

Filed on behalf of Petitioner Corning Optical Communications RF, LLC

By: Todd R. Walters, Esq.
Roger H. Lee, Esq.
BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC
1737 King Street, Suite 500
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-2727
Telephone (703) 836-6620
Facsimile (703) 836-2021
todd.walters@bipc.com
roger.lee@bipc.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

CORNING OPTICAL COMMUNICATIONS RF, LLC
Petitioner

v.

PPC BROADBAND, INC.
Patent Owner

Case No. IPR2014-00441
Patent 8,562,366

SUBMISSION OF NOTICE OF APPEAL

I. NOTICE OF APPEAL

Petitioner Corning Optical Communications RF, LLC hereby gives notice of its appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit for review of the final Decision Granting Patent Owner's Motions to Dismiss Petitions for Failure to Name All Real Parties-In-Interest, dated August 18, 2015 (Paper 66).

Petitioner's Notice of Appeal is filed pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §§ 141, 142 and 314, 28 U.S.C. § 1295(a)(4)(a), and 37 C.F.R. §§ 90.2(a) and 90.3(a)(1). This Notice of Appeal is timely filed within 63 days of the Board's Decision Denying Petitioner's Request for Rehearing on December 9, 2015 (Paper 68), in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 90.3(b)(1).

Simultaneously with this submission, the Notice of Appeal is being filed with (1) the Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office (via hand-delivery), and (2) the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (via ECF) with the docketing fee (\$500).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 10, 2016

/Roger H. Lee/
Roger H. Lee, Esq. (Reg. No. 46,317)
BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC
1737 King Street, Suite 500
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
Tel (703) 836-6620 / Fax (703) 836-2021
roger.lee@bipc.com
Counsel for Petitioner

CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing **SUBMISSION OF NOTICE OF APPEAL** together with a copy of the **NOTICE OF APPEAL** to the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit is being filed via PRPS and served via electronic mail this 10th day of February, 2016 on counsel for Patent Owner as follows:

Denis J. Sullivan
Douglas J. Nash
HISCOCK & BARCLAY, LLP
One Park Place, 300 South State Street
Syracuse, New York 13202
Telephone (315) 425-2700
dsullivan@hblaw.com
dnash@hblaw.com

Robert L. Burns
Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow,
Garrett & Dunner, LLP
11955 Freedom Drive
Reston, VA 20190
Telephone (571) 203-2736
robert.burns@finnegan.com

David C. Reese
Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow,
Garrett & Dunner, LLP
901 New York Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20001-4413
Telephone (202) 408-6098
david.reese@finnegan.com

Date: February 10, 2016

/Roger H. Lee/
Roger H. Lee, Esq. (Reg. No. 46,317)
BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC
1737 King Street, Suite 500
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
Telephone (703) 836-6620
Facsimile (703) 836-2021
roger.lee@bipc.com
Counsel for Petitioner

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

CORNING OPTICAL
COMMUNICATIONS RF, LLC

Appellant

v.

PPC BROADBAND, INC.

APPELLEE.

NOTICE OF APPEAL

Appeal from the U.S. Patent and
Trademark Office Patent Trial and
Appeal Board, Case No. IPR2014-
00441

I. NOTICE OF APPEAL

Corning Optical Communications RF, LLC (“Appellant”) hereby appeals to the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit for review of the final Decision Granting Patent Owner’s Motions to Dismiss Petitions for Failure to Name All Real Parties-In-Interest, dated August 18, 2015 (Paper 66) (*Attachment A*) of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office Patent Trial and Appeal Board (“Board”) in *Inter Partes* Review Case No. IPR2014-00441.

Appellant’s Notice of Appeal is filed pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §§ 141, 142 and 314, 28 U.S.C. § 1295(a)(4)(a), and 37 C.F.R. §§ 90.2(a) and 90.3(a)(1). This Notice of Appeal is timely filed within sixty-three (63) days of the Board’s Decision Denying Petitioner’s Request for Rehearing on December 9, 2015 (Paper 68) (*Attachment B*), in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 90.3(b)(1).

II. ISSUES ON APPEAL

In accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 90.2(a)(3)(ii), Appellant provides the following information on issues to be reviewed on appeal in order to allow the Director to determine whether to exercise the right to intervene in the appeal. The issues include:

(1) The Board's failure to issue a final written decision with respect to the patentability of the challenged claims within one year of the date of institution of the *inter partes* review proceeding, as required by 35 U.S.C. §§ 316(a)(11) and 318(a), and 37 C.F.R. § 42.100(c).

(2) The Board's grant of Patent Owner's motion to dismiss the *inter partes* review proceeding *after* (a) the Board had issued a "final and nonappealable" Decision to Institute and (b) a trial had been conducted.

(3) The Board's termination of the *inter partes* review proceeding where such termination is not authorized by statute.

