

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., and  
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

NEODRON LTD.,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2020-01119  
Patent 7,821,425

---

Before MIRIAM L. QUINN, PATRICK M. BOUCHER, and  
CHRISTOPHER L. OGDEN, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

QUINN, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION

Institution of *Inter Partes* Review and Grant of Motion for Joinder  
*35 U.S.C. § 314*  
*37 C.F.R. § 42.122(b)*

## I. INTRODUCTION

Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. and Samsung Electronics America, Inc. (collectively “Petitioner”) filed a Petition requesting *inter partes* review of claims 1–40 of U.S. Patent No. 7,821,425 B2 (Ex. 1001, “the ’425 patent”). Paper 1 (“Pet.”). Petitioner also filed a Motion for Joinder seeking joinder of this proceeding with *Apple Inc. v. Neodron Ltd.*, Case No. IPR2020-00778 (the “Apple IPR”). Paper 4 (“Mot.”). Neodron Ltd. (“Patent Owner”) did not file either a Preliminary Response or an Opposition to the Motion for Joinder. For the reasons that follow, we institute *inter partes* review, and grant Petitioner’s Motion for Joinder.

## II. INSTITUTION OF INTER PARTES REVIEW

We instituted *inter partes* review in IPR2020-00778 on all challenged claims and on all the asserted grounds of unpatentability (Apple IPR, Paper 10 (Decision on Institution)). The Petition in this proceeding is a “carbon copy” of the petition in the Apple IPR (Mot. 1) and challenges the same claims and asserts the same grounds as those we instituted in the Apple IPR (*id.* at 1–2). Petitioner also presents testimony from the same declarant relied on in the Apple IPR. Ex. 1003 (Declaration of Dr. Tony Givargis).

In view of the identicalness of the issues in the instant Petition and in the Apple IPR, and for the same reasons stated in our Decision on Institution in the Apple IPR, we institute *inter partes* review in this proceeding on the

grounds presented in the Petition.

### III. GRANT OF MOTION FOR JOINDER

Joinder in *inter partes* review is subject to the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 315(c):

(c) JOINDER.—If the Director institutes an inter partes review, the Director, in his or her discretion, may join as a party to that inter partes review any person who properly files a petition under section 311 that the Director, after receiving a preliminary response under section 313 or the expiration of the time for filing such a response, determines warrants the institution of an inter partes review under section 314.

As the moving party, Petitioner bears the burden of proving that it is entitled to the requested relief. 37 C.F.R. § 42.20(c). A motion for joinder should: (1) set forth the reasons joinder is appropriate; (2) identify any new grounds of unpatentability asserted in the petition; and (3) explain what impact (if any) joinder would have on the trial schedule for the existing review. *See Kyocera Corp. v. Softview LLC*, Case IPR2013-00004, slip op. at 4 (PTAB Apr. 24, 2013) (Paper 15).

Petitioner has filed a timely Motion in accordance with 35 U.S.C. § 315(c). Petitioner also has met its burden of showing that joinder is appropriate. For instance, the Petition here is substantively identical to the petition in the Apple IPR. Mot. 5. The evidence also is identical, including the reliance on the same declaration of Dr. Givargis. *Id.*

Petitioner further has shown that the trial schedule will not be affected by joinder. Mot. 6, 7–8. No changes in the schedule are anticipated or necessary, and the limited participation, if at all, of Petitioner will not impact the timeline of the ongoing trial. *Id.* at 6. Petitioner has agreed to a “second-chair” role, as long as the petitioner in the Apple IPR remains in the proceeding, which will not affect the ongoing Apple IPR. *Id.* at 6.

#### IV. ORDER

In view of the foregoing, it is

ORDERED that IPR2020-01119 is hereby instituted on all challenged claims and asserted grounds;

FURTHER ORDERED that Petitioner’s Motion for Joinder with IPR2020-00778 is *granted*;

FURTHER ORDERED that the Scheduling Order entered in IPR2020-00778 and schedule changes agreed-to by the parties in IPR2020-00778 shall govern the schedule of the joined proceeding;

FURTHER ORDERED that, throughout the joined proceeding, all filings in IPR2020-00778 will be consolidated and no filing by the Samsung Petitioner, alone, will be allowed without prior authorization by the Board;

FURTHER ORDERED that a copy of this Decision will be entered into the record of IPR2020-00778;

IPR2020-01119  
Patent 7,821,425 B2

FURTHER ORDERED that the case caption in IPR2020-00778, from now on, shall reflect joinder with this proceeding in accordance with the attached example.

# 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.