

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SNAP INC.,
Petitioner

v.

VAPORSTREAM, INC.,
Patent Owner

Inter Partes Review No. IPR2018-00312
U.S. Patent No. 9,306,885

**PATENT OWNER'S REQUEST FOR DIRECTOR REVIEW
PURSUANT TO *UNITED STATES V. ARTHREX***

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. BACKGROUND	1
A. The '885 Patent.....	1
B. Relevant Procedural History.....	2
III. ARGUMENT.....	3
A. Only A Principal Officer May Conduct Director Review Pursuant to <i>Arthrex</i>	3
B. The Director Should Grant Vacatur to Allow Termination By the Board....	6
C. In the Alternative, the Director Should Vacate the FWD On the Merits....	11
IV. CONCLUSION	13
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE.....	14

..

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>A.L. Mechling Barge Lines, Inc. v. United States</i> , 368 U.S. 324 (1961)	8
<i>Arthrex, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.</i> , 941 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2019)	2-3
<i>Cox Commc'ns, Inc. v. AT&T Intellectual Prop. II, L.P.</i> , IPR2015-01536, Paper 65 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 8, 2016)	9
<i>Dell Inc. v. Accelaron, LLC</i> , 818 F.3d 1293 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	6
<i>Facebook, Inc. v. Windy City Innovations, LLC</i> , 953 F.3d 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2020)	6
<i>Fidelity Info. Servs., LLC v. Mirror Imaging, LLC</i> , CBM2017-00064, CBM2017-00065, CBM2017-00066, CBM2017-00067, Paper 70 (P.T.A.B. July 21, 2020)	10
<i>Kaken Pharm. Co., Ltd., v. Iancu</i> , 952 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2021)	12
<i>LM-M v. Cuccinelli</i> , 442 F. Supp. 3d 1 (D.D.C. 2020)	5, 6
<i>In re MTD Prods. Inc.</i> , IPR2016-00194, Paper 44 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 3, 2020)	9
<i>Petroleum Geo-Services Inc. v. WesternGeco LLC</i> , IPR2016-00407, IPR2016-00499, Paper 29 (P.T.A.B. July 5, 2017)	9
<i>Red Wing Shoe Co. v. Hockerson-Halberstadt, Inc.</i> , 148 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	10
<i>Samsung Elecs. Co. v. Image Processing Techs. LLC</i> , IPR2017-00353, IPR2017-01218, Paper 45 (P.T.A.B. Sep. 9, 2020)	11

...

<i>Samsung Elecs. Co. v. Uniloc 2017, LLC</i> , IPR2017-01797, IPR2017-01798, IPR2017-01799, IPR2017- 01800, IPR2017-01801, IPR2017-01802, Paper 39 (P.T.A.B. July 21, 2020).....	10
<i>SAS Institute Inc. v. Iancu</i> , 138 S. Ct. 1348 (2018).....	9
<i>United States v. Arthrex, Inc.</i> , 141 S. Ct. 1970 (2021).....	Passim
<i>Vaporstream, Inc. v. Snap Inc.</i> , No. 19-2231, Dkt. 49 (Fed. Cir. Jan. 23, 2020).....	3
<i>Vaporstream, Inc. v. Snap Inc.</i> , No. 2019-2231, Dkt. 67 (Fed. Cir. Oct. 22, 2021)	1, 3, 10
Statutes	
5 U.S.C. §§ 3345(a)(3), 3348(a)-(b), 3347	4
35 U.S.C. § 3(b)(2)(A).....	4
35 U.S.C. § 314(a)(4)	6
35 U.S.C. § 317(a)	7, 8
Other Authorities	
Arthrex Q&As, U.S.P.T.O., <i>available at</i> https://uspto.gov/ patents/patent-trial-and-appealboard/procedures/arthrex-qas	7
Regulations	
37 C.F.R. § 42.72	8

I. INTRODUCTION

Patent Owner Vaporstream, Inc. (“Vaporstream”) respectfully requests Director review of the Board’s June 14, 2019 FWD. Paper 43. Vaporstream timely filed this request within 30 days of the Federal Circuit’s remand order. *Vaporstream, Inc. v. Snap Inc.*, No. 2019-2231, Dkt. 67 (Fed. Cir. Oct. 22, 2021).

II. BACKGROUND

A. The ’885 Patent

The ’885 Patent discloses systems and methods for reducing traceability of electronic messages so as to enhance the privacy and security of modern electronic messaging. *See, e.g.*, Ex. 1001, Abstract. As the specification explains, the claimed invention allows “users of [] computers 315 and 320 to have a private conversation over [a] network 325” via “electronic messages 330.” *Id.* at 17:47-49. The specification identifies numerous problems existing in prior art electronic messaging systems because electronic messages: (1) “travel[ed] along a public network, such as the Internet, and [were] susceptible to interception by unintended third parties,” *id.* at 1:53-56; (2) were easily “logged and archived” by the prior art systems themselves, and may be “copied, cut, pasted, printed, forwarded, blind copied, . . . manipulated” or disseminated by either the sender or the recipient, giving the messages longevity or a “shelf-life” that was “uncontrollable” and often unintended, *id.* at 1:56-59; and

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.