

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.,

Petitioner,

v.

PROXENSE, LLC,

Patent Owner.

Case No. IPR2025-00075

U.S. Patent No. 9,679,289

**MOTION FOR JOINDER UNDER
35 U.S.C. § 315(c) AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.122(b)
TO RELATED *INTER PARTES* REVIEW IPR2024-00783**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	STATEMENT OF THE PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED	1
II.	STATEMENT OF MATERIAL FACTS	1
III.	STATEMENT OF THE PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED	2
A.	LEGAL STANDARD.....	2
B.	PETITIONER’S MOTION FOR JOINDER IS TIMELY	2
C.	EACH FACTOR WEIGHS IN FAVOR OF JOINDER	2
1.	<i>Joinder is Appropriate</i>	3
2.	<i>Petitioner Proposes No New Grounds of Unpatentability</i>	4
3.	<i>Joinder Will Not Unduly Burden or Negatively Impact Any Forthcoming Google IPR Trial Schedule</i>	4
4.	<i>Procedures to Simplify Briefing and Discovery</i>	5
IV.	GENERAL PLASTIC IS INAPPLICABLE	7
V.	CONCLUSION.....	11

I. STATEMENT OF THE PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED

Apple Inc. (“Petitioner”) respectfully submits this Motion for Joinder, together with a Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 9,679,289 (“’289 Patent”) (IPR2025-00075, “the 0075 Petition”) filed contemporaneously herewith. Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 315(c) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.122(b), Petitioner requests institution of an *inter partes* review and joinder with the *inter partes* review in *Google LLC v. Proxense, LLC*, IPR2024-00783 (“the Google IPR”). The 0075 Petition is also narrowly tailored to the same claims, prior art, and grounds for unpatentability that are the subject of the Google IPR. In addition, Petitioner is willing to streamline discovery and briefing. Petitioner understands that Google does not oppose Petitioner’s request for joinder.

Petitioner submits that joinder is appropriate because it will not unduly burden or prejudice the parties to the Google IPR while efficiently resolving the question of the ’289 Patent’s validity in a single proceeding.

II. STATEMENT OF MATERIAL FACTS

1. On April 19, 2024, Google LLC filed a petition for *inter partes* review (IPR2024-00783) requesting cancellation of claims 1-20 of the ’289 Patent.

2. On August 20, 2024, Patent Owner filed its preliminary response, setting a deadline for the Board to issue an institution decision of November 20, 2024. 35 U.S.C. § 315(b); IPR2024-00783, Paper 5.

3. Contemporaneously with this Motion, Petitioner filed its Petition for *Inter Partes* Review requesting cancellation of claims 1-20 of the '289 Patent, which is substantively identical to the Google IPR.

III. STATEMENT OF THE PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED

A. Legal Standard

The Board has the authority under 35 U.S.C. § 315(c) to join a properly filed *inter partes* review petition to an instituted *inter partes* review proceeding. See 35 U.S.C. § 315(c). A motion for joinder must be filed within one month of the Board instituting an original *inter partes* review. 37 C.F.R. § 42.122(b). In deciding whether to exercise its discretion and permit joinder, the Board considers factors, including: (1) the reasons why joinder is appropriate; (2) whether the new petition presents any new grounds of unpatentability; (3) what impact, if any, joinder would have on the trial schedule for the existing review; and (4) how briefing and discovery may be simplified. *Kyocera Corporation v. Softview LLC*, IPR2013-00004, Paper 15 at 4 (April 24, 2013).

B. Petitioner's Motion for Joinder is Timely

This Motion for Joinder is timely because it is filed before any institution decision has been made in the Google IPR. 37 C.F.R. § 42.122(b).

C. Each Factor Weighs in Favor of Joinder

Each of the four factors considered by the Board weighs in favor of joinder here. Specifically, the 0075 Petition does not present any new grounds of

unpatentability; rather it is substantively identical to the Google IPR Petition. Further, joinder will have minimal, if any, impact on any forthcoming trial schedule, as all issues are substantively identical and Petitioner will accept an “understudy” role. *See Sony Corp. et al. v. Memory Integrity, LLC*, IPR2015-01353, Decision Instituting IPR Review, Motion for Joinder, Paper 11 at 6; (granting IPR where petitioners requested an “understudy” role); *see also* IPR2015-01353, Motion for Joinder, Paper 4 at 5-7. Lastly, the briefing and discovery will be simplified by resolving all issues in a single proceeding.

1. Joinder is Appropriate

Joinder with the Google IPR is appropriate because the 0075 Petition involves the same patent, challenges the same claims, relies on the same expert declaration, and is based on the same grounds and combinations of prior art submitted in the Google IPR Petition. *Id.* The 0075 Petition is substantively identical to the Google IPR Petition, containing only minor differences related to only other issues associated with a different party filing the petition. The 0075 Petition presents no changes to the facts, citations, evidence, or arguments related to patentability presented in the Google IPR Petition. Because these proceedings are substantively identical, good cause exists for joining this proceeding with the Google IPR so that the Board can efficiently resolve all grounds in both the 0075 Petition and Google IPR Petition in a single proceeding. *Id.*

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.