

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

COLEMAN CABLE, LLC, JIAWEI TECHNOLOGY (HK) LTD., JIAWEI
TECHNOLOGY (USA) LTD., SHENZHEN JIAWEI PHOTOVOLTAIC
LIGHTING CO, LTD., ATICO INTERNATIONAL (ASIA) LTD., ATICO
INTERNATIONAL USA, INC., SMART SOLAR, INC., AND TEST RITE
PRODUCTS CORP.

Petitioner,

v.

SIMON NICHOLAS RICHMOND

Patent Owner.

Case No. IPR2014-00938

Patent 7,429,827

**PATENT OWNER'S MOTION TO TERMINATE
THIS PROCEEDING FOR PETITIONER'S FAILURE
TO IDENTIFY ALL REAL PARTIES IN INTEREST**

Table of Contents

- I. Introduction..... 1
- II. Petitioner, not Patent Owner, Bears the Burden of Establishing Compliance Under 35 U.S.C. § 312..... 2
- III. Newly Learned Facts Make This The Appropriate Time To Challenge Petitioner’s Standing Under § 312(a).....3
- IV. Patent Owner’s Investigation Shows that Southwire Is A Real Party In Interest..... 5
 - A. An RPI is one that controls or could control the IPR Proceedings.....5
 - B. Southwire Exercised Control Over Coleman’s Petition By, Among Other Means, Acting Through Its Executive Vice President And General Counsel Floyd W. Smith6
 - C. Blurring of the Corporate Lines Between Coleman and Southwire7
- V. The Failure To Disclose Southwire As An RPI Is A Substantive Defect And Any Remedy Of This Defect Would Require A New Filing Date..... 11
- VI. This Proceeding Should be Terminated Because These Facts are More Compelling Than Those in *Atlanta Gas* and *Galderma S.A.*..... 12
- VII. Conclusion..... 14

Table of Authorities

Cases

<i>Compass Bank v. Intellectual Ventures II LLC</i> , Case IPR2014-00724, Paper 12 (PTAB Nov. 6, 2014).....	4
<i>Galderma S.A. et al. v. Allergan Industrie, SAS, et al.</i> , IPR2014-01422, ppr 14 (March 5, 2015)	6, 12, 13
<i>Gonzalez v. Banco Cent. Corp.</i> , 27 F.3d 751 (1st Cir. 1994).....	6
<i>In re Guan, Inter Partes Reexamination Proceeding</i> , Control No. 95/001,045, Decision Vacating Filing Date (Aug. 25, 2008)	5
<i>Intellectual Ventures Mgmt., LLC v. Patents of Xilinx, Inc.</i> , IPR2012-00018, Ppr 12 (Jan. 24, 2013)	11
<i>Petroleum Geo-Services Inc. v. Westerngeco, LLC</i> , IPR2014-00678, Ppr 15 (Jul. 24, 2014).....	12
<i>RPX v. Virnetx</i> , IPR2014-00171, Paper 49 (Jun. 5, 2014).....	6
<i>Samsung v. Black Hills Media</i> , IPR2014-00717 Paper 8 (Aug. 7, 2014).....	5
<i>Syntroleum Corp v. Neste Oil Oyj</i> , IPR2013-00178, Paper 22 (Sep. 4, 2013).....	5

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 312	passim
35 U.S.C. § 315	4, 12, 15

Regulations

<i>Inter Partes, Post Grant, and Covered Business Method Review Final Rules</i> , 77 Fed. Reg. 48680, 48695 (Aug. 14, 2012).....	4
---	---

...

I. Introduction

In May of 2015, Patent Owner learned that Southwire Company, LLC (“Southwire”), which had acquired Coleman Cable LLC (“Coleman”) (a co-petitioner in these proceedings), in February of 2014, had its own exhibitor’s booth at the 2015 National Hardware Show listed as “Moonrays/Southwire,” “Moonrays” being the trademark used by Coleman for selling the products to those that Patent Owner had accused Coleman of infringing his 7,429,827 Patent (“827 Patent”), whose validity is at issue in this proceeding. Furthermore, Patent Owner learned that Mr. Floyd W. Smith, the person who signed the Power of Attorney for Coleman authorizing its participation as Petitioner was, in fact, *Southwire’s* Executive Vice President, Secretary and General Counsel. *See* Paper 5; *see also* Declaration by Simon Nicholas Richmond (Hereinafter, “Dec.”) ¶¶ 10-11 citing Exs. 2042, 2043.

Further evidence that has come to Patent Owner’s attentions since May of 2015 which demonstrates that the purported parent-subsidary relationship between Southwire and Coleman was, in fact, a merger that integrated operations and marketing, and blurred and eviscerated the corporate lines between these two companies, such that Southwire is a real party in interest and that it controls, or at least could control, this proceeding.

In view of the foregoing, and other evidence discussed herein demonstrating that Southwire is an unnamed real party in interest, Patent Owner moves to terminate this proceeding for Petitioner's failure to comply with 35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(2)'s requirement that *all* real parties in interest ("RPI") be named.

II. Petitioner, not Patent Owner, Bears the Burden of Establishing Compliance Under 35 U.S.C. § 312

"A real party in interest is a party that 'desires review' of the patent at issue, and may be the petitioner itself, and/or it may be the party or parties at whose behest the petition has been filed. *Atlanta Gas Light Co. v. Bennett Regulator Guards, Inc.*, IPR2013-00453, Paper 88 at p. 7 (January 6, 2015), citing *Zoll Lifecor Corp. v. Philips Elec. North America Corp. et al.*, IPR2013-00606 Paper 13 at 12 (March 20, 2014). "The Board generally accepts the petitioner's identification of real parties in interest at the time of filing the petition." *Atlanta Gas* at p. 7, citing *Zoll* at 7. "[A]ccepting the identification of real parties in interest in a petition as accurate acts as a rebuttable presumption that benefits petitioners." *Id.* And, "[t]he party against whom a presumption is directed has the burden of producing evidence to rebut the presumption. *But this rule does not shift the burden of persuasion, which remains on the party who had it originally.*" *Id.* at 8. Thus, once a patent owner presents evidence showing that a real party-in-interest

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.