

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

GUI GLOBAL PRODUCTS, LTD., D/B/A GWEE,
Patent Owner.

IPR2021-01289
Patent 10,259,020 B2

Before SALLY C. MEDLEY, BRYAN F. MOORE, and
SHEILA F. McSHANE, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

MOORE, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION

Denying Institution of *Inter Partes* Review
35 U.S.C. § 314

Denying Motion for Joinder
35 U.S.C. § 315(c); 37 C.F.R. § 42.122

I. INTRODUCTION

Apple Inc. (“Petitioner”) filed a Petition for *inter partes* review of claims 1–19 of U.S. Patent No. 10,259,020 B2 (Ex. 1001, “the ’020 patent”). Paper 3 (“Pet.”). Petitioner also filed a Conditional Motion for Joinder with *Samsung et al. v. GUI Global Products, Ltd.*, IPR2021-00335 (“the 335 IPR” or “the Samsung 335 IPR”). Paper 4 (“Mot.”). GUI Global Products, Ltd., d/b/a Gwee (“Patent Owner”) filed a Preliminary Response to the Petition. Paper 10 (“Prelim. Resp.”). Patent Owner also filed an Opposition to the Conditional Motion for Joinder. Paper 8 (“Opp.”). Petitioner filed a Reply to Patent Owner’s Opposition. Paper 9 (“Reply”). We have authority under 35 U.S.C. § 314(a), which provides that an *inter partes* review may not be instituted “unless . . . there is a reasonable likelihood that the petitioner would prevail with respect to at least 1 of the claims challenged in the petition.”

For the reasons described below, we do not institute an *inter partes* review of the challenged claims and deny Petitioner’s Conditional Motion for Joinder.

II. RELATED PROCEEDINGS

The parties indicate that the ’020 patent is the subject of court proceeding *GUI Global Products, Ltd. d/b/a Gwee v. Apple, Inc.*, Civil Action No. 4:20-cv-2652 (S.D. Tex.), which has been consolidated with Civil Action No. 4:20-cv-2624 (S.D. Tex.). Pet. 79; Paper 6, 2. The parties also indicate that the ’020 patent is the subject of the 335 IPR, and IPR2021-00470 (“the 470 IPR”), where Petitioner filed a petition challenging claims 1–10 and 16–19 of the ’020 patent. Pet. 78; Paper 6, 2. In the 470 IPR, we instituted an *inter partes* review of claims 1–10 and 16–19 of the ’020

patent. *Apple Inc. v. GUI Global Products, Ltd., D/B/A Gwee*, IPR2021-00470, Paper 10 at 7–8, 40–41 (PTAB Aug. 13, 2021) (“470 Decision” or “470 Dec.”). Thus, before us here is Petitioner’s second petition for *inter partes* review. In accordance with the Consolidated Trial Practice Guide,¹ Petitioner filed a separate paper, identifying a ranking of its petitions and explaining the differences between the petitions. Paper 2 (“Explanation”).

In the 335 IPR, we instituted an *inter partes* review of claims 1–19 of the ’020 patent on the following grounds:

Claim(s) Challenged	35 U.S.C §	Reference(s)/Basis
1–9, 11–15, 19	103(a)	Kim ²
10	103(a)	Kim, Koh ³
16, 17	103(a)	Kim, Lee ⁴
18	103(a)	Kim, Jiang ⁵

¹ Patent Trial and Appeal Board Consolidated Trial Practice Guide (Nov. 2019), <https://www.uspto.gov/TrialPracticeGuideConsolidated>, 59–61 (explaining that the Board may exercise discretion under 35 U.S.C. § 314(a) to deny a petition(s) if it determines that more than one petition challenging claims of the same patent is not warranted) (“Trial Practice Guide” or “TPG”).

² U.S. Pat. Appl. Pub. No. US 2010/0227642 A1, published Sept. 9, 2010 (Ex. 1010, “Kim”).

