

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

GOOGLE LLC,
Petitioner,

v.

RFCYBER CORP.,
Patent Owner.

Patent No. 10,600,046
Filing Date: June 2, 2015
Issue Date: March 24, 2020

Inventors: Xiangzhen Xie, Liang Seng Koh, and Hsin Pan
Title: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR MOBILE PAYMENTS

**RFCYBER CORP.'S
SUR-REPLY TO PETITIONER'S REPLY**

Case No. PGR2021-00028

Discretionary denial is warranted here because the trial in the Eastern District of Texas (the “Texas Action”), between the same parties as here, will be completed months before the projected Final Written Decision date in this proceeding. Institution thus will result in unnecessary duplication of the parties’ and District Court’s substantial efforts and should be denied.

Moreover, as discussed in Patent Owner’s POPR, the ’046 patent is not eligible for PGR because every claim has a priority date predating March 16, 2013. However, if the Board should find that the limitations in claims 6-11 and 15-16 were not disclosed in the pre-AIA applications, it should deny institution because disclaimed claims are treated as never having existed under controlling law.

I. ALL *FINTIV* FACTORS FAVOR DISCRETIONARY DENIAL

On May 12, 2021, the District Court in the parallel litigation set trial for March 21, 2022, with a claim construction hearing on October 28, 2021. Reply, 1.

A. The Significant Time Between Trial and a Final Written Decision Weighs Strongly in Favor of Denial

The District Court’s trial date of March 21, 2022 will come approximately four months before the projected Final Written Decision in this case. *Id.* At that time, all issues relating to the challenged claims (including claim construction, validity, and infringement) will have been finally determined by the District Court. This factor, therefore, weighs strongly in favor of denial. POPR, 59-61.

Google asserts that this factor is neutral but provides no evidence or argument to support its assertion. Reply, 1-2.

B. There Is No Likelihood of a Stay

As explained in the POPR, there is no likelihood of a stay in the Texas Action because the Court there has explicitly stated that its “*consistent and long established practice* [is] to deny motions to stay pending IPR and EPR when the PTAB or PTO have instituted review on less than all asserted claims of all asserted patents.” *AGIS Software Dev. LLC v. Google LLC*, No. 2:19-cv-00361-JRG, 2021 WL 465424, at *2 (E.D. Tex. Feb. 9, 2021) (emphasis added); *see also* POPR at 62-63. There are no instituted reviews on any of the four other patents in the Texas action, and thus no stay is likely to issue. Accordingly, this factor favors denial. *Stanley Black & Decker, Inc. v. Zircon Corp.*, IPR2020-01572, Paper No. 10, 9-12 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 19, 2021) (finding, even though no stay had been requested, ITC was unlikely to stay investigation and therefore this factor favored denial).

Google ignores the Texas Court’s explicit description of its established practice and suggests that this factor is always neutral when Petitioner has not sought a stay. Reply, 1. But *Fintiv* considers both “whether the court granted a stay *or evidence exists that one may be granted if a proceeding is instituted.*” *Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc.*, IPR2020-00019, Paper 11, at 6 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 20, 2020)

(precedential) (emphasis added). Here, there is no evidence that a stay may be granted if a proceeding is instituted; to the contrary, there is strong evidence that a stay will not be granted. Accordingly, this factor favors denial. *See Stanley Black & Decker*, IPR2020-01572, Paper No. 10 at 9-12.

C. Overlapping Parties Favors Denial

Patent Owner and Google are both parties to the parallel District Court litigation. POPR, 58. Thus, this factor favors denial of the Petition. *E.g.*, *Cellco P'ship v. Huawei Techs. Co.*, IPR2020-01352, Paper No. 13 at 15 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 5, 2021). Google offers no substantive argument or explanation as to why this factor does not weigh against it, instead stating, without evidence, analysis, or citation that the factor is neutral. Reply, 5. But it is well-established that overlap between parties weighs in favor of denial. *E.g.*, *Cellco*, IPR2020-01352, Paper No. 13 at 15. Accordingly, this factor weighs against institution.

D. The Overlap of Issues Weighs in Favor of Denial

Patent Owner has asserted claims 1, 2, and 5 against Google in the Texas Action. Google has challenged those claims in this proceeding as well. Pet., 27. Thus, the same claims are at issue in both proceedings.

Google attempts to sidestep the substantial overlap by nebulously promising that it will not assert any §101 grounds or the same written description grounds

that were raised in the Petition but only if trial is instituted. Even then, Google limits its “stipulation” to “the claims on which trial is instituted, while trial is instituted.” Reply, 4.

Google’s “stipulation” does not remove the substantial overlap in issues between the Texas Action and this proceeding. It would not prevent Google from raising substantially similar written description grounds in the District Court. Moreover, in view of the fact that the prior art date for Google’s primary reference in its companion PGR is after the priority date of the ’046 patent, it is likely that the District Court will have to engage in the same written description analysis that Google asks the Board to perform here. Accordingly, Google’s stipulation does not obviate the substantial overlap in issues and this factor favors denial.

E. The Significant Investment of the Parties and District Court Favors Denial

Patent Owner served its infringement contentions on May 12, 2021. According to the parties’ agreed schedule, Petitioner will serve its invalidity contentions (including § 101 contentions) on July 14, 2021. *RF Cyber Corp. v. Google LLC*, No. 2:20-cv-00274-JRG, Dkt. 55-1 at 4-5 (E.D. Tex. May 26, 2021). Claim construction briefs will be filed with the Court in September and October, with a claim construction hearing on October 28, 2021. *Id.* Accordingly, substantial resources will have been expended by the parties by the time of the

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.