

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MICRON TECHNOLOGY, INC., MICRON SEMICONDUCTOR
PRODUCTS, INC., and MICRON TECHNOLOGY TEXAS LLC,
Petitioner,

v.

NETLIST, INC.,
Patent Owner.

IPR2023-00406
Patent 11,016,918 B2

Before PATRICK M. BOUCHER, JON M. JURGOVAN, and
DANIEL J. GALLIGAN, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

JURGOVAN, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION
Granting Institution of *Inter Partes* Review
35 U.S.C. § 314
Granting Motion for Joinder
35 U.S.C. § 315(c); 37 C.F.R. § 42.122

I. DISCUSSION

Inter partes review of U.S. Patent 11,016,918 B2 (“918 patent”) was instituted in IPR2022-00996 (“996 IPR”) based on a petition filed by Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. (“Samsung”). 996 IPR, Papers 1, 10. In this proceeding, Micron Technology, Inc., Micron Semiconductor Products, Inc., and Micron Technology Texas LLC (collectively “Petitioner”) concurrently filed a Petition (Paper 1) and a Motion for Joinder (Paper 3) seeking to be joined as a petitioner in the 996 IPR. Petitioner represents that Samsung, the petitioner in the 996 IPR, does not oppose joinder. Motion 2. Patent Owner did not file an opposition to the Motion.

The statute governing *inter partes* review joinder states the following:

JOINDER.—If the Director institutes an *inter partes* review, the Director, in his or her discretion, may join as a party to that *inter partes* review any person who properly files a petition under section 311 that the Director, after receiving a preliminary response under section 313 or the expiration of the time for filing such a response, determines warrants the institution of an *inter partes* review under section 314.

35 U.S.C. § 315(c).

The time for filing a preliminary response to the Petition has expired, and Patent Owner did not file one. *See* 37 C.F.R. 42.107(b) (“The preliminary response must be filed no later than three months after the date of a notice indicating that the request to institute an *inter partes* review has been granted a filing date.”); Paper 4 (filing date notice entered on January 23, 2023).

The standard for instituting an *inter partes* review is set forth in 35 U.S.C. § 314(a), which provides that an *inter partes* review may not be instituted unless the information presented in the Petition and any preliminary response shows “there is a reasonable likelihood that the

petitioner would prevail with respect to at least 1 of the claims challenged in the petition.”

The patentability challenges in the 996 IPR met the “reasonable likelihood” standard of § 314(a). 996 IPR, Paper 10 at 55. Petitioner represents that the Petition “is substantively identical to” the petition in the 996 IPR. Motion 1. Petitioner presents the following grounds in this Petition, which are identical to the instituted grounds in the 996 IPR:

Claim(s) Challenged	35 U.S.C. §	Reference(s)/Basis
1–3, 8, 14, 15, 23	103(a) ¹	Harris ² , FBDIMM Standards ³
1–30	103(a)	Harris, FBDIMM Standards, Amidi ⁴
1–30	103(a)	Harris, FBDIMM Standards, Amidi, Hajeck ⁵
1–30	103(a)	Spiers ⁶ , Amidi
1–30	103(a)	Spiers, Amidi, Hajeck

Pet. 3; *see* 996 IPR, Paper 10 at 8, 55 (identifying same grounds and instituting *inter partes* review).

¹ The Leahy-Smith America Invents Act (“AIA”), Pub. L. No. 112-29, 125 Stat. 284, 287–88 (2011), amended 35 U.S.C. § 103 and became effective March 16, 2013. For this proceeding, Petitioner assumes that the ’918 patent has an effective priority date before this date (Pet. 3–4) and applies the pre-AIA version of § 103.

² US 2006/0174140 A1, published Aug. 3, 2006 (Ex. 1023).

³ JESD82-20 and JESD205 standards published March 2007 (Ex. 1027, Ex. 1028).

⁴ US Patent No. 7,724,604 B2, issued May 25, 2010 (Ex. 1024).

⁵ US Patent No. 6,856,556 B1, published Apr. 13, 2006 (Ex. 1038).

⁶ US 2006/0080515 A1, published Apr. 13, 2006 (Ex. 1025).

We determine that Petitioner has demonstrated a reasonable likelihood of prevailing with respect to at least one challenged claim of the '918 patent for the reasons given in the institution decision in the 996 IPR and that the Petition warrants institution. *See* 996 IPR, Paper 10 at 8–55.

As discussed above, Petitioner's Motion is unopposed by Samsung or Patent Owner. We have reviewed the Motion, and we determine that it is appropriate under these circumstances to join Petitioner as a party to the 996 IPR.

II. ORDER

Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 314(a) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.4, an *inter partes* review is hereby instituted on the challenge raised in the Petition;

FURTHER ORDERED that Petitioner's Motion for Joinder with IPR2022-00996 is *granted*, and Petitioner is hereby joined as a petitioner in IPR2022-00996;

FURTHER ORDERED that the grounds on which trial in IPR2022-00996 was instituted are unchanged, and no other grounds are added in IPR2022-00996;

FURTHER ORDERED that the Scheduling Order entered in IPR2022-00996 (Paper 11) and the Parties' stipulation to modify Dates 1, 2, and 3 (Paper 15) shall govern the trial schedule in IPR2022-00996;

FURTHER ORDERED that Petitioner's role in IPR2022-00996 shall be limited as stated by Petitioner in the Motion for Joinder (Paper 3 at 5–9) unless and until Samsung is terminated from that proceeding;

IPR2023-00406
Patent 11,016,918 B2

FURTHER ORDERED that the case caption in IPR2022-00996 shall be changed to reflect joinder of Petitioner in accordance with the attached example;

FURTHER ORDERED that a copy of this Decision be entered into the record of IPR2022-00996; and

FURTHER ORDERED that all further filings shall be made in IPR2022-00996.

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.