Trials@uspto.gov
571-272-7822

Paper 12
Entered: November 18, 2020

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

PARUS HOLDINGS, INC.,
Patent Owner.

IPR2020-00686
Patent 7,076,431 B2

Before DAVID C. McKONE, STACEY G. WHITE, and SHELDON M. McGEE, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

McKONE, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION
Denying Patent Owner's Request on Rehearing of Decision on Institution
37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d)

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Background and Summary

Apple Inc. ("Petitioner") filed a Petition requesting an *inter partes* review of claims 1–7, 9, 10, 13, 14, 18–21, and 25–30 of U.S. Patent No. 7,076,431 B2 (Ex. 1001, "the '431 patent"). Paper 1 ("Pet."). Parus Holdings, Inc. ("Patent Owner") filed a Preliminary Response to the Petition. Paper 6 ("Prelim. Resp."). Pursuant to our authorization (Ex. 1033), Petitioner filed a Reply, Paper 7 ("Reply"), and Patent Owner filed a Sur-reply, Paper 8 ("Sur-reply").

Upon consideration of the Petition, Preliminary Response, Reply, and Sur-reply, we instituted an *inter partes* review of the '431 patent. Paper 9 ("Dec."), 1. In doing so, we rejected arguments by Patent Owner that we should exercise our discretion under 35 U.S.C. § 314(a), *NHK Spring Co. v. Intri-Plex Technologies, Inc.,* IPR2018-00752, Paper 8 (PTAB Sept. 12, 2018) (precedential), and *Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc.*, IPR2020-00019, Paper 11 (PTAB Mar. 20, 2020) (precedential), to deny the petition in light of a trial scheduled in *Parus Holdings Inc. v. Apple, Inc.*, No. 6:19-cv-00432 (W.D. Tex.[1]) ("the Texas case"). Dec. 8–22.

Patent Owner asks us to reconsider our decision not to exercise our discretion to deny the Petition in light of alleged "new facts that have arisen since the Board's Decision, which decidedly tilt the *Fintiv* factors in favor of denying institution in light of the earlier trial in the Parallel Proceeding in the District Court for the Western District of Texas." Paper 11 ("Req."), 1. For the reasons given below, we decline to modify our Decision.

---

[1] We refer to the United States District Court for the Western District of Texas, Waco Division, as "the Texas court" in this Decision.

II. ANALYSIS

A. Legal Background

When rehearing a decision on institution, we review the decision for an abuse of discretion. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.71(c) (2019). An abuse of discretion may be indicated if a decision is based on an erroneous interpretation of law, if a factual finding is not supported by substantial evidence, or if the decision represents an unreasonable judgment in weighing relevant factors. *See Star Fruits S.N.C. v. U.S.*, 393 F.3d 1277, 1281 (Fed. Cir. 2005); *Arnold P'ship v. Dudas*, 362 F.3d 1338, 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2004); *In re Gartside*, 203 F.3d 1305, 1315–16 (Fed. Cir. 2000). The burden of showing that the Institution Decision should be modified is on Patent Owner, the party challenging the Decision. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d) (2019). In addition, "[t]he request must specifically identify all matters the party believes [we] misapprehended or overlooked, and the place where each matter was previously addressed in a motion, an opposition, or a reply." *Id.*

Institution of *inter partes* review is discretionary. *See Harmonic Inc. v. Avid Tech., Inc.*, 815 F.3d 1356, 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2016) ("[T]he PTO is permitted, but never compelled, to institute an IPR proceeding."); 35 U.S.C. § 314(a). The Board has held that the advanced state of a parallel district court action is a factor that may weigh in favor of denying a petition under § 314(a). *See NHK Spring*, Paper 8 at 20; Patent Trial and Appeal Board, Consolidated Trial Practice Guide, 58 & n.2 (Nov. 2019). We consider the following factors to assess "whether efficiency, fairness, and the merits support the exercise of authority to deny institution in view of an earlier trial date in the parallel proceeding":

1. whether the court granted a stay or evidence exists that one may be granted if a proceeding is instituted;

2. proximity of the court's trial date to the Board's projected statutory deadline for a final written decision;
3. investment in the parallel proceeding by the court and the parties;
4. overlap between issues raised in the petition and in the parallel proceeding;
5. whether the petitioner and the defendant in the parallel proceeding are the same party; and
6. other circumstances that impact the Board's exercise of discretion, including the merits.

Fintiv, Paper 11 at 5–6. In evaluating these factors, we "take[] a holistic view of whether efficiency and integrity of the system are best served by denying or instituting review." *Id.* at 6.

B. Patent Owner's Arguments

Patent Owner does not argue that we misapprehended or overlooked any argument or evidence that it presented previously. Rather, Patent Owner argues that we should re-evaluate our Decision in light of "new facts" that have arisen in the Texas court after our Decision. Req. 1–2. In particular, Patent Owner argues that

(1) Petitioner has moved for, and Patent Owner has opposed, a stay in the Texas court, which should impact our evaluation of *Fintiv* factor 1; and

(2) Petitioner and Patent Owner have indicated that they are available for trial in July 2021, and

(3) the Texas court has resumed conducting jury trials, which, together, should impact our evaluation of *Fintiv* factors 2 and 5 by removing any doubt that a trial in the Texas court will happen in July 2021. *Id.*

1. Fintiv Factor 1: Whether the court granted a stay or evidence exists that one may be granted if a proceeding is instituted

Patent Owner asserts that Petitioner requested a stay in the Texas court on October 1, 2020, and that Patent Owner opposed the request on the next day. Req. 5. Patent Owner argues that a decision from the Texas court on the motion to stay is imminent and that, given its prior rulings "in exactly the same circumstances," the Texas court will deny the motion. *Id.*

Patent Owner did not make this argument in its Preliminary Response or Sur-reply; thus, we could not have misapprehended or overlooked it. For that reason alone, Patent Owner's new argument is improper and insufficient. Nevertheless, even if we were to consider the argument, it would not be persuasive.

In the Decision, we made clear that it would improper for us to speculate as to how the Texas court might rule on a motion to stay. Dec. 10–11 (citing *Sand Revolution II, LLC v. Continental Intermodal Group – Trucking LLC*, IPR2019-01393, Paper 24 at 7 (PTAB June 16, 2020) (informative); *Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc.*, IPR2020-00019, Paper 15 at 12 (PTAB May 13, 2020) (informative) ("*Fintiv II*")). On that basis, we determined that this *Fintiv* factor was neutral as to whether we should exercise our discretion to deny the Petition. *Id.*

The circumstances have not changed materially in the Texas court. Although a motion to stay has been filed, the Texas court has not ruled on it. Accordingly, Patent Owner still asks us to speculate as to how the Texas court might rule. We decline to speculate, and instead determine that this factor remains neutral. *See Sand Revolution*, Paper 24 at 7; *Fintiv II*, Paper 15 at 12.

DOCKET ALARM

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.