

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MAJOR DATA UAB,
Petitioner,

v.

BRIGHT DATA LTD.,
Patent Owner.

IPR2022-00915
Patent 10,257,319 B2

Before THOMAS L. GIANNETTI, KEVIN C. TROCK, and
SHEILA F. McSHANE, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

TROCK, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

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

I. INTRODUCTION

Major Data UAB (“Petitioner”) filed a Petition (Paper 1, “Pet.”) requesting *inter partes* review of claims 1, 2, 12, 14, 15, 17–19, and 21–29 (the “challenged claims”) of U.S. Patent No. 10,257,319 B2 (Ex. 1001, “the ’319 patent”). Bright Data Ltd.¹ (“Patent Owner”) filed a Preliminary Response (Paper 12, “Prelim. Resp.”). With authorization from the panel, Petitioner filed a Preliminary Reply (Paper 16, “Pet. Prelim. Reply”), and Patent Owner filed a Preliminary Sur-reply (Paper 17, “PO Prelim. Sur-reply”).

The Board has authority to determine whether to institute *inter partes* review. *See* 35 U.S.C. § 314; 37 C.F.R. § 42.4(a). Under 35 U.S.C. § 314(a), we may not authorize an *inter partes* review unless the information in the petition and the preliminary response “shows that 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 stated below, we determine that Petitioner has established a reasonable likelihood that it would prevail with respect to at least one claim. We therefore institute *inter partes* review as to all of the challenged claims of the ’319 patent and all of the asserted grounds of unpatentability in the Petition.

II. BACKGROUND

A. Related Matters

The parties identify several district court proceedings involving the ’319 patent and a related patent, U.S. Patent No. 10,484,510 (“the ’510

¹ According to Petitioner, Bright Data Ltd. was formerly known as Luminati Networks, Ltd. *See* Pet. 1.

IPR2022-00915
Patent 10,257,319 B2

patent”), including *Bright Data Ltd. v. NetNut Ltd.*, No. 2:21-cv-225 (E.D. Tex.) (the “NetNut Litigation”); and *Luminati Networks Ltd. v. Teso LT, UAB, et al.*, No. 2:19-cv-395 (E.D. Tex.) (the “Teso Litigation”). Pet. 3–4; Paper 6, 2–3. The parties also identify a number of district court actions involving patents related to the ’319 patent. *Id.*

According to the parties, the ’319 patent was previously before the Board in IPR2020-01266, IPR2021-01492, IPR2022-00135, and IPR2022-00861. Pet. 4; Paper 6, 1–2. The parties also identify a number of other USPTO proceedings involving patents related to the ’319 patent. *See* Pet. 4–6; Paper 6, 1–2.

In addition, Patent Owner identifies *ex parte* reexaminations requested for the ’319 and ’510 patents, respectively, Control No. 90/014,875 and Control No. 90/014,876. Paper 6, 2.

B. Real Parties-in-Interest

Petitioner identifies Major Data UAB as the real party-in-interest. Pet. 2. Patent Owner expresses concern, however, that “Major Data was formed as a ‘back-up’ option to continue these IPRs,” and represents that Patent Owner “has not sued Major Data for infringement of any patents and Patent Owner is not aware of any services offered by Major Data.” Prelim. Resp. 3.

In its Preliminary Reply, however, Petitioner points out that shortly before Patent Owner filed the Preliminary Response, Petitioner had advised Patent Owner and “confirmed, *inter alia*, that it is not affiliated with any of the Code200 parties and did not discuss the preparation or filing of IPRs with anyone apart from privileged communications with its own attorneys.”

IPR2022-00915
Patent 10,257,319 B2

Pet. Prelim. Reply 3. Petitioner avers that “it did not file its IPRs at any another party’s behest.” *Id.*

In its Preliminary Sur-reply, Patent Owner does not directly challenge Petitioner’s representations, but instead “reserves all rights including, *e.g.*, vacatur and sanctions, if any contradictions to Petitioner’s representations should arise.” PO Prelim. Sur-reply 4.

Based on the current record, we determine that Petitioner has established compliance with the statutory requirement under 35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(2) to identify all real parties in interest.

C. The ’319 Patent

The ’319 patent is titled “System Providing Faster and More Efficient Data Communication.” Ex. 1001, (54). According to the ’319 patent, there is a “need for a new method of data transfer that is fast for the consumer, cheap for the content distributor and does not require infrastructure investment for ISPs.” *Id.* at 1:54–56. The patent states that other “attempts at making the Internet faster for the consumer and cheaper for the broadcaster,” such as proxy servers and peer-to-peer file sharing, have various shortcomings. *Id.* at 1:58–59; 2:24–2:32; 2:59–3:3.

The ’319 patent describes a system and method “for faster and more efficient data communication within a communication network,” such as in the network illustrated in Figure 3, reproduced below (*id.* at 4:41–44):




FIG. 3

Figure 3 is a schematic diagram depicting communication network 100 including a number of communication devices. *Id.* at 4:43–45. Due to the functionality provided by software stored within each communication device, “each device may serve as a client, peer, or agent, depending upon requirements of the network 100.” *Id.* at 4:46–50.

Client 102 is capable of communicating with peers 112, 114, and 116, as well as with one or more agents 122. *Id.* at 4:56–58. Web server 152 may be “a typical HTTP server, such as those being used to deliver content on any of the many such servers on the Internet.” *Id.* at 4:63–67.

Acceleration server 162 includes an acceleration server storage device 164

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.