

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ALARM.COM INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

VIVINT, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2015-01995, Case IPR2015-01997, Case IPR2015-02003,
Case IPR2015-02004, Case IPR2016-00116, Case IPR2016-00129,
Case IPR2016-00155, Case IPR2016-00161, and Case IPR2016-00173
(Patents 6,147,601, 6,462,654 B1, 6,535,123 B2, and 6,717,513 B1)¹

Before MICHAEL R. ZECHER, JAMES B. ARPIN, and
CHARLES J. BOUDREAU, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

BOUDREAU, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

ORDER
Conduct of Proceeding
37 C.F.R. § 42.5

On January 19, 2016, Petitioner requested a telephone conference
with the panel regarding Patent Owner's December 17, 2015, filing of

¹ This Order addresses an issue pertaining to all nine identified cases.
Therefore, we exercise our discretion to issue one Order to be filed in each

Case IPR2015-01995, Case IPR2015-01997, Case IPR2015-02003, Case IPR2015-02004, Case IPR2016-00116, Case IPR2016-00129, Case IPR2016-00155, Case IPR2016-00161, and Case IPR2016-00173 (Patents 6,147,601, 6,462,654 B1, 6,535,123 B2, and 6,717,513 B1)

Requests for Certificates of Correction (“Requests”) with respect to each of the four patents involved in the above-captioned proceedings. Pursuant to Petitioner’s request, we held a telephone conference on January 27, 2016. Counsel for the parties participated, along with Administrative Patent Judges Arpin, Boudreau, and Zecher.

BACKGROUND

Petitioner filed Petitions in these proceedings on various dates ranging from September 28, 2015, to November 9, 2015, seeking *inter partes* review of certain claims of U.S. Patent Nos. 6,147,601,² 6,462,654 B1,³ 6,535,123 B2,⁴ and 6,717,513 B1⁵ (collectively, “the Involved Patents”). On December 17, 2015, Patent Owner filed the Requests with respect to the respective Involved Patents in the Office. Patent Owner did not request authorization from the panel prior to filing the Requests and did not notify the panel of the filing of the Requests upon their filing. On January 8, 2016, Patent Owner filed Preliminary Responses in Cases IPR2015-01995,

case. The parties are not authorized to use this style heading for any subsequent papers.

² See Case IPR2015-02004 (Paper 1); Case IPR2016-00116 (Paper 1); Case IPR2016-00155 (Paper 1).

³ See Case IPR2015-02003 (Paper 1); Case IPR2016-00161 (Paper 1).

⁴ See Case IPR2015-01995 (Paper 1); Case IPR2016-00173 (Paper 1).

⁵ See Case IPR2015-01997 (Paper 1); Case IPR2016-00129 (Paper 1).

Case IPR2015-01995, Case IPR2015-01997, Case IPR2015-02003, Case IPR2015-02004, Case IPR2016-00116, Case IPR2016-00129, Case IPR2016-00155, Case IPR2016-00161, and Case IPR2016-00173 (Patents 6,147,601, 6,462,654 B1, 6,535,123 B2, and 6,717,513 B1)

IPR2015-01997, IPR2015-02003, and IPR2015-02004.⁶ Those Preliminary Responses reference the respective Requests.⁷

Petitioner represented during the telephone conference that it disputes Patent Owner's characterization of the corrections in the Requests as being "of a clerical or typographical nature, or of a minor character," at least with respect to certain of the corrections. 35 U.S.C. § 255.

DISCUSSION

Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.3, "[t]he Board may exercise exclusive jurisdiction within the Office over *every* involved application and patent *during [a] proceeding*, as the Board may order" (emphases added). Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.2, "*Proceeding* means a trial or preliminary proceeding," where a "*Preliminary Proceeding* begins with the filing of a petition for instituting a trial and ends with a written decision as to whether a trial will be instituted."

