Filed: December 12, 2019

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD
LG ELECTRONICS, INC.,
PETITIONER,
v.
BELL NORTHERN RESEARCH, LLC,
PATENT OWNER.
Case No. IPR2020-00108
U.S. Patent No. 8,416,862

PATENT OWNER'S OPPOSITION TO PETITIONER'S MOTION FOR JOINDER

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.		
III.	ARGUMENTS	5
A.	There is No Instituted Proceeding for LG to Join.	5
В.	Granting LG's Motion Prejudices Patent Owner's Reliance on Stated Board Policy.	9
C.	The Denial of its Joinder Request Would Not Result in Prejudice to LG	.11
IV.	CONCLUSION	.12



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Cellitron, Inc., v. Genentech, Inc., IPR2018-01019, Paper 3 (PTAB May 4, 2018)
Celltrion, Inc. v. Genentech, Inc., IPR2018-01019, Paper 11 (PTAB Oct. 30, 2018)
Choirock Contents Factory Co., Ltd. v. Spin Master Ltd., IPR2019-00897, Paper 17 (PTAB Sept. 26, 2019)
Linear Tech. Corp. v. In-Depth Test LLC, IPR2015-01994, Paper 7 (PTAB Oct. 20, 2015)
Pfizer Inc., v. Genentech, Inc., IPR2017-01923, Paper 14 (PTAB May 4, 2018)
Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd. v. Raytheon Co., IPR2016-00962, Paper 12 (Aug. 24, 2016)
STMicroElectronics, Inc. v. Semcon IP Inc., IPR2017-01432, Paper 10 (PTAB Jan. 24, 2018)
Ubisoft, Inc. v. Uniloc USA Inc., IPR2016-00414, Paper 16 (PTAB June 2, 2016)
ZTE (USA) LLC v. Seven Networks, LLC, IPR2019-00460, Paper 18 (PTAB June 6, 2019)
Statutes
35 U.S.C. § 314(a)1
35 U.S.C. § 315
Regulations
37 C.F.R. § 42.1(b)



I. INTRODUCTION

Patent Owner Bell Northern Research, LLC ("BNR" or "Patent Owner") opposes Petitioner LG Electronics, Inc.'s ("LG" or "Petitioner") motion for joinder (IPR2020-00182, Paper 3 ("LG Mot.")) seeking to join *Huawei Technologies Co.*, *Ltd. v. Bell Northern Research, LLC*, IPR2019-01439 ("the Huawei IPR").

As an initial matter, there are key facts pertaining to the Huawei IPR that LG neglected to tell the Board. On October 23, 2019, after court-supervised mediation between Patent Owner and Huawei, those parties settled the then-pending litigation between them in its entirety, including Patent Owner's lawsuit regarding the '862 Patent. It is a near certainty that LG knew of the settlement because, not only was there a publicly filed order by the district court stating that the case had settled, LG and Huawei are represented by the same law firm. Thus, LG, recognizing that the Huawei settlement would likely mean that the parties agreed to request termination of all IPR proceedings Huawei had initiated, sought to "skip the line" and join the Huawei proceeding in an attempt to ensure that it would continue despite the likely impending termination motions. This is the only explanation for LG's motion, because if LG had a true interest in joining the Huawei IPR for the reasons it claims in its brief, it would have either filed a joinder motion months ago—the Huawei IPR was filed in August 2019, and Patent Owner's litigation against LG has been pending since December 2018—or would have waited until



an institution decision, which is what the statute contemplates and is the most common in practice.

However, notwithstanding LG's true motivation for its joinder motion, LG fails to put forth a sufficient showing that joinder is warranted or justified. First, as a threshold issue, the Huawei IPR must be instituted before LG can join that proceeding. The joinder statute requires that institution of a proceeding is a **condition precedent** before a party later filing a petition under section 311 may join as a party. See 35 U.S.C. § 315(c). But the Huawei IPR has not been instituted. Moreover, the probability of the Huawei IPR being instituted is low because the parties in the Huawei IPR jointly moved to terminate the Huawei IPR following settlement. See IPR2019-01439, Paper No. 7 (filed Dec. 6, 2019). While Patent Owner recognizes that the Board has the discretion despite the parties' preferences, the Board's practice with respect to other cases and including other IPRs that Huawei filed is that the Board accepts the parties' requests and terminates the proceeding. See IPR2019-01172, Paper 15 (termination decision); IPR2019-01175, Paper 15 (termination decision). And to the extent LG's motion seeks to influence the proceedings in the Huawei IPR, such interference is inappropriate and does not independently warrant maintaining the Huawei IPR. Without the Huawei IPR, LG's joinder motion is moot and properly denied on this



DOCKET

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.