³ Korean Pat. Pub. No. 10-2008-0093178, published Oct. 21, 2008 (Ex. 1012, 16–30, “Koh”). Petitioner provides a certified English-language translation of Koh (Ex. 1012, 1–15). Any reference to Koh hereinafter will be to the English-language translation.

⁴ U.S. Pat. Appl. Pub. No. US 2010/0298032 A1, published Nov. 25, 2010 (Ex. 1013, “Lee”).

⁵ U.S. Pat. No. US 5,946,121, issued Aug. 31, 1999 (Ex. 1014, “Jiang”)

Samsung et al. v. GUI Global Products, Ltd., D/B/A Gwee, IPR2021-00335, Paper 11 at 8, 37 (PTAB Jul. 2, 2021) (“335 Decision” or “335 Dec.”).

III. DISCUSSION

The Petition in this proceeding asserts the same grounds of unpatentability as those upon which we instituted review in the 335 IPR. *Compare* Pet. 1–2, with 335 Dec. 8, 37. Indeed, Petitioner, Apple, contends that the Petition is “substantively equivalent to the petition instituted in” the 335 IPR. Pet. 1. Petitioner requests that we institute *inter partes* review and conditionally seeks joinder with the 335 IPR. Mot. 1. In the Motion, Petitioner seeks joinder “**if, and only if**, the Board has previously denied institution of *Apple Inc., v. GUI Global Products, Ltd.*, IPR2021-00470 (“the 470 Proceeding”).” *Id.* at 1; Explanation 1. In its Reply, Petitioner revises its request stating, “Apple respectfully requests that the Board institute review of IPR2021-01289 and grant Apple’s pending Motion if, and only if, the Board will align in time the issuance of final written decisions in the 335 Proceeding and the 470 Proceeding.” Reply 2–3. Petitioner asserts that it is seeking alignment of the schedules in the 335 and 470 proceedings in order to avoid a potential prejudice from estoppel under 35 U.S.C. § 315(e)(1). *Id.* at 3.

“To join a party to an instituted IPR, the plain language of § 315(c) requires two different decisions.” *Facebook, Inc. v. Windy City Innovations, LLC*, 973 F.3d 1321, 1332 (Fed. Cir. 2020). First, we “determine whether the joinder applicant’s petition for IPR ‘warrants’ institution under § 314.” *Id.* Second, if the petition warrants institution, we then “decide whether to ‘join as a party’ the joinder applicant.” *Id.* Thus, before determining

whether to join Petitioner as a party to the 335 IPR, we first determine whether the petition warrants institution under § 314(a).

The Director has discretionary authority under 35 U.S.C. § 314(a) to institute *inter partes* review and has delegated that authority to the Board. *See SAS Inst. Inc. v. Iancu*, 138 S. Ct. 1348, 1356 (2018); 37 C.F.R. § 42.4(a). Patent Owner argues that “the Board should exercise its discretion and deny institution of trial,” citing the Board’s precedential *General Plastic*⁶ and *Uniloc*⁷ decisions. Prelim. Resp. 3–4. Petitioner argues we should institute an *inter partes* review of the challenged claims. Pet. 74–78. For the reasons set forth below, we exercise our discretion to deny institution.

In *General Plastic*, the Board articulated a list of non-exclusive factors to be considered in determining whether to exercise discretion under § 314(a) to deny a petition:

1. whether the same petitioner previously filed a petition directed to the same claims of the same patent;
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;
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;
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;

⁶ *General Plastic Industrial Co., Ltd. v. Canon Kabushiki Kaisha*, IPR2016-01357, Paper 19 (PTAB Sept. 6, 2017) (precedential) (“*General Plastic*”).

⁷ *Apple, Inc. v. Uniloc 2017 LLC*, IPR2020-00854, Paper 9 (PTAB Oct. 28, 2020) (precedential) (“*Uniloc*”).

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.