

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

SZ DJI TECHNOLOGY CO., LTD.  
Petitioner,

v.

AUTEL ROBOTICS USA LLC,  
Patent Owner.

---

IPR2019-00343  
Patent 9,260,184 B2

---

Before ERICA A. FRANKLIN, JENNIFER MEYER CHAGNON, and  
AVELYN M. ROSS, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

CHAGNON, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

ORDER  
Granting Patent Owner's Motion for Late Submission  
of Supplemental Information  
*37 C.F.R. § 42.123(b)*

This proceeding involves challenges to certain claims of U.S. Patent No. 9,260,184 (Ex. 1001, “the ’184 patent”). On December 23, 2019, with Board authorization (*see* Paper 24), Patent Owner filed a Motion to Submit Supplemental Information Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.123(b). Paper 25<sup>1</sup> (“Mot.” or “Motion”). Petitioner filed an Opposition to the Motion. Paper 27 (“Opp.”). Having reviewed the record on this matter, we *grant* Patent Owner’s Motion.

Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.123, a motion to submit supplemental information more than one month after the date a trial is instituted<sup>2</sup> “must show why the supplemental information could not have been obtained earlier[] and that consideration of the supplemental information would be in the interest[] of [] justice.” *Id.* § 42.123(b). In its Motion, Patent Owner requests entry into the record of this proceeding excerpts of testimony from a parallel International Trade Commission investigation<sup>3</sup> relating to the ’184 patent. Mot. 1. In particular, Patent Owner seeks to submit testimony of Petitioner’s expert witness Juan J. Alonso, Ph.D.<sup>4</sup> (Proposed Exhibit 1) and

---

<sup>1</sup> Patent Owner appends the following documents to the Motion: Proposed Exhibit 1, Proposed Exhibit 2, and Motion Exhibit. Submission of these documents was authorized, however, these documents have not yet been entered as evidence of record in these proceedings. Paper 24, 3.

<sup>2</sup> Trial in this proceeding was instituted on May 22, 2019. Paper 7.

<sup>3</sup> *Certain Unmanned Aerial Vehicles and Components Thereof*, Inv. No. 337-TA-1133 (“the ITC investigation”).

<sup>4</sup> Petitioner does not rely on testimony from Dr. Alonso in this *inter partes* review proceeding. Petitioner’s positions in this *inter partes* review are supported by Declarations of Alfred Ducharme, Ph.D. (Ex. 1003; Ex. 1032).

testimony of Patent Owner’s expert witness Charles F. Reinholtz, Ph.D.<sup>5</sup> (Proposed Exhibit 2) from the hearing conducted in the ITC investigation. *Id.*

Patent Owner contends that the supplemental information reasonably could not have been obtained earlier because the hearing in the ITC investigation was held on October 21–23, 2019, and that Petitioner’s reply brief, which contains arguments allegedly contradicted by the proposed supplemental evidence was filed on November 22, 2019. *Id.* at 2.

Patent Owner further contends that “[t]he testimony from Petitioner’s expert [in the ITC investigation] contradicts Petitioner’s arguments relating to Microdrones<sup>[6]</sup> (Grounds 1 and 2) as applied to claim 1” of the ’184 patent and that “[t]he testimony is directly relevant to the exact same arguments and issues pending in the IPR, and is thus highly relevant.” *Id.* at 1. At issue in this proceeding, among other things, is whether Microdrones discloses the “engagement limitation”<sup>7</sup> of claim 1 of the ’184 patent, which also implicates related claim construction arguments. *See id.* at 3; Paper 22 (Petitioner’s Reply to Patent Owner’s Response), 5–7. According to Patent

---

<sup>5</sup> Patent Owner also submits testimony of Dr. Reinholtz in this proceeding (Ex. 2010).

<sup>6</sup> Microdrones User Manual for md4-200 (Version 2.2) (Ex. 1004).

<sup>7</sup> Claim 1 recites “the clockwise rotor blade is engageable only with the clockwise lock mechanism and cannot be engaged in the counterclockwise lock mechanism, and the counterclockwise rotor blade is engageable only with the counterclockwise lock mechanism and cannot be engaged in the clockwise lock mechanism,” which the parties refer to as the “engagement limitation.” Ex. 1001, 5:53–6:4.

Owner, Dr. Alonso's testimony from the ITC investigation is inconsistent with positions Petitioner has taken in this *inter partes* review. *See* Mot. 3–5.

As to timeliness, Petitioner contends that Patent Owner has “failed to establish that the proffered testimony could not be obtained earlier through cross-examination” of Dr. Ducharme<sup>8</sup>, or “why it waited six weeks after the ITC testimony to seek to submit this testimony.” Opp. 1.

As to whether consideration of the proffered testimony would be in the interests-of-justice, Petitioner argues that Patent Owner's Motion is “merely an attempt to substitute ITC cross-examination in place of cross-examination of the IPR declarant.” *Id.* at 2. In this regard, Petitioner asserts that, Patent Owner “never alleges any contradictions between [Dr. Ducharme's] testimony and the proffered ITC testimony,” but instead argues that the proffered ITC testimony “is inconsistent with [Petitioner's] positions in this IPR.” *See id.* (citing Mot. 2). Petitioner also argues that “Dr. Alonso's ITC testimony does not contradict [Petitioner's] positions.” *Id.* at 3; *see id.* at 3–5 (expanding on this contention). Finally, Petitioner argues that “admission of PE1 would be unduly prejudicial to Petitioner because it is an incomplete representation of Dr. Alonso's testimony.” *Id.* at 5. In particular, Petitioner notes that Patent Owner does not seek to introduce Dr. Alonso's witness statement submitted as his direct testimony in the ITC investigation, but only seeks to introduce his cross-examination testimony. *Id.*

---

<sup>8</sup> As noted by Petitioner (Opp. 1), Patent Owner elected not to depose Dr. Ducharme in this proceeding.

Having considered the parties' arguments, we determine that Patent Owner has met the threshold required to show that the proposed supplemental information has relevance in this proceeding, that Patent Owner's request is timely despite the advanced stage of this proceeding, and that it would be in the interests-of-justice to grant the Motion. We are cognizant of the concerns raised by Petitioner, however we determine those concerns are outweighed by the relevance of potentially inconsistent testimony provided by Petitioner's expert in the ITC investigation.<sup>9</sup> *Cf. Ultratec, Inc. v. CaptionCall, LLC*, 872 F.3d 1267, 1272–73 (Fed. Cir. 2017) (“Ultratec sought to offer recent sworn testimony of the same expert addressing the same patents, references, and limitations at issue in the IPRs. A reasonable adjudicator would have wanted to review this evidence.”), 1273 (“There would have been very little administrative burden to reviewing more on-point testimony from the same expert on the same exact issues. Had the testimony been inconsistent, a reasonable fact finder would consider the inconsistencies. Had the testimony been consistent, the Board would not have had to spend any more time on the issue.”). Further, we determine that reviewing the testimony would place minimal additional burden on the Board. *See Ultratec*, 872 F.3d at 1273.

---

<sup>9</sup> We note that we will be able to discern at the conclusion of trial whether Patent Owner's use of the supplemental information reveals actual inconsistencies in Petitioner's positions, as Patent Owner contends. Further, little weight may be given to this supplemental information in the context of assessing the credibility of Dr. Ducharme's testimony in this *inter partes* review, as it is not the cross-examination of Dr. Ducharme himself.

# 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.