

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MERCEDES-BENZ USA, LLC,
Petitioner

v.

DAEDALUS PRIME LLC,
Patent Owner

Case (to be assigned)
U.S. Patent No. 10,049,080

**PETITIONER'S CONTINGENT MOTION FOR JOINDER UNDER 35 U.S.C.
§ 315(c) AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.122**

Helen Trac (Reg. No. 62,250)
HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP
Four Embarcadero, #3500
San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone: 415-374-2300
Facsimile: 415-374-2399

Filed on behalf of Petitioners:
Celine Jimenez Crowson (Reg. No. 40,357)
Joseph Raffetto (Reg. No. 66,218)
Scott Hughes (Reg. No. 68,385)
Ryan Stephenson (Reg. No. 76,608)
Nicholas Rotz (Reg. No. 75,959)
HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP
555 13th Street N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone: 202.637.5600
Facsimile: 202.637.5710

I. Statement of Precise Relief Requested

Mercedes-Benz USA LLC (“**Petitioner**”) respectively submits this Motion for Joinder, concurrently with a Petition for *inter partes* review of U.S. Patent No. 10,049,080 (the “**’080 patent**”).

Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 315(c) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.122(b), Petitioner moves for joinder with any *inter partes* review that is instituted as to the ’080 patent in *Qualcomm Inc. v. Daedalus Prime LLC*, IPR2023-00567 (the “Qualcomm IPR”).¹ Petitioner requests that action on this motion be held in abeyance until, and the motion be granted if, the Qualcomm IPR is instituted. Should the Qualcomm IPR be terminated prior to any institution decision or otherwise not instituted for any reason, Petitioner submits this motion for joinder would be moot, and requests the Board consider Petitioner’s *inter partes* review petition on its own merits. This motion is timely because it is being filed before institution of the Qualcomm IPR.

Petitioner requests institution of its Petition for *inter partes* review filed concurrently herewith. The Petition is substantively the same as the Qualcomm

¹ Petitioner notes that IPR2023-00567 has been terminated as to Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. and Samsung Electronics America, Inc. per the Board’s decision on June 27, 2023.

IPR petition. It challenges the same claims, on the same grounds, and relies on the same prior art as the Qualcomm IPR petition. Accordingly, no additional burden would be created for the Board, the Qualcomm IPR petitioners, or Patent Owner if joined. Joinder would therefore lead to an efficient resolution of the invalidity of the '080 patent.

Petitioner agrees to proceed solely on the grounds, evidence, and arguments advanced, or that will be advanced, in the Qualcomm IPR if it is instituted. The Petition therefore warrants institution under 35 U.S.C. § 314, and 35 U.S.C. § 315(c) permits Petitioner's joinder to the Qualcomm IPR if it is instituted.

Petitioner stipulates that if joinder is granted, it will act as an "understudy" and will not assume an active role unless the Qualcomm IPR petitioners cease to participate in the proceeding. The Qualcomm IPR petitioner will maintain the lead role in the proceeding so long as it remains in the proceeding. These limitations will avoid lengthy and duplicative briefing. Petitioner also will not seek additional depositions or deposition time. Accordingly, the proposed joinder will neither unduly complicate the Qualcomm IPR nor delay its schedule.

Joinder will not unduly prejudice any party. Because joinder will not add any new substantive issues, delay the schedule, burden deponents, or increase needless filings, any additional costs on the Patent Owner would be minimal. On the other hand, denial of joinder would prejudice Petitioner. Petitioner's interests

may not be adequately protected in the Qualcomm IPR, particularly if the Qualcomm IPR petitioners settle with the Patent Owner. Petitioner should be allowed to join in a proceeding affecting a patent that has been previously asserted against it.

II. Statement of Reasons for the Relief Requested

A. Legal Standards and Applicable Rules

The Board has discretion to join a properly filed IPR petition to an existing IPR proceeding. *See* 35 U.S.C. § 315(c); 37 C.F.R. § 42.122(b); *see also Sony Mobile Commc'ns. AB v. Ancora Techs., Inc.*, IPR2021-00663, Paper 17, at 29-33; *Dell Inc. v. Network-1 Sec. Solutions, Inc.*, IPR2013-00385, Paper 19, at 4-6; *Sony Corp. v. Yissum Res. & Dev. Co. of the Hebrew Univ. of Jerusalem*, IPR2013-00326, Paper 15, at 3-4; *Microsoft Corp. v. Proxyconn, Inc.*, IPR2013-00109, Paper 15, at 3-4; *Mercedes-Benz Grp. AG v. Neo Wireless, LLC.*, No. IPR2023-00079, Paper No. 11 at 6-14.

“The Board will determine whether to grant joinder on a case-by-case basis, taking into account the particular facts of each case, substantive and procedural issues, and other considerations.” *Dell*, IPR2013-00385, Paper 19, at 3. The movants bear the burden of proof in establishing entitlement to the requested relief. 37 §§ 42.20(c), 42.122(b). A motion for joinder should:

- (1) set forth the reasons why joinder is appropriate;
- (2) identify any new grounds of unpatentability asserted in the petition;
- (3)

explain what impact (if any) joinder would have on the trial schedule for the existing review; and (4) address specifically how briefing and discovery may be simplified.

Dell, IPR2013-00385, Paper 19, at 4.

B. Joinder with the Proceeding is Appropriate

The Board “routinely grants motions for joinder where the party seeking joinder introduces identical arguments and the same grounds raised in the existing proceeding.” *Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd. v. Raytheon Co.*, IPR2016-00962, Paper No. 12 at 9 (Aug. 24, 2016) (emphasis added) (internal quotations and citations omitted).

Here, in the event the Qualcomm IPR is instituted, joinder is appropriate because the Petition introduces identical unpatentability arguments and the same grounds raised in the Qualcomm IPR petition. In other words, both petitions contain the same grounds based on the same prior art combinations and supporting evidence against the same claims. There are no substantive differences between the Petition and the Qualcomm IPR petition. Petitioner also relies on substantially the same supporting evidence in the Petition as is relied on in the Qualcomm IPR. Because these proceedings introduce identical unpatentability arguments and the same grounds, good cause exists for joinder, so that the Board, consistent with 37 C.F.R. § 42.1(b), can efficiently “secure the just, speedy, and inexpensive resolution” of this proceeding and the Qualcomm IPR.

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.