(4) The Board's Decision Granting Patent Owner's Motions to Dismiss is not a "determination by the Director whether to institute an *inter partes* review" under 35 U.S.C. § 314(d) and therefore is not "nonappealable."

(5) The Board's application of a preponderance of evidence standard in vacating its "final and nonappealable" Decision to Institute, rather than

“reconsidering” its Decision to Institute, which the Board acknowledged would have required it to apply an abuse of discretion standard.

(6) The Board’s denial of authorization for Appellant to, under 37 C.F.R. § 42.5(b), amend the identification of real parties-in-interest in the Petition and maintain the original filing date accorded to the Petition, where (a) the entity that Patent Owner had sued was the named real-party-in-interest, (b) no fraud or improper motive was involved in not naming other related corporate entities as real parties-in-interest, (c) there was no prejudice to Patent Owner, and (d) Appellant affirmatively requested authorization to amend prior to the Board’s dismissal of the proceeding, contrary to the Board’s statement that Appellant did not request authorization to amend.

(7) The Board’s determination that 37 C.F.R. § 42.106 requires all real parties-in-interest to be named in the Petition for the Petition to be accorded a filing date.

(8) The Board’s determination that the Petition for *Inter Partes* Review (Paper 1) did not identify all real parties-in-interest.

Appellant reserves the right to raise on appeal any finding, opinion, order, decision or determination related to the issues listed above and to raise any other issue decided adversely to Appellant in this proceeding underlying the Board’s

Decision Granting Patent Owner's Motions to Dismiss Petitions for Failure to Name All Real Parties-In-Interest.

Simultaneously with this submission, Appellant is filing a true and correct copy of this Notice of Appeal with the Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office and a true and correct copy of the same, along with the required docketing fee, with the Clerk of the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit as set forth in the accompanying Certificate of Filing.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 10, 2016

/s/ Roger H. Lee

Roger H. Lee, Esq.

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

1737 King Street, Suite 500

Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Telephone (703) 836-6620

Facsimile (703) 836-2021

roger.lee@bipc.com

Counsel for Appellant

ATTACHMENT A

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

CORNING OPTICAL COMMUNICATIONS RF, LLC,
Petitioner,

v.

PPC BROADBAND, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2014-00440 (Patent 8,597,041 B2)
Case IPR2014-00441 (Patent 8,562,366 B2)
Case IPR2014-00736 (Patent 6,676,446 B2)¹

Before JAMESON LEE, JOSIAH C. COCKS, and
JACQUELINE WRIGHT BONILLA, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

BONILLA, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION

Granting Patent Owner's Motions to Dismiss Petitions for
Failure to Name All Real Parties-In-Interest
35 U.S.C. § 312(a) and 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.8(b)(1), 42.72

¹ This Decision addresses common issues raised in all three cases. Papers, arguments, and evidence submitted by Patent Owner and Petitioner as it relates to the issue at hand are largely the same in each case. Thus, we issue one Decision to be entered in each case. The parties are not authorized to use this caption without prior authorization of the Board.

IPR2014-00440 (Patent 8,597,041 B2)
IPR2014-00441 (Patent 8,562,366 B2)
IPR2014-00736 (Patent 6,676,446 B2)

I. INTRODUCTION

On August 19, 2014, we instituted an *inter partes* review of claims 1, 8, 9, 11, 18–26, and 29 of U.S. Patent No. 8,597,041 (“the ’041 patent”) in Case IPR2014-00440, as well as an *inter partes* review of claims 31, 37, 39, 41, 42, 55, and 56 of U.S. Patent No. 8,562,366 (“the ’366 patent”) in Case IPR2014-00441, based on two Petitions filed by Petitioner, Corning Optical Communications RF, LLC (“Petitioner”). On September 12, 2014, we instituted an *inter partes* review of claims 1–7 of U.S. Patent No. 6,676,446 (“the ’446 patent”) in Case IPR2014-00736, based on a Petition also filed by Petitioner.

After institution, in all three proceedings, we authorized Patent Owner, PPC Broadband, Inc. (“Patent Owner”) to file a motion for additional discovery directed to information as to whether the Petitions should have identified Petitioner’s parent, Corning Incorporated (“Corning Inc.”), and Petitioner’s sister company, Corning Optical Communications LLC (“Corning NC”), as real parties-in-interest. *See, e.g.*, IPR2014-00440, Paper 31 (order authorizing motion).² Specifically, we authorized a motion for discovery as to whether those two entities funded or controlled the filing and conduct of these *inter partes* reviews. *Id.* We also urged the parties to come to agreement on discovery, to obviate the need for a motion. *Id.* Thereafter, Patent Owner provided a Request for Discovery to Petitioner, and Petitioner responded. *See, e.g.*, IPR2014-00440, Ex. 2100 (“Petitioner’s Objections and Responses to Patent Owner’s First Request for Discovery,” “Response to the Discovery Request” or “Discovery Response”).

