

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.
Petitioner,

v.

BELL NORTHERN RESEARCH, LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2020-00613
Patent 8,416,862

**Petitioner's Request for Rehearing
Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d)(2)**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. STATEMENT OF THE PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED..... 1

II. LEGAL STANDARD2

III. STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR RELIEF REQUESTED.....2

 A. The Board Overlooked or Misapprehended that Samsung’s
Expert Testimony Outweighs BNR’s Attorney Arguments.....3

 B. The Board Improperly Discounted Samsung’s Expert’s
Testimony Based on a Requirement of Personal Knowledge of
the Practices of a Specific Library.....7

 C. The Board Improperly Imposed a Requirement That Samsung
Establish the Publication Date of References Citing *Haykin* 11

IV. CONCLUSION..... 14

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>BioMarin Pharma. Inc. v. Genzyme Therapeutic Prods. Ltd. P’ship</i> , IPR2013-00534, Paper 80, 5–6 (Jan. 7, 2015)	7
<i>Google LLC v. IPA Techs. Inc.</i> , IPR2019-00728, Paper 11 (Sept. 4, 2019).....	9
<i>GoPro, Inc. v. Contour IP Holding LLC</i> , IPR2015-01078, Paper 28 (Dec. 28, 2015).....	6
<i>In re Hall</i> , 781 F.2d 897 (Fed. Cir. 1986).....	7
<i>Hulu, LLC v. Sound View Innovations, LLC</i> , IPR2018-01039, Paper 29 (Dec. 20, 2019).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Jazz Pharms. Inc. v. Amneal Pharms., Inc.</i> , 895 F.3d 1347 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	4
<i>LG Elecs., Inc. v. Bell N. Research, LLC</i> , IPR2020-00108, Paper 14 (May 20, 2020).....	9, 10
<i>Medtronic, Inc. v. Barry</i> , 891 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	4
<i>RPX Corp. v. IYM Techs. LLC</i> , IPR2017-01888, Paper 16 (May 14, 2018).....	6
<i>Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd. v. M & K Holdings Inc.</i> , IPR2018-00696, Paper 48 (Sept. 4, 2019).....	11
<i>Seabery North America Inc. v. Lincoln Global, Inc.</i> , IPR2016-00840, Paper 40 (Mar. 15, 2017).....	6
<i>Unified Patents Inc. v. Sound View Innovations, LLC</i> , IPR2018-00599, Paper 50 (Sept. 9, 2019).....	9

Valeo North America, Inc. v. Magna Elecs., Inc.,
IPR2014-01204, Paper 26 (Apr. 10, 2015).....7

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 102(a).....1

Other Authorities

37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d).....2

37 C.F.R. § 42.108(c).....3

I. STATEMENT OF THE PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED

Petitioner Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. (“Petitioner” or “Samsung”) requests rehearing of the Board’s Decision (Paper 10, “Decision”), denying institution of Samsung’s IPR petition (Paper 1, “Petition”) for claims 9-12 of U.S. Patent No. 8,416,862 (“the ’862 patent”). The Board found that Samsung did not establish that *Haykin* (Ex.1010) qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a). The Board’s Decision is erroneous in several respects, as Samsung established a reasonable likelihood that *Haykin* qualifies as a printed publication under the totality of the evidence.

Patent Owner Bell Northern Research, LLC (“Patent Owner” or “BNR”) did not submit expert testimony supporting its arguments regarding *Haykin*, yet the Board credited BNR’s attorney arguments concerning details relating to the publication history of *Haykin* over the *expert* testimony of Dr. Ingrid Hsieh-Yee submitted by Samsung. Dr. Hsieh-Yee offered her expert opinion based on a detailed analysis of relevant facts and her two-plus decades of experience in the library sciences. The Board improperly discounted her testimony based on a requirement of personal knowledge of past practices of the Library of Congress; including at the time of publication of the *Haykin* reference. Similarly, the Board provided no legal guidance to support its criticism of Samsung for not sufficiently establishing the publication dates of prior art references citing *Haykin*. The Board

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.