UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ADVANCED MICRO DEVICES, INC. Petitioner

V.

BROADCOM CORPORATION
Patent Owner

CASE IPR2017-01183 U.S. PATENT NO. 7,720,294

JOINT MOTION TO DISMISS PETITION



The Board authorized the parties to file a joint motion to dismiss the Petition in this case on August 29, 2017. The parties agree that neither party will be prejudiced by the dismissal, that the dismissal is in the interests of efficiency and judicial and administrative economy. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.1(b). Accordingly, the parties hereby move for dismissal of the pending Petition.

I. BACKGROUND

On June 6, 2016, Patent Owner filed a complaint in U.S. district court alleging that Sony Corporation infringed several patents (including the '294 Patent) by virtue of Sony's inclusion of Petitioner's products into Sony's products. *See, Broadcom Corp. v. Sony Corp.*, Case. No. 8:16-cv-01052 (C.D. Cal.). Petitioner was not named as a party to that litigation, and was not served with a complaint. However, because Patent Owner's infringement theories addressed the functionality of Petitioner's products, Petitioner independently decided to file a Petition challenging the validity of the '294 Patent.

Patent Owner settled its litigation with Sony, and there is no other pending litigation in which Patent Owner alleges that any party infringes the '294 Patent based on the functionality of Petitioner's products. Accordingly, the parties conferred and agreed that it is in both parties' interest that the current Petition be



dismissed given that there is no current dispute between the parties. Ex. 1009.

II. ARGUMENT

In addition to both parties requesting that the Board grant this Motion to Dismiss, there are a number of other factors that weigh in favor of dismissing the pending Petition. First, the above-captioned IPR is in its preliminary phase. While Patent Owner has filed a preliminary response, the Board has yet to reach the merits and issue a decision on institution. In similar circumstances involving IPRs at such an early juncture, the Board has previously granted motions to dismiss using its authority under at least 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.5 and 42.71(a). *See*, *e.g.*, *Samsung Elec. Co. LTD v. Nvidia Corp.*, IPR2015-01270, Paper 12 at pp. 3-4 (PTAB December 9, 2015) (dismissing Petition even over the patent owner's objection).

Second, dismissal of the Petition in the above-captioned IPR will preserve the Board's resources and the parties' resources. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.1(b). The requested dismissal would relieve the Board of the substantial time and resources required to consider the merits, issue an institution decision, and proceed through



Although it is possible that, at some point in the future, Petitioner may file another Petition seeking *inter partes* review of the challenged patent, the parties do not currently anticipate this will occur.

trial (if instituted) when there is no current dispute between the parties. Moreover, granting this Motion to Dismiss would relieve the parties of the substantial expense in preparing responses and replies, presenting expert testimony, conducting cross-examination, and participating in an oral hearing, when there is no current dispute between the parties. As such, it would be entirely proper for the Board to dismiss the pending Petition "at this early junction[] to promote efficiency and minimize unnecessary costs." *Samsung*, IPR 2015-01270, Paper 12 at p. 4.

Lastly, dismissal of the Petition and termination of the above-captioned IPR is a just and fair result. Again, all parties here agree that neither party would be prejudiced by the dismissal. Moreover, the parties and the Board will benefit from preserving the resources that would otherwise be expended if this Motion is denied.

III. CONCLUSION

For at least these reasons, the parties respectfully request that the Board grant this joint motion to dismiss the pending Petition.



Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 30, 2017 /Brian W. Oaks/

Brian W. Oaks (Reg. No. 44,981) 98 San Jacinto Blvd., Suite 1500

Austin, Texas 78701 Phone: (512) 322-2500 Facsimile: (512) 322-2501

ATTORNEY FOR PETITIONER

ADVANCED MICRO DEVICES, INC.

Date: August 30, 2017 / Daniel S. Young/

Daniel S. Young (Reg. No. 48,277) SWANSON & BRATSCHUN, LLC

8210 Southpark Terrace Littleton, CO 80120

(303) 268-0066 (telephone) (303) 268-0065 (facsimile)

ATTORNEY FOR PATENT OWNER BROADCOM CORPORATION



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.

