

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

FLEX LOGIX TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

VENKAT KONDA,
Patent Owner.

IPR2020-00260
IPR2020-00261
IPR2020-00262¹
Patent 8,269,523 B2

Before SALLY C. MEDLEY, THOMAS L. GIANNETTI, and
JO-ANNE M. KOKOSKI, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

KOKOSKI, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

ORDER
Conduct of the Proceeding
37 C.F.R. § 42.5

¹ The parties are not authorized to use this style heading for any subsequent papers.

IPR2020-00260
IPR2020-00261
IPR2020-00262
Patent 8,269,523 B2

A telephone conference was held on May 22, 2020 between counsel for Petitioner Flex Logix Technologies Inc., *pro se* Patent Owner Venkat Konda, and Judges Medley, Giannetti, and Kokoski. A court reporter was on the line, and a copy of the transcript was filed as Exhibit 1049 in each of the above-identified proceedings.² The matters addressed during the call included (1) Petitioner’s request for authorization to file a reply to Patent Owner’s Preliminary Response; (2) Patent Owner’s objections to evidence filed with the Petitions; and (3) Petitioner’s filing of multiple Petitions challenging the same patent.

Petitioner’s Request for Authorization to File a Reply

Petitioner seeks a reply to address Patent Owner’s arguments regarding a pending reissue application that seeks reissue of U.S. Patent No. 8,269,523 B2 (“the ’523 patent”), which is the patent challenged in these proceedings. Patent Owner opposes Petitioner’s request.

After considering the parties’ arguments (reflected in the reporter’s transcript), we determined that Petitioner did show good cause for a reply to address Patent Owner’s position that a denial of each Petition is warranted in light of the pending reissue application. Accordingly, we authorized Petitioner to file a reply, not to exceed three pages, by June 1, 2020. We also authorized Patent Owner to file a sur-reply, not to exceed three pages, by June 8, 2020. Patent Owner’s sur-reply is limited to responding to arguments made in Petitioner’s reply.

² This Order summarizes the statements made during the conference call. A more detailed record may be found in the transcript.

IPR2020-00260
IPR2020-00261
IPR2020-00262
Patent 8,269,523 B2

During the call, Patent Owner confirmed that he had not notified the Central Reexamination Unit that the patent at issue in the pending reissue application is the subject of these Petitions. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 1.178(b) (“In any reissue application before the Office, the applicant must call to the attention of the Office any prior or concurrent proceedings in which the patent (for which reissue is requested) is or was involved, such as interferences or trials before the Patent Trial and Appeal Board, reissues, reexaminations, or litigations and the results of such proceedings.”). We informed Patent Owner that the Board will notify the Central Reexamination Unit of these proceedings.

Patent Owner’s Evidentiary Objections

On May 20, 2020, Patent Owner filed a paper entitled Patent Owner’s Objections to Evidence in each proceeding, in which Patent Owner objects to, and asks the Board to exclude, certain exhibits filed with the Petitions. We explained to Patent Owner that such evidentiary objections and requests to exclude evidence are not authorized at this point of the proceedings, and will be expunged from the record of each proceeding. We further explained that, pursuant to our rules, objections to evidence submitted during a preliminary proceeding (prior to institution of trial) must be served within ten business days of the institution of trial. 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(1). We advised Patent Owner that the timeline for filing a motion to exclude evidence, which is necessary to preserve the objection (*see id.* § 42.64(c)), will be provided in the scheduling order that would accompany a decision to institute a trial in any of the proceedings. We also directed Patent Owner to

IPR2020-00260
IPR2020-00261
IPR2020-00262
Patent 8,269,523 B2

our Consolidated Trial Practice Guide³ for guidance on how to challenge the admissibility of evidence during trial.

Multiple Petitions

On December 16, 2019, Petitioner filed the three Petitions in the instant proceedings, each challenging claims of U.S. Patent No. 8,569,523 B2 (“the ’523 patent”). As the Consolidated Trial Practice Guide notes, Board experience demonstrates that one petition should be sufficient to challenge the claims of a patent in most situations, and that filing two or more petitions against the same patent at the same time “may place a substantial and unnecessary burden on the Board and the patent owner and could raise fairness, timing, and efficiency concerns.” Consolidated Trial Practice Guide, 59. The Board recognizes, however, that there may be some situations where more than one petition may be necessary, and, therefore, the Consolidated Trial Practice Guide instructs:

To aid the Board in determining whether more than one petition is necessary, if a petitioner files two or more petitions challenging the same patent, then the petitioner should, in its petitions or in a separate paper filed with the petitions, identify: (1) a ranking of the petitions in the order in which it wishes the Board to consider the merits, if the Board uses its discretion to institute any of the petitions, and (2) a succinct explanation of the differences between the petitions, why the issues addressed by the differences are material, and why the Board should exercise its discretion to institute additional petitions if it

³ Available at:

<https://www.uspto.gov/sites/default/files/documents/tpgnov.pdf>

IPR2020-00260
IPR2020-00261
IPR2020-00262
Patent 8,269,523 B2

identifies one petition that satisfies petitioner's burden under 35 U.S.C. § 314.

Id. at 59–60.

During the call, Petitioner confirmed that it did not provide this information in either the Petitions or in a separate paper filed with the Petitions. Accordingly, Petitioner is ordered to submit a Notice within seven days of this Order, not to exceed five pages, identifying its ranking of the three Petitions in the order in which it wishes the panel to consider the merits, providing an explanation of the differences between the Petitions, why those differences are material, and explaining why the Board should exercise its discretion to consider the additional Petitions, as described in the Consolidated Trial Practice Guide. The Board encourages the Petitioner to use a table to aid in identifying the similarities and differences between the Petitions.

If he so chooses, Patent Owner may, within seven days of the filing of Petitioner's Notice, provide a Response not to exceed five pages, stating his position with respect to any of the differences identified by Petitioner. In particular, Patent Owner should explain whether the differences identified by Petitioner are material and in dispute. If stating that the reasons are not material or in dispute, Patent Owner should clearly provide any necessary stipulations.

Petitioner and Patent Owner are instructed to file the same paper in all three proceedings.

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.