Grounds of Unpatentability*

Petitioner challenges the patentability of claims 43, 44, and 46 of the '096 patent on the following grounds. Pet 6.

Challenged Claims	35 U.S.C. §	References
43, 44, 46	103(a) <sup>1</sup>	Carol-1995, <sup>2</sup> Viggars <sup>3</sup>
43, 44, 46	103(a)	Curran-5, <sup>4</sup> Carol-2 <sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The Leahy-Smith America Invents Act (“AIA”), Pub. L. No. 112-29, 125 Stat. 284, 287–88 (2011), amended 35 U.S.C. § 103. Because the '096 patent was filed before March 16, 2013 (the effective date of the relevant amendment), the pre-AIA version of § 103 applies.

<sup>2</sup> Peacock™: A System for Planning and Rotational Delivery of Intensity-Modulated Fields,” *International Journal of Imaging Systems and Technology* (Spring 1995) (Ex. 1006, “Carol-1995”).

<sup>3</sup> Viggars D.A., et al., “The Objective Evaluation of Alternative Treatment Plans III: The Quantitative Analysis of Dose Volume Histograms,” *International Journal of Radiation Oncology • Biology • Physics*, 23:419–27 (1992) (Ex. 1015, “Viggars”).

<sup>4</sup> Curran, B.H., *Chapter 5 – Conformal Radiation Therapy Using a Multileaf Intensity Modulating Collimator*, *The Theory & Practice of Intensity Modulated Radiation Therapy* (1997) 75–90 (Ex. 1007, “Curran-5”).

<sup>5</sup> Carol, M.P., *Chapter 2 – IMRT: Where We Are Today*, *The Theory & Practice of Intensity Modulated Radiation Therapy* (1997) 17–36 (Ex. 1020, “Carol-2”).

Challenged Claims	35 U.S.C. §	References
43, 44, 46	103(a)	Curran-5, Carol-17 <sup>6</sup>

Petitioner relies on the Declaration of Kenneth P. Gall, Ph.D. (Ex. 1002) in support of its contentions.

## II. ANALYSIS

### A. *Institution of Inter Partes Review*

We instituted an *inter partes* review in the Varian IPR on all challenged claims and all asserted grounds of unpatentability. Varian IPR, Paper 15. Petitioner here challenges the same claims and asserts the same grounds of unpatentability as those on which we instituted the Varian IPR. Pet. 1 (“The challenges to claims 43, 44, and 46 presented herein are substantively identical to Varian’s challenges in IPR2020-00072 and are based on the same evidence as presented in IPR2020-00072”); Mot. 1. Petitioner also relies on the same declarant as did the petitioner in the Varian IPR. Mot. 4. *Compare* Ex. 1002, *with* Varian IPR, Ex. 1002 (Declarations of Kenneth P. Gall, Ph.D.).

Because the issues in the instant Petition are identical to those in the Varian IPR, and for the same reasons stated in our Decision on Institution in the Varian IPR, we institute *inter partes* review in this proceeding on the grounds presented in the Petition. *See* Varian IPR, Paper 15.

---

<sup>6</sup> Carol, M.P., *Chapter 17 – Where We Go From Here: One Person’s Vision*, *The Theory & Practice of Intensity Modulated Radiation Therapy* (1997) 243–52 (Ex. 1021, “Carol-17”).

*B. Motion for Joinder*

Joinder in an *inter partes* review is subject to the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 315(c):

(c) JOINDER.—If the Director institutes an inter partes review, the Director, in his or her discretion, may join as a party to that inter partes review any person who properly files a petition under section 311 that the Director, after receiving a preliminary response under section 313 or the expiration of the time for filing such a response, determines warrants the institution of an inter partes review under section 314.

As the moving party, Petitioner bears the burden of proving that it is entitled to the requested relief. 37 C.F.R. § 42.20(c). A motion for joinder should: (1) set forth the reasons joinder is appropriate; (2) identify any new grounds of unpatentability asserted in the petition; and (3) explain what impact (if any) joinder would have on the trial schedule for the existing review. *Kyocera Corp. v. SoftView, LLC*, IPR2013-00004, Paper 15 at 4 (PTAB Apr. 24, 2013).

We determine that Petitioner has met its burden of showing that joinder is appropriate because, as set forth above, the Petition here: (1) is substantively identical to the petition in the Varian IPR; (2) contains the same grounds based on the same evidence; and (3) relies on the same declaration of Dr. Kenneth P. Gall. Mot., *passim*; Ex. 1002. Petitioner also represents that it “is willing to streamline discovery and briefing by taking an ‘understudy role,’ so that the proposed joinder will not complicate or delay the schedule in the Varian IPR.” Mot. 1.

Additionally, “so long as Varian remains an active party in the joined proceeding,” Petitioner: (1) “shall be bound by any agreement between Patent Owner and Varian concerning discovery and/or depositions,” (2) shall

# 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.