

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

WESTERN DIGITAL CORPORATION, TOSHIBA CORPORATION, TOSHIBA  
AMERICA ELECTRONIC COMONENTS, INC., and APRICORN<sup>1</sup>,  
Petitioners

v.

SPEX TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2018-00082  
U.S. Patent No. 6,088,802

---

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

---

<sup>1</sup>Kingston Technology Company, Inc., which filed a Petition in Case IPR2018-01003, has been joined as a petitioner in this proceeding. Toshiba Corporation, Toshiba America Electronic Components, Inc, Apricorn, which filed a Petition in Case IPR2018-01068, have been joined as petitioners in this proceeding. (The official caption in this IPR was never corrected to reflect that Kingston is a party.)

Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 141 and 37 C.F.R. § 90.2, Petitioner Kingston Technology Company, Inc. (“Petitioner”) hereby provides notice that it appeals to the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit from the Final Written Decision entered April 18, 2019 (Paper 40) and from all underlying orders, decisions, rulings, and opinions adverse to it regarding U.S. Patent 6,088,802 (“the ‘802 patent”) at issue in *Inter Partes* Review IPR2018-00082.

In accordance with and for the purpose of providing the Director with the information requested pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 90.2(a)(3)(ii), Petitioner anticipates that the issues on appeal may include, but are not limited to the following, as well as any underlying findings, determinations, rulings, decisions, opinions, or other related issues:

- The Board violated *SAS Institute, Inc. v. Iancu*, 138 S. Ct. 1348 (2018), the Administrative Procedure Act, and/or Petitioner’s due process rights by denying Petitioner’s requests to: (i) supplement the record to include admissions made by Patent Owner’s experts that were made only after the Petition was filed, and (ii) file a reply, with respect to the patent claims for which the Board instituted review but did not find, based on the Petition, that Petitioner had a reasonable likelihood of prevailing.
- The Board violated *SAS Institute, Inc. v. Iancu*, 138 S. Ct. 1348 (2018), the Administrative Procedure Act, and/or Petitioner’s due process rights by

limiting Petitioner's arguments to issues raised in a Patent Owner's response, where the Patent Owner did not file a Patent Owner Response and hence raised no issues with respect to the patent claims for which the Board instituted review but did not find, based on the Petition, that Petitioner had a reasonable likelihood of prevailing.

- The Board erred in holding that an invalidity argument based on disclosure found in a prior art reference relied upon in the Petition, in combination with 3 admissions by the Patent Owner's experts that were made after the Petition was filed, constitutes a new "ground" for unpatentability.
- Any and all findings or determinations supporting or related to the above identified issues, and all other issues decided adversely to Petitioner in any order, decision, ruling, or opinion by the Board in this Inter Partes Review.

Simultaneous with this filing and in accordance with 35 U.S.C. § 142 and 37 C.F.R. § 90.2(a)(1), this Notice is being filed with the Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, and a copy of this Notice is being concurrently filed with the Patent Trial and Appeal Board. In addition, a copy of this Notice along with the required docketing fees are being filed with the Clerk's Office for the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit via CM/ECF.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 7, 2019

/David Hoffman/

David Hoffman  
Reg. No. 54,174

**Customer Number 26171**  
Fish & Richardson P.C.  
Telephone: (512) 226-8154  
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

In accordance with 37 CFR § 90.2(a)(1) and § 104.2, the undersigned hereby certifies that on June 7, 2019, in addition to being filed electronically through the Board's E2E System, the original version of the foregoing, Patent Owner's Notice of Appeal was filed by hand on the Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, at the following address:

Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office  
c/o Office of the General Counsel  
Madison Building East, 10B20  
600 Dulany Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314-5793

The undersigned hereby certifies that on June 7, 2019, a true and correct copy of the foregoing, Patent Owner's Notice of Appeal, along with a copy of the Final Written Decision, was filed electronically with the Clerk's Office of the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, at the following address:

United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit  
717 Madison Place, N.W., Suite 401  
Washington, DC 20005

# 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.