

DOCKET NO.: 01033300-00348

Filed on behalf of Apple Inc.

By: Jason D. Kipnis, Reg. No. 40,680
David L. Cavanaugh, Reg. No. 36,476
Mary V. Sooter, Reg. No. 71,022
Richard Goldenberg, Reg. No. 38,895
Ravinder Deol, Reg. No. 62,165
Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP
60 State Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02109
Tel: (617) 526-6000
Email: Jason.Kipnis@wilmerhale.com
David.Cavanaugh@wilmerhale.com
Mindy.Sooter@wilmerhale.com
Richard.Goldenberg@wilmerhale.com
Ravi.Deol@wilmerhale.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

OPTIS CELLULAR TECHNOLOGY LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2020-00465
U.S. Patent No. 8,102,833 B2

PETITIONER'S NOTICE OF APPEAL

Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §§ 141-142 and 319, 5 U.S.C. §§ 701-706, 28 U.S.C. § 1295(a)(4)(A), and 28 U.S.C. § 1651, and in accordance with 37 C.F.R. §§ 90.2-90.3, and Federal Circuit Rule 15(a)(1), notice is hereby given that Petitioner Apple Inc. appeals to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit from the Decision Denying Institution of Inter Partes Review entered on September 17, 2020 (Paper 13) in IPR2020-00465, attached as Exhibit A, and all prior and interlocutory rulings related thereto or subsumed therein.

In accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 90.2(a)(3)(ii), Petitioner states that the issues for appeal include, but are not limited to:

(1) whether the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (PTO) exceeded its statutory authority and violated the text, structure, and purpose of the Leahy-Smith America Invents Act, 35 U.S.C. §§ 311-319 (AIA), and Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. §§ 701-706 (APA), by adopting a rule—and applying that rule to deny institution here—that purports to authorize the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (Board) to deny institution of inter partes review (IPR) based on non-statutory, discretionary factors related to the pendency of parallel patent-infringement litigation;

(2) whether the PTO exceeded its statutory authority and violated the APA by adopting a rule governing institution decisions—and applying the rule to deny

institution here—that incorporates non-statutory, discretionary factors that are arbitrary and capricious;

(3) whether the PTO exceeded its statutory authority and violated the AIA and the APA by adopting a rule to govern all institution decisions—and applying that rule to deny institution here—without following the procedures for notice-and-comment rulemaking; and

(4) whether the court of appeals has jurisdiction over this appeal, notwithstanding 35 U.S.C. § 314(d), because the PTO acted in excess of its statutory authority and outside its statutory limits or because the grounds for attacking the decision to deny institution depend on statutes, including the APA, that are less closely tied to the application and interpretation of statutes related to the decision to initiate IPR.

This Notice of Appeal is timely, having been duly filed 21 days after the date of the Decision Denying Institution of Inter Partes Review.

A copy of this Notice of Appeal is being filed simultaneously with the Board, the Clerk's Office for the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, and the Director of the PTO.

[Signature line on next page.]

Dated: October 8, 2020

Respectfully submitted:

/David L. Cavanaugh/
David L. Cavanaugh
Registration No. 36,476

Jason D. Kipnis
Registration No. 40,680
Lead Counsel for Petitioner Apple Inc.

Mary V. Sooter
Registration No. 71,022

Richard Goldenberg
Registration No. 38,895

Ravinder Deol
Registration No. 62,165

ATTORNEYS FOR PETITIONER
APPLE INC.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 90.2(a)(1) and 104.2(a), I hereby certify that, in addition to being filed electronically through the Patent Trial and Appeal Board's End to End (PTAB E2E) system, a true and correct original version of the foregoing Petitioner's Notice of Appeal is being filed by Priority Express Mail on this 8th day of October, 2020, with the Director of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, at the following address:

Office of the General Counsel
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Madison Building East, Room 10B20
600 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 90.2(a)(2) and Federal Circuit Rule 15(a)(1), and Rule 52(a), (e), I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing Petitioner's Notice of Appeal is being filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit using the Court's CM/ECF filing system on this 8th day of October, 2020, and the filing fee is being paid electronically using pay.gov.

I hereby certify that on October 8, 2020, I caused a true and correct copy of the foregoing Petitioner's Notice of Appeal to be served via email on the following counsel for Patent Owner:

Hong Annita Zhong (Reg. No. 66,530)

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.