

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SONY MOBILE COMMUNICATIONS AB, SONY MOBILE
COMMUNICATIONS, INC., SONY ELECTRONICS INC., and
SONY CORPORATION,
Petitioners

v.

ANCORA TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,
Patent Owner

Case IPR2021-00663
Patent No. 6,411,941

**PATENT OWNER ANCORA'S OPPOSITION TO
PETITIONERS' MOTION FOR JOINDER**

Table of Contents

Table of Authorities	iii
List of Exhibits	vi
I. Introduction	1
II. Background.....	2
III. Petitioner’s Motion for Joinder Should Be Denied for Mootness or Because it Will Unduly Delay the Original Proceeding.....	6
A. The Board Should Terminate the Original Proceeding, Which Would Moot this Motion.....	6
B. Undue Delay in the Original Proceedings Alternatively Requires Denying Petitioners’ Motion for Joinder	9
IV. The Board Should Exercise its Discretion to Deny this Petition	11
A. The <i>General Plastic</i> Factors Favor Discretionary Denial of Sony’s Joinder Petition	11
1. Factor 1: Whether the Same Petitioner Previously Filed a Petition Directed to the Same Claims of the Same Patent	13
2. Factor 2: Whether at the Time Of Filing of the First Petition the Petitioner Knew of the Prior Art Asserted in the Second Petition or Should Have Known of It.....	13
3. Factor 3: Whether at the Time of Filing of the Second Petition the Petitioner Already Received the Patent Owner’s Preliminary Response to the First Petition or Received the Board’s Decision on Whether to Institute Review in the First Petition.....	14
4. Factor 4: The Length of Time That Elapsed Between the Time the Petitioner Learned of the Prior Art Asserted in the Second Petition and the Filing of the Second Petition	14
5. Factor 5: Whether the Petitioner Provides Adequate Explanation for the Time Elapsed Between the Filings of Multiple Petitions Directed to the Same Claims of the Same Patent	15
6. Factor 6: The Finite Resources of the Board	15
7. Factor 7: The Requirement Under 35 U.S.C. § 316(a)(11) to Issue a final Determination Not Later	

Than 1 Year After the Date on Which the Director Notices Institution of Review.....	16
8. In Total, the <i>General Plastic</i> Factors Weigh Against Institution.....	16
B. The <i>Fintiv</i> Factors Favor Discretionary Denial of Sony’s Petition	16
1. Factor 1: Whether a Stay Exists or Is Likely to Be Granted If a Proceeding Is Instituted.....	18
2. Factor 2: Proximity of the Court’s Trial Date to the Board’s Projected Statutory Deadline	18
3. Factor 3: Investment in the Parallel Proceeding by the Court and Parties.....	19
4. Factor 4: Overlap Between Issues Raised in the Petition and in the Parallel Proceedings	20
5. Factor 5: Whether the Petitioner and the Defendant in the Parallel Proceeding Are the Same Party	21
6. Factor 6: Other Circumstances That Impact the Board’s Exercise of Discretion, Including the Merits	21
7. In Total, the <i>Fintiv</i> Factors Weigh Against Institution	22
V. Conclusion.....	22
Certificate of Service	24
Certificate of Compliance Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.24.....	25

Table of Authorities

Cases

<i>Aerohive Networks, Inc. v. Chrimar Sys., Inc.</i> , IPR2016-01757 (PTAB Sep. 8, 2016).....	7
<i>Ancora Techs., Inc. v. Apple, Inc.</i> , 774 F.3d 732 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	3
<i>Ancora Techs., Inc. v. HTC Am., Inc.</i> , 908 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	4
<i>Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc.</i> , IPR2020-00019 (PTAB Mar. 20, 2020)	17
<i>Apple Inc. v. Uniloc 2017 LLC</i> , IPR2020-00854 (PTAB Oct. 28, 2020).....	12
<i>Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee</i> , 136 S. Ct. 2131 (2016).....	17
<i>Dell Inc. v. Chrimar Sys., Inc.</i> , IPR2016-00569 (PTAB Jan. 20, 2017)	3, 7
<i>HTC Corp. v. Ancora Techs. Inc.</i> , Case No. CBM2017-00054 (PTAB Dec. 1, 2017).....	4
<i>Intel Corp. v. VLSI Tech. LLC</i> , IPR2020-00583 (P.T.A.B. October 5, 2020)	19
<i>Lenovo (U.S.) Inc. v. Neodron Ltd.</i> , Case No. IPR2020-00729 (PTAB Aug. 3, 2020).....	6
<i>LG Elec., Inc. v. Cellular Commc'ns Equip. LLC</i> , Case No. IPR2016-00711 (PTAB May 13, 2016)	8
<i>LG Elecs., Inc. v. Bell Northern Research, LLC</i> , Case No. IPR2020-00108 (PTAB May 20, 2020)	6

<i>Mylan Techs., Inc. v. MonoSol Rx, LLC,</i> IPR2017-00200 (PTAB Oct. 6, 2017)	7
<i>Par Pharma., Inc. v. MonoSol Rx, LLC,</i> IPR2017-01557 (PTAB June 9, 2017)	7
<i>Samsung Elecs. Co. Ltd. v. Ancora Techs., Inc.,</i> Case No. IPR2020-01184 (PTAB Jan. 5, 2021)	17
<i>Samsung Elecs. Co. Ltd. v. Immersion Corp.,</i> IPR2018-01467 (PTAB June 18, 2019).....	10
<i>Valve Corp. v. Elec. Scripting Prods., Inc.,</i> Case IPR2019-00062 (PTAB Apr. 2, 2019)	12, 13
<i>ZTE (USA) LLC, v. Seven Networks, LLC,</i> Case No. IPR 2019-00460 (PTAB Feb. 28, 2019).....	8
<i>ZTE USA, Inc. v. Parthenon Unified Memory Architecture LLC,</i> Case No. IPR2016-00664 (PTAB June 8, 2016)	8

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 314	17
35 U.S.C. § 315	9, 20
35 U.S.C. § 316	16
35 U.S.C. § 317	8

Other Authorities

PTAB Consolidated Trial Practice Guide (Nov. 2019), https://www.uspto.gov/TrialPracticeGuideConsolidated	8
--	---

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.