² As discussed below, for clarity and expediency, we treat IPR2014-00440 as representative of all three cases. All citations are to IPR2014-00440 unless otherwise noted.

IPR2014-00440 (Patent 8,597,041 B2)

IPR2014-00441 (Patent 8,562,366 B2)

IPR2014-00736 (Patent 6,676,446 B2)

A few weeks later, after a subsequent telephone conference with the parties, we authorized Patent Owner to file a Motion to Dismiss the Petition for failure to name all real parties-in-interest in each of the three proceedings. *E.g.*, IPR2014-00440, Paper 41, 2. We indicated to the parties that each Motion to Dismiss should include two sections, the first discussing why Patent Owner waited until March 2015 to raise the issue of real party-in-interest and whether Patent Owner raised the issue too late, and the second discussing the merits of the issue. *Id.*

Because the real parties-in-interest issue is common to all three cases, and both parties filed similar papers in all cases as it relates to this issue, we consider the three cases together in this Decision. For clarity and expediency, we treat IPR2014-00440 as representative of all three cases.

Patent Owner filed a Motion to Dismiss the Petition for Failure to Name All Real Parties-In-Interest in each of the three cases. Papers 43, 44 (“Motion to Dismiss” or “Motion”).³ As also authorized (Paper 50, 2), Patent Owner filed Supplemental Briefing on the Legislative History of 35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(2) (Paper 52, “Supp. Briefing”). Petitioner filed an Opposition to the Motion to Dismiss (Paper 54, “Opp.”) and Patent Owner filed a Reply to the Opposition (Paper 59, “Reply”). Petitioner also filed Objections to Evidence Entered with Patent Owner’s Reply. Paper 64 (“Objections”).⁴ An oral hearing was held on June 4,

³ Patent Owner originally filed “Confidential” (Paper 43) and “Redacted—Public” (Paper 44) versions of its Motion to Dismiss. As jointly requested by the parties, the confidential version of the Motion to Dismiss (Paper 43) will be designated as available to the public, and the original public version of the Motion (Paper 44) will be expunged. Paper 53, 1.

⁴ Specifically, Petitioner objected to Exhibit 2142, which is cited in Patent Owner’s Reply. Objections 1; Reply 10. Because we do not rely on Exhibit 2142 in this Decision, Petitioner’s objection is moot.

IPR2014-00440 (Patent 8,597,041 B2)

IPR2014-00441 (Patent 8,562,366 B2)

IPR2014-00736 (Patent 6,676,446 B2)

2015. A transcript of the hearing in relation to the Motion to Dismiss has been entered into the record. Paper 67 (“Tr.”).

Because the Petitions fail to identify all real parties in interest as required by 35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(2), we grant Patent Owner’s Motions to Dismiss, vacate our Decisions to Institute (Paper 10), and terminate the reviews.

II. ANALYSIS

A. Patent Owner’s Contentions

Patent Owner contends that Petitioner’s parent, Corning Inc. (Ex. 2104),⁵ and its sister company, Corning NC (Ex. 2105),⁶ were and are real parties-in-interest (“RPI”) because they had the opportunity to control, and actually controlled, Petitioner’s participation in these *inter partes* review (“IPR”) proceedings. Motion, 1, 6. Among other evidence, Patent Owner refers to Petitioner’s Response to the Discovery Request (Ex. 2100), as well as a relevant engagement letter in relation to these IPR proceedings between an executive at Corning Inc. and outside counsel for Petitioner (Ex. 2101). Motion 4–11.

Specifically, Patent Owner contends that Petitioner admitted that officers and in-house counsel employed by Corning Inc. and Corning NC provided direction to counsel for Petitioner in this proceeding. *Id.* at 1, 4–9. To the extent that Petitioner asserts that certain individuals at Corning Inc. and Corning NC directed outside counsel only in their “capacity” as an officer or counsel to

⁵ Exhibit 2104, which presents a copy of a Certificate of Interest filed by counsel for Petitioner with the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, states “Corning Optical Communications RF LLC is a wholly owned subsidiary of Corning Oak Holding, LLC, which is a wholly owned subsidiary of Corning Inc.”

⁶ Exhibit 2105, which is copy of a D&B Business Report, indicates that Corning NC is a subsidiary of Corning Inc.

IPR2014-00440 (Patent 8,597,041 B2)

IPR2014-00441 (Patent 8,562,366 B2)

IPR2014-00736 (Patent 6,676,446 B2)

Petitioner, Patent Owner contends “that ‘capacity’ clearly is in name only,” because they “did not work for Petitioner and are not paid by Petitioner.” *Id.* at 6.

Patent Owner further contends that “[a]t the very least, the boundary lines are sufficiently blurred between the Corning entities such that—it is difficult for both insiders and outsiders to determine precisely where one ends and another begins.” *Id.* at 6–9 (quoting *Atlanta Gