

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

PROPPANT EXPRESS INVESTMENTS, LLC,  
PROPPANT EXPRESS SOLUTIONS, LLC,  
Petitioner,

v.

OREN TECHNOLOGIES, LLC,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2017-01917 (Patent 9,296,518)  
Case IPR2017-01918 (Patent 9,403,626)<sup>1</sup>

---

Before MITCHELL G. WEATHERLY, KEVIN W. CHERRY, and  
MICHAEL L. WOODS, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

WOODS, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

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

---

<sup>1</sup> We issue one Order and enter it in each proceeding.

IPR2017-01917 (Patent 9,296,518)

IPR2017-01918 (Patent 9,403,626)

In its preliminary responses, Oren Technologies, LLC (“Patent Owner”) argues that Proppant Express Investments, LLC, and Proppant Express Solutions, LLC, (collectively, “Petitioner”) failed to name all real parties in interest, namely, Liberty Oilfield Services, LLC (“Liberty”). Paper 7, 12–32 (IPR2017-01917); Paper 7, 12–33 (IPR2017-01918).

The statute governing *inter partes* review proceedings sets forth certain requirements for a petition for *inter partes* review, including that “the petition identif[y] all real parties in interest.” 35 U.S.C. § 312(a); *see also* 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1) (providing a requirement to identify real parties-in-interest in mandatory notices). “Whether a party who is not a named participant in a given proceeding nonetheless constitutes a ‘real party-in-interest’ . . . to that proceeding is a highly fact-dependent question” with no “bright line test,” and is assessed “on a case-by-case basis.” 77 Fed. Reg. at 48,759 (citing *Taylor v. Sturgell*, 553 U.S. 880, 893–95 (2008)).

Our precedential decision in *Lumentum Holdings, Inc. v. Capella Photonics, Inc.*, Case IPR2015-00739, slip op. at 5 (PTAB Mar. 4, 2016) (Paper 38), indicates that “a lapse in compliance with those requirements [under 35 U.S.C. § 312(a), including that all real parties in interest be identified] does not deprive the Board of jurisdiction over the proceeding, or preclude the Board from permitting such lapse to be rectified.” *See also Intel Corp. v. Alacritech, Inc.*, Case IPR2017-01392, slip op. at 23 (PTAB Nov. 30, 2017) (Paper 11) (noting that real parties in interest can be corrected); *Elekta, Inc. v. Varian Med. Sys., Inc.*, Case IPR2015-01401, slip op. at 6–10 (PTAB Dec. 31, 2015) (Paper 19) (holding that disclosing

IPR2017-01917 (Patent 9,296,518)

IPR2017-01918 (Patent 9,403,626)

additional real parties in interest via an updated disclosure does not mandate a change in petition filing date).

Our policy is to “secure the just, speedy, and inexpensive resolution of every [*inter partes* review] proceeding.” 37 C.F.R. § 42.1. To that end, we grant Petitioner leave, if it wishes, to amend its mandatory notices to include Liberty. This amendment will not change the filing date accorded to the petitions in these proceedings. This Order does not decide the issue of whether Liberty is a real party in interest. That is, this Order shall not be construed as a finding that Liberty is a real party in interest in these proceedings. If Petitioner does not believe that Liberty is an unnamed real party in interest, in lieu of updating its mandatory notices, Petitioner may file a reply brief to address Patent Owner’s argument regarding the real party in interest issue (and only that issue).

For the reasons given, it is hereby:

ORDERED that within 5 days of the entry of this Order, Petitioner *may* amend its mandatory notices to name Liberty as a real party in interest in each of IPR2017-01917 and IPR2017-01918, and updating its mandatory notices will not result in a new filing date accorded to the petitions;

FURTHER ORDERED that in lieu of updating its mandatory notices, Petitioner *may* file a 10-page reply brief to address only Patent Owner’s real party in interest arguments in each of IPR2017-01917 and IPR2017-01918, if such briefs are filed within 10 days of the entry of this Order; and

FURTHER ORDERED that Patent Owner may not file a sur reply in response to Petitioner’s reply briefs, if filed.

IPR2017-01917 (Patent 9,296,518)

IPR2017-01918 (Patent 9,403,626)

For PETITIONER:

Mark Garrett

W. Andrew Liddell

Jeffrey Kitchen

Jeremy Albright

Charles Walker

Catherine Garza

Norton Rose Fulbright US LLP

mark.garrett@nortonrosefulbright.com

andrew.liddell@nortonrosefulbright.com

jeff.kitchen@nortonrosefulbright.com

jeremy.albright@nortonrosefulbright.com

charles.walker@nortonrosefulbright.com

cat.garza@nortonrosefulbright.com

For PATENT OWNER:

Gianni Cutri

Eugene Goryunov

Adam Kaufmann

Kyle Kantarek

KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP

gianni.cutri@kirkland.com

egoryunov@kirkland.com

adam.kaufmann@kirkland.com

kyle.kantarek@kirkland.com