

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ROKU, INC.,
Petitioner

v.

UNIVERSAL ELECTRONICS, INC.,
Patent Owner

Case IPR2020-00951
U.S. Patent 9,911,325

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

Mail Stop "PATENT BOARD"
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent & Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

The Board maintains discretion to grant same-party joinder based on the abrogation of *Windy City* by the Supreme Court's decision in *Thryv v. Click-to-Call Techs.*, 140 S. Ct. 1367 (2020), and the Board's precedential opinion in *Proppant Express Invs. v. Oren Techs.*, IPR2018-00914, Paper 38 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 13, 2019). The Board should use its discretion to grant Roku's Motion for Joinder because granting joinder will promote fairness and the efficient resolution of the validity of the '325 patent.

I. UEI's Arguments Regarding *Thryv* Are Meritless.

UEI argues that *Thryv* does not abrogate *Windy City* because it is only applicable to decisions under § 315(b) and not § 315(c). UEI is wrong. *Thryv* is applicable to all decisions that are closely related to the institution decision—including § 315(c). *Thryv* therefore abrogates *Windy City* as decisions under § 315(c), like § 315(b), are closely related to institution.

UEI also alleges that *Thryv* does not abrogate *Windy City* because *Windy City* is related only to managing an already instituted decision and not to an institution decision. UEI focuses on the wrong petition. A decision under § 315(c) is closely related to the Board's decision to institute the *newly filed* petition. See USPTO Supplemental Brief, *Facebook, Inc. v. Windy City Innovations, LLC*, CAFC-18-1400, Doc. ID. No. 106, 10.

Not only are UEI's arguments misinformed and inaccurate, UEI blatantly ignores the positions advocated by the USPTO in its supplemental brief in *Facebook v. Windy City*. UEI had full knowledge of the USPTO's positions but failed to consider or address any of the arguments or positions raised by the USPTO.

II. Granting joinder promotes fairness and prevents undue prejudice.

UEI alleges that Roku's Motion for Joinder does not implicate *Proppant's* fairness concerns because it is the "direct consequence of [Roku's] own intentional omissions." Paper 7, Opp., 10. However, UEI mischaracterizes Roku's alleged "omissions." UEI's inaccurate representations of Roku's omissions in the First Petition are insufficient to negate the fairness concerns raised by UEI's calculated actions to insulate their claims from an IPR challenge.

III. Granting joinder will not disrupt the ongoing schedule nor create a substantial burden for UEI.

UEI argues that Roku's Motion for Joinder should be denied because granting the motion would disrupt the ongoing IPR proceeding and result in a substantial duplication of effort to address the new claims and issues. Opp., 12. UEI is wrong on both counts.

Roku has made several concessions to minimize any impact on scheduling. Paper 3, Mot., 10-12. Additionally, Roku has attempted to work with UEI to minimize any potential disruptions in scheduling. In light of the USPTO's position

that it could entertain same-party joinder, Roku reached out to UEI and proposed minor changes in the schedule of Roku's First Petition. Roku's proposed adjustments included delaying the deposition of Dr. Samuel Russ, while the parties worked through the scheduling proposal. UEI refused to postpone the deposition or adjust the schedule. EX1034, 9:7-15:19. Rather than working to maximize efficiency and prevent wasting the Board's time and resources, UEI seeks to exacerbate potential scheduling differences to increase the likelihood that Roku's Motion for Joinder will be denied. Having refused to work with Roku to minimize the impact of a joined petition, UEI cannot now be heard to complain about the potential distance between the schedules.

The Board, of course, has the authority to make adjustments to accommodate joinder. *See Enzymotec Ltd. v. Neptune Tech. & Bioresources, Inc.*, IPR2014-00556, Paper 19 (Jul. 9, 2014) (adjusting the due date of the POR to accommodate joinder). To further minimize scheduling conflicts, the Board is also able to accelerate its institution deadline. And in the unlikely event that joinder does impact the schedule of Roku's First Petition, the Board has the authority to extend the 1-year decision deadline by six months in the case of joinder under § 315(c). *See* 35 U.S.C. § 316(a)(11).

Finally, UEI alleges that granting joinder would result in a substantial duplication of efforts to address the new claims and issues. Opp., 12-13. UEI

exaggerates the differences between the petitions. EX1034, 12:14-15:19. Roku's Second and Third Petitions (IPR2020-00951 and IPR2020-00953) are substantially similar to its First Petition. In its Second Petition, Roku simply addresses independent claim 9 and dependent claims 6, 8, and 11-16—claims similar to those analyzed in the First Petition. For example, the Second Petition relies primarily on the same art as the First Petition—Rye, Skerlos, Caris, and Dubil. For independent claim 9, the Second Petition introduces Woolgar for a single limitation. The analysis for the other nine out of ten limitations, however, is identical to Roku's First Petition. Further, while Roku's Second Petition also applies the Gutman reference, Gutman is only applied to a single concept as well (see claims 6 and 14). As such, Roku's Second Petition presents very little new analysis. Rather, UEI is already intimately familiar with the analysis and primary prior art references cited in Roku's Second Petition.

Additionally, Roku uses the same expert witness, Dr. Samuel Russ, for all three Petitions. Dr. Russ's declarations in the Second and Third Petitions are identical to his declaration in the First Petition, but for the addition of the analysis of the newly asserted claims. Roku also submitted the same exhibits in the Second and Third Petitions as it did in the First Petition. And Roku's Second and Third Petitions propose the exact same claim construction as its First Petition.

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.