

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

INTEL CORPORATION.

Petitioner

v.

DEMARAY LLC
Patent Owner

Patent No. 7,544,276

IPR2021-01030

Petitioner's Motion for Joinder of IPR2021-00103
Under 35 U.S.C. § 315(c) and 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.22 and 42.122(b)

I. INTRODUCTION

Intel Corporation files the present petition for *inter partes* review IPR2021-01030 (the “Intel IPR”) and moves for joinder of IPR2021-00103, filed by Applied Materials, Inc. (the “Applied IPR”). The Intel IPR is identical to the Applied IPR in all substantive respects, includes identical exhibits, and relies upon the same expert declarants. Petitioner does not seek to alter the grounds upon which the Board has already instituted the Applied IPR, and seeks no change in the existing schedule for that IPR proceeding. Petitioner respectfully requests an opportunity to join with the Applied IPR solely as an “understudy,” where Petitioner would only assume an active role in the event Applied Materials settles with Patent Owner Demaray LLC and moves to terminate the Applied IPR.

II. BACKGROUND AND RELATED PROCEEDINGS

Demaray is the owner of U.S. Patent No. 7,544,276 (the “’276 Patent”) and has asserted infringement of this patent in the following cases: *Demaray LLC v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. et al.*, Case No. 6-20-cv-00636 (W.D. Tex.) (“Samsung Litigation”); *Demaray LLC v. Intel Corporation*, Case No. 6-20-cv-00634 (W.D. Tex.) (“Intel Litigation”); *Applied Materials, Inc. v. Demaray LLC*, Case No. 5-20-cv-05676 (N.D. Cal.) (terminated); *Applied Materials, Inc. v. Demaray LLC*, 5-20-cv-09341 (N.D. Cal.). The ’276 Patent is also at issue in *Applied*

Materials, Inc. v. Demaray LLC, IPR2021-00105 (PTAB) (institution denied under 314(a)).

On October 23, 2020, Applied Materials filed a Petition requesting an *inter partes* review of claims 1–13 of the '276 Patent. Demaray filed a Preliminary Response to the Petition, Petitioner filed a Reply, and Demaray filed a Sur-reply. Applied Materials also filed a Petitioner's Notice Regarding Multiple Petitions to which Demaray filed a Response. The Board instituted the Applied IPR on May 11, 2021.

III. DISCUSSION

Petitioner respectfully requests that the Board exercise its discretion to grant joinder of the Intel IPR and the Applied IPR proceedings pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 315(c), 37 C.F.R. § 42.22, and 37 C.F.R. § 42.122(b). In support of this motion, Petitioner proposes consolidated filings and other procedural accommodations designed to streamline the proceedings.

A. Reasons Why Joinder Is Appropriate

Joinder is appropriate in this case because it is the most expedient way to secure the just, speedy, and inexpensive resolution of the related proceedings. *See* 35 U.S.C. § 316(b); 37 C.F.R. § 42.1(b). Intentionally, the Intel IPR is substantively identical to the corresponding Applied IPR in an effort to avoid multiplication of issues before the Board. Given the duplicative nature of these petitions, joinder of

the related proceedings is appropriate. Further, Petitioner will agree to consolidated filings and discovery, and procedural concessions, which Applied Materials does not oppose.

1. Substantively Identical Petitions

Petitioner represents that the Intel IPR is identical to the Applied IPR in all substantive respects. It includes identical grounds, analysis, and exhibits and relies upon the same expert declarants and declarations. Accordingly, if instituted, maintaining the Intel IPR proceeding separate from that of Applied Materials would entail needless duplication of effort.

2. Consolidated Filings and Discovery

Because the grounds of unpatentability in the Intel IPR and Applied IPR are the same, the case is amenable to consolidated filings. Petitioner will agree to consolidated filings for all substantive papers in the proceeding (e.g., Reply to the Patent Owner's Response, Opposition to Motion to Amend, Motion for Observation on Cross Examination Testimony of a Reply Witness, Motion to Exclude Evidence, Opposition to Motion to Exclude Evidence and Reply). Specifically, Petitioner will agree to incorporate its filings with those of Applied Materials in a consolidated filing, subject to the ordinary rules for one party on page limits. Applied Materials and Petitioner will be jointly responsible for the consolidated filings.

Petitioner agrees not to be permitted any arguments separate from those advanced by Petitioner and Applied Materials in the consolidated filings. These limitations avoid lengthy and duplicative briefing.

Consolidated discovery is also appropriate given that Petitioner and Applied Materials are using the same expert declarants who has submitted the same, identical declarations in the two proceedings. Petitioner and Applied Materials will designate an attorney to conduct the cross-examination of any given witness produced by Demaray and the redirect of any given witness produced by Petitioner or Applied Materials within the timeframe normally allotted by the rules for one party. Petitioner will not receive any separate cross-examination or redirect time. Petitioner will agree to the foregoing conditions regarding consolidated filings and discovery even in the event other IPRs filed by other, third-party petitioners are joined with the Applied IPR.

B. No New Grounds Of Patentability

The Intel IPR raises no new grounds of unpatentability from those of the Applied IPR because, in fact, the petitions are identical.

C. No Impact On IPR Trial Schedule

The small difference between the filing date of the Intel IPR and the Applied IPR is without consequence should the proceedings be joined. The trial schedule for the Applied IPR would not need to be delayed to effect joinder based on Demaray's

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.