

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

CHARTER COMMUNICATIONS, INC.,

Petitioner

v.

SPRINT COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY L.P.,

Patent Owner

Case Nos. IPR2019-01135, IPR2019-01137, IPR2019-01139
Patent No. 6,757,907

**PATENT OWNER'S NOTICE REGARDING
MULTIPLE SUCCESSIVE PETITIONS**

As authorized by the Board’s email of July 29, 2019, Patent Owner Sprint Communications Company L.P. files this Notice in response to the Notice filed by Petitioner Charter Communications, Inc. on August 19, 2019.

Between May 30 and June 4, 2019, Petitioner filed three Petitions for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 6,757,907 (the “7907 patent”). Combined, these Petitions assert nine grounds of challenge, and each ground is asserted against all fifty-three claims of the patent. With these filings, Petitioner imposes an unfair burden on Patent Owner and unnecessary costs on the Office and the patent system. *See* Trial Practice Guide Update at 26 (July 2019) (expressing concern about the “substantial and unnecessary burden on the Board and the patent owner” caused by parallel petitions and the effect on “fairness, timing, and efficiency”), *available at* <https://www.uspto.gov/sites/default/files/documents/trial-practice-guide-update3.pdf> (last visited Aug. 27, 2019). Despite raising nine grounds, Petitioner asserts only five total pieces of alleged prior art, which it rearranges in myriad configurations, as shown in the chart below. Rather than limit these grounds to a reasonable number or focus on arguments it deems superior, Petitioner foists the responsibility onto the Board to sift through hundreds of pages of repetitive briefing to consider, *e.g.*, the combinations of Humpleman with Ellis or Yosuke (in IPR2019-01139) and Ellis with Humpleman and Yosuke (in IPR2019-01137). *Cf. Nalox-1 Pharms., LLC v. Opiant Pharms., Inc.*, IPR2019-00694, et al., 2019 WL 3483268,

at *1-2 (PTAB July 31, 2019) (agreeing that three Petitions “challenging the same patent . . . may place a substantial and unnecessary burden on the Board and Patent Owner, particularly if we determine the Petitions rely on substantially overlapping grounds and theories”).

Case	Grounds	Overlap
IPR2019-01135	Sampsell & Yosuke, §103	Only Ellis missing.
	Sampsell, Yosuke & Browne §103	
	Sampsell, Yosuke & Humpleman, §103	
IPR2019-01137	Ellis & Yosuke, §103	Only Sampsell missing.
	Ellis, Yosuke & Browne, §103	
	Ellis, Yosuke & Humpleman, §103	
IPR2019-01139	Humpleman, §102	Only Sampsell missing.
	Humpleman & Yosuke, §103	
	Humpleman & Ellis, §103	

(See IPR2019-01135, Paper 2, 9; IPR2019-01137, Paper 2, 9; IPR2019-01139, Paper 2, 9.)

Petitioner was given the opportunity to defend this conduct, and it cannot.

First, Petitioner complains that Patent Owner has taken “numerous inconsistent positions” about claim scope. (Paper 6, 1.) Yet Petitioner identifies only one issue of claim scope—the use of a set-top box to control a “video-on-demand [VOD] system” of the claims—and no evidence that Patent Owner’s position on that

single issue has been inconsistent in any way. Petitioner concedes that the *Comcast* court imported a negative limitation excluding the use of a set-top box for VOD system control, which was contrary to Patent Owner's proposed constructions. (*Id.*, 1. *See generally* EX1010, 27-35.) Patent Owner disagreed with the *Comcast* court's constructions, then, and continues to oppose the use of those constructions in concurrent litigation. Patent Owner's position has therefore been consistent.

In addition, Petitioner argues in every Petition that the references disclose the claimed subject matter of the '7907 patent under both the *Comcast* court's construction and Patent Owner's. (IPR2019-01135, Paper 2, 27-30, 33; IPR2019-01137, Paper 2, 26-28, 30-31, 33-34; IPR2019-01139, Paper 2, 22-24, 26, 32, 62, 75-76.) The difference between these constructions is therefore not material. Even if Petitioner is only allowed institution on a single Petition, it will have addressed both constructions.

Second, the differences between the disclosures of the cited references are not material for essentially the same reason. As shown in its Notice, Petitioner's position in these proceedings (with which Patent Owner disagrees) is that "*Sampsell, Humpleman, and Ellis* each invalidate the claims under the *Comcast* court's construction." (Paper 6, 4.) That construction gives the claims a narrower scope than they would have under the construction Patent Owner has proposed in litigation. Petitioner does not appear to dispute that anything encompassed by the narrower

construction would also be encompassed by the broader one. Petitioner therefore fails to identify any differences between the prior art references that would be material to the outcome on any of its Petitions.

The differences identified in the cited art are not material for the further reason that Petitioner relies on various overlapping combinations of its primary references in each Petition, as shown in the chart above.

Third, there is no priority date issue. The '7907 patent does not claim priority to any earlier filings. (*See* EX1001, cover.) And Petitioner's suggestion that antedating might be an issue is pure speculation. The filing dates of the primary references do not differ significantly; they are all within a 13-month span (June 24, 1998 to July 16, 1999). And the earliest prior conception Sprint has alleged in litigation was September 1999.

Fourth, the number of claims also does not justify the burden of instituting review on multiple parallel petitions. Petitioner challenged every claim of the '7907 patent in every ground of every Petition. In other words, the "number of claims" is not a difference between the Petitions at all, let alone a material difference. If the Board institutes on any Petition, Petitioner will have the opportunity to be heard on several grounds challenging each claim of the '7907 patent; instituting on more than one Petition is not necessary to ensure this.

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.