

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

GROUP III INTERNATIONAL, INC. and EVERKI USA, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

TARGUS INTERNATIONAL LLC,
Patent Owner.

IPR2021-00371
Patent 8,567,578 B2

Before JAMES J. MAYBERRY, FREDERICK C. LANEY, and
SEAN P. O'HANLON, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

O'HANLON, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

ORDER
Conduct of the Proceeding
37 C.F.R. § 42.5

I. INTRODUCTION

On January 20, 2022, we authorized Patent Owner to file a motion to submit supplemental information under 37 C.F.R. § 42.123(b). Ex. 3007, 1. On January 27, 2022, Patent Owner filed its Motion to Submit Supplemental Information. Paper 61 (“Motion” or “Mot.”). On February 3, 2022, Petitioner filed an Opposition to the Motion. Paper 64 (“Opp.”). For the reasons set forth below, we *grant* the Motion.

II. DISCUSSION

A. Patent Owner’s Contentions

Patent Owner seeks to submit as supplemental information Exhibits 2211 and 2217 (collective, the “New Exhibits”). Mot. 1. Patent Owner asserts that the New Exhibits are “from the cross-examination of Petitioner’s expert Mr. Godshaw” and that, “[w]hen confronted with [the New Exhibits] during cross-examination on January 17, 2022, Mr. Godshaw impeached himself.” *Id.* Patent Owner asserts that “[Exhibit 2217] is Mr. Godshaw’s own patent” and “[Exhibit 2211] is a webpage from Mr. Godshaw’s company Travelon.” *Id.* at 2, 4. Patent Owner argues that the New Exhibits “show[] that the prior art could, contrary to Mr. Godshaw’s reply declaration, include metal that would disrupt a scanner even though it included a zipper.” *Id.* at 4; *see also id.* at 2 (“Mr. Godshaw testified for the first time on reply that the sides of the Hollingsworth and Miller cases ‘are not and *cannot be made of a metal*’ because they include zippers.” (citing Ex. 1040 ¶¶ 101, 105)).

B. Petitioner's Contentions

Petitioner argues that we should deny entry of the New Exhibits because “they are irrelevant.” Opp. 1. Petitioner asserts that in both Mr. Godshaw’s original declaration (Exs. 1001, 1014) and supplemental declaration (Ex. 1040), Mr. Godshaw opined that, in order to be configured to allow a scanning device to scan through a bag, the bag must be made of “a non-metallic material” but “did not require the absence of any metallic material whatsoever.” *Id.* at 2–4. Petitioner asserts that “Mr. Godshaw never said, at any time, that just the ‘inclusion’ of a piece of metal could disrupt a scanner, let alone that it ‘would’ do so.” *Id.* at 5.

C. Analysis

As the moving party, Patent Owner bears the burden of proving that it is entitled to the requested relief. 37 C.F.R. § 42.20(c). Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.123(b), a party seeking to submit supplemental information later than one month after the date on which the trial was instituted must show: (1) why the supplemental information reasonably could not have been obtained earlier, and (2) consideration of the supplemental information would be in the interests of justice.

1. Whether the New Exhibits Reasonably Could Not Have Been Obtained Earlier

With respect to the first requirement of § 42.123(b), Patent Owner asserts that Mr. Godshaw “submitted new unpatentability opinions” in his supplemental declaration filed on December 23, 2021. Mot. 1 (citing Ex. 1040 ¶¶ 101–106). Patent Owner asserts that it presented the New Exhibits to Mr. Godshaw during a deposition on January 17, 2022, and

sought authorization to file the New Exhibits as supplemental information in this proceeding on January 18, 2022. *Id.*

We agree with Patent Owner that the New Exhibits reasonably could not have been obtained earlier. The New Exhibits are directed to bags having zippers and security features in the form of a mesh or matrix of cut-resistant material such as wires. Ex. 2211, 2; Ex. 2217, code (57). The first instance of argument regarding whether or not a material is metallic based on the presence of zippers appears to be in Mr. Godshaw's supplemental declaration filed on December 23, 2021. *See* Ex. 1040 ¶¶ 101–103, 105–106. Petitioner does not apprise us of an earlier instance of such argument in this proceeding. *See generally* Opp. Accordingly, we do not think it is reasonable to have expected Patent Owner to foresee the specific issues raised here prior to December 23, 2021, and to submit the New Exhibits before now.

2. Whether Consideration of the New Exhibits Would Be in the Interests of Justice

With respect to the second requirement of § 42.123(b), Patent Owner asserts that entry of the New Exhibits into the record is in the interests of justice because the New Exhibits contradict Mr. Godshaw's testimony in the supplemental declaration that the Hollingsworth and Miller cases cannot be made of metal because they include zippers and, thus, the New Exhibits would allow us to weigh the credibility of such testimony. Mot. 2. We agree. The New Exhibits also provide a more complete record, as they were discussed during the deposition of Mr. Godshaw. *See* Ex. 2218, 11–31. Petitioner's arguments that the New Exhibits are not relevant (Opp. 4–5) fail

IPR2021-00371
Patent 8,567,578 B2

to persuade us that entry of the New Exhibits would not be in the interests of justice.

III. ORDER

In consideration of the foregoing, it is ORDERED that Patent Owner's motion to submit supplemental information under 37 C.F.R. § 42.123(b) is *granted* with respect to Exhibits 2211 and 2217.

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.