IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

JUNIPER NETWORKS, INC.

Petitioner,

V.

ORCKIT CORPORATION

Patent Owner.

Case IPR2024-00037

U.S. Patent No. 10,652,111

MOTION FOR JOINDER TO *INTER PARTES* REVIEW IPR2023-00554



TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	. 1
	STATEMENT OF MATERIAL FACTS	
III.	STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR RELIEF REQUESTED	.2
A.	LEGAL STANDARD	.2
B.	PETITIONER'S MOTION FOR JOINDER IS TIMELY	.3
C.	THE BOARD SHOULDN'T EXERCISE DISCRETION UNDER §314(A)). 3
	ALL FOUR KYOCERA FACTORS WEIGH IN FAVOR OF JOINDER	
IV.	CONCLUSION	. 7



I. Introduction

Juniper Networks, Inc. ("Juniper" or "Petitioner") respectfully submits this Motion for Joinder along with a Petition for *Inter Partes* review of U.S. Patent No. 10,652,111 ("the Juniper Petition"). The Patent Trial and Appeal Board ("Board") instituted *Cisco Systems, Inc. v. Orckit Corp.*, IPR2023-00554 ("Cisco IPR") on September 20, 2023. Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §315(c) and 37 C.F.R. §42.122(b), Juniper requests institution of *inter partes* review and joinder with the Cisco IPR. As detailed below, doing so won't unduly burden or prejudice the parties to the Cisco IPR and will efficiently resolve the question of the validity of U.S. Patent No. 10,652,111 ("the '111 Patent") in a single proceeding.

II. STATEMENT OF MATERIAL FACTS

- 1. On July 22, 2022, Patent Owner, Orckit Corporation ("Orckit") filed a civil action against Cisco Systems, Inc. asserting four patents, including the '111 Patent.¹
 - 2. Cisco filed the Cisco IPR on February 21, 2023.
- 3. On July 28, 2023, Patent Owner filed a civil action against Arista Networks, Inc. asserting three patents, including the '111 Patent.²



¹ Orckit Corporation v. Cisco Systems, Inc., No. 2:22-cv-00276 (E.D. Tex.).

² Orckit Corporation v. Arista Networks, Inc., No. 1:23-cv-00821 (D. Del.).

- 4. On July 31, 2023, Patent Owner filed a civil action against Juniper asserting three patents, including the '111 Patent.³
 - 5. The Board instituted trial in the Cisco IPR on September 20, 2023.⁴

III. STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR RELIEF REQUESTED

A. Legal Standard

The Board may join as a party to an instituted IPR any person who has properly filed a petition for IPR that warrants institution.⁵ Any request for joinder must be filed "no later than one month after the institution date of any inter partes review for which joinder is requested."⁶ The statute requires the Board to determine whether the joinder applicant's petition warrants institution under §314, and, to effect joinder, requires the Director to exercise her discretion to decide whether to join the joinder applicant.⁷ Applying this standard, the Board first analyzes the petition's merits and whether it should exercise discretion to deny

⁷ Facebook, Inc. v. Windy City Innovations, LLC, 973 F.3d 1321, 1332 (Fed. Cir. 2020).



³ Orckit Corporation v. Juniper Networks, Inc., No. 1:23-cv-00822 (D. Del.).

⁴ See Cisco Systems, Inc. v. Orckit Corp., IPR2023-00554, Paper 8 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 20, 2023).

⁵ 35 U.S.C. §315(c).

⁶ 37 C.F.R. §42.122(b).

institution.⁸ Then, the Board considers the *Kyocera* factors, which include: the reasons why joinder is appropriate, whether the petition presents new grounds of unpatentability, what impact joinder will have on the trial schedule, and how simplification of briefing and discovery might occur to minimize any trial schedule impact.⁹

B. Petitioner's Motion for Joinder is Timely.

Juniper files this Motion for Joinder within one month of the September 20, 2023 institution decision of the Cisco IPR.

C. The Board Shouldn't Exercise Discretion Under §314(a).

The Juniper Petition details the reasons why the Board shouldn't exercise its discretion to deny Juniper's first challenge to the '111 Patent. The Board previously found the Cisco IPR merited institution. The Juniper Petition relies on the same evidence presented in the Cisco IPR including Cisco's expert testimony. ¹⁰ Institution of the Juniper Petition is therefore appropriate for similar reasons.

¹⁰ See, e.g., OpenSky Indus., LLC v. VLSI Tech. LLC, IPR2021-01064, Paper 102 at 9 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 4, 2022) (acknowledging the propriety of "copycat" petitions utilizing the same evidence including refiled declarations).



⁸ See, e.g., AT&T Servs., Inc. v. Broadband iTV, Inc., IPR2021-00556, Paper No. 14 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 25, 2021).

⁹ See Kyocera Corp. v. Softview LLC, IPR2013-00004, Paper No. 15 at 4 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 24, 2013).

DOCKET

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.

