

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

MEMORYWEB, LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case No. IPR2022-00031
U.S. Patent No. 10,621,228

**PETITIONER'S RESPONSE TO PATENT OWNER'S
OPENING BRIEF ON GOOD CAUSE, SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION,
AND ADDITIONAL DISCOVERY**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION.....1

II. ARGUMENT1

A. MEMORYWEB HAS NOT MET ITS BURDEN TO SHOW GOOD CAUSE FOR ITS LATE ACTION AND DELAY.....1

 1. *MemoryWeb Did Not Timely Raise RPI or Estoppel.1*

 2. *MemoryWeb Did Not Meet Its Burden to Show Good Cause.4*

B. MEMORYWEB HAS NOT MET ITS BURDEN TO JUSTIFY LATE SUBMISSION OF SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION.....10

 1. *MemoryWeb Could Have Timely Submitted the Information.10*

 2. *MemoryWeb Has Not Shown Consideration of the Untimely Evidence Serves the Interests of Justice.....12*

 3. *MemoryWeb’s Cited Precedent Is Contrary to MemoryWeb’s Position.....14*

C. MEMORYWEB SHOULD NOT BE AUTHORIZED TO PURSUE ADDITIONAL DISCOVERY.....15

III. CONCLUSION.....17

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**Page(s)****Cases**

| | |
|---|------|
| <i>Arris Grp., Inc. v. C-Cation Techs., LLC</i> , No. IPR2015-00635, Paper 10 (PTAB May 1, 2015) | 9 |
| <i>Kofax, Inc. v. Uniloc USA, Inc.</i> , No. IPR2015-01207, 2016 WL 8944779 (PTAB July 20, 2016)..... | 7, 8 |
| <i>SharkNinja Operating LLC v. iRobot Corp.</i> , No. IPR2020-00734, Paper 11 (PTAB Oct. 6, 2020)..... | 6 |

Statutes

| | |
|----------------------------|------|
| 35 U.S.C. § 315(e)(1)..... | 2, 3 |
|----------------------------|------|

Regulations

| | |
|--|------|
| 37 C.F.R. Part 42, Subpart A | 14 |
| 37 C.F.R. § 42.5(c)(3)..... | 1 |
| 37 C.F.R. § 42.25(b) | 1, 4 |
| 37 C.F.R. § 42.123(b) | 15 |
| 77 Fed. Reg. 48621-22 (Aug. 14, 2012)..... | 12 |

I. INTRODUCTION

MemoryWeb’s opening brief largely ignores the two requirements that it must satisfy here. It does not show that good cause exists to excuse its intentional delay in raising real-party-in-interest (“RPI”) and estoppel arguments, nor does it show that the late submission of evidence—possessed more than a year before this proceeding was instituted—serves the interests of justice. The Board should deny MemoryWeb’s improper attempt to raise new arguments and introduce new evidence at this late stage of the proceeding.

II. ARGUMENT

A. **MemoryWeb Has Not Met Its Burden to Show Good Cause For Its Late Action and Delay.**

To excuse its intentional delay in raising RPI and estoppel arguments in this proceeding, MemoryWeb must establish “good cause or that consideration on the merits would be in the interests of justice.” 37 C.F.R. § 42.5(c)(3). Its opening brief does not come close to doing so.

1. MemoryWeb Did Not Timely Raise RPI or Estoppel.

MemoryWeb claims it complied with 37 C.F.R. § 42.25(b) because it sought relief “promptly” after the Final Written Decision (“FWD”) issued in IPR2021-01413 (“*Unified*”). Paper 47, 10 (“MW Br.”). MemoryWeb, however, misunderstands what issues it was required to raise “promptly” (RPI and estoppel)

and when it was required to do so (before filing its Patent Owner Response (“POR”)).

Issuance of the *Unified* FWD, standing alone, cannot create estoppel under 35 U.S.C. § 315(e)(1)—it requires a predicate finding that an RPI relationship exists between a petitioner (Apple) and the petitioner in an earlier proceeding (Unified Patents). Without that predicate finding—which does not exist in light of the Director’s Decision in *Unified* (EX2038)—the FWD in *Unified* is irrelevant to this proceeding. See Paper 46 (“Apple Br.”), § III.B.1.

MemoryWeb knows this—it said as much in *Unified* and IPR2022-00222 (“*Samsung*”):

- In *Unified*, MemoryWeb stated on June 6, 2022, that “[i]f (1) this IPR results in a final written decision **and (2) Apple and Samsung are RPIs** (which they are), Apple and Samsung would be estopped from maintaining their IPRs against claims 1-7 of the ‘228 patent. 35 U.S.C. § 315(e)(1).” *Unified*, POR, Paper 23, 16 (emphases added).
- In *Samsung*, MemoryWeb stated on September 6, 2022, that “[s]hould the Board determine in a final written decision that **Samsung is an unnamed RPI** in the Unified IPR, Samsung should be estopped from maintaining the present IPR challenge under Section 315[e](1). *Samsung*, POR, Paper 19, 64 (emphases added).

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.