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.3, we hereby exercise jurisdiction over the Requests, filed as they were after the Petitions in these proceedings, pending our determination whether or not to institute *inter partes* review. For any

⁶ Patent Owner's Preliminary Responses in the remaining cases are due on February 5, 2016 (Case IPR2016-00116), February 16, 2016 (Cases IPR2016-00129, IPR2016-00155, and IPR2016-00161), and February 18, 2016 (Case IPR2016-00173)

⁷ Case IPR2015-01995 (Paper 9, 2 n.1); IPR2015-01997 (Paper 9, 34 n.4); IPR2015-02003 (Paper 9, 27); IPR2015-02004 (Paper 9, iv n.1).

Case IPR2015-01995, Case IPR2015-01997, Case IPR2015-02003, Case IPR2015-02004, Case IPR2016-00116, Case IPR2016-00129, Case IPR2016-00155, Case IPR2016-00161, and Case IPR2016-00173 (Patents 6,147,601, 6,462,654 B1, 6,535,123 B2, and 6,717,513 B1)

claims for which correction is sought and for which we institute *inter partes* review, we order that consideration of the Requests by the Certificate of Correction Branch is stayed and will maintain jurisdiction over the Requests for the pendency of trial, including making a determination whether or not the Requests satisfy 35 U.S.C. § 255 and 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.322 and 1.323. Otherwise, if we determine not to institute review of any claims for which correction is sought, Patent Owner's Requests will be returned to the jurisdiction of the Certificate of Correction Branch for further action.

Further, because Petitioner did not have the benefit of having the proposed corrected claim language in the Requests at the time the Petitions were filed, and yet Patent Owner did have the benefit of those proposed corrections when it filed its Preliminary Responses, we authorize Petitioner to file a reply brief, no more than five pages in length, in each of the four cases in which Patent Owner has already filed a Preliminary Response (i.e., Cases IPR2015-01995, IPR2015-01997, IPR2015-02003, and IPR2015-02004). Petitioner's reply briefs shall be limited to arguments, if any, as to (1) why Patent Owner's proposed corrections are not merely "of a clerical or typographical nature, or of a minor character," such that the Certificate of Correction for the respective patent should not be entered; (2) why Petitioner was unable to discern the requested corrections unassisted⁸; and (3) where

⁸In this regard, we note that Petitioner appears to have been able to discern the requested correction with respect at least to U.S. Patent No. 6,717,513 B1. *See* Case IPR2015-01997 (Paper 1, 18) (recognizing that "[t]here is no

Case IPR2015-01995, Case IPR2015-01997, Case IPR2015-02003, Case IPR2015-02004, Case IPR2016-00116, Case IPR2016-00129, Case IPR2016-00155, Case IPR2016-00161, and Case IPR2016-00173 (Patents 6,147,601, 6,462,654 B1, 6,535,123 B2, and 6,717,513 B1)

the references cited in the respective Petition disclose the corrected claim elements. Petitioner also is authorized to file a brief, subject to the same limitations set forth above for the reply briefs, in each of the five cases in which Patent Owner has not yet filed a Preliminary Response (i.e., Cases IPR2016-00116, IPR2016-00129, IPR2016-0155, IPR2016-00161, and IPR2016-00173).

No further briefing by Patent Owner is authorized at this time in Cases IPR2015-01995, IPR2015-01997, IPR2015-02003, and IPR2015-02004, in which Patent Owner already has filed a Preliminary Response. The Board, nonetheless, will determine upon review of Petitioner's reply briefs whether or not to authorize additional briefing from Patent Owner.

As we explained during the telephone conference, Patent Owner is not authorized to file any papers in the Office while a proceeding is pending before the Board with respect to an involved patent, *except with the Board's prior authorization*. Despite Patent Owner's suggestion during the telephone conference that this is inconsistent with non-precedential decisions by other panels, we note that the same instruction was

antecedent basis for the 'message generating mechanism' of claim 9 unless the 'said message generating mechanism' of claim 9 is intended to refer to the 'message generating means' of claim 8" and recognizing that "[s]uch an error in claim drafting can be corrected 'by interpretation of the patent' where, as here, the error is not 'subject to reasonable debate' and where the 'prosecution history does not suggest a different interpretation.'"); Case IPR2016-00129 (Paper 1, 16) (same).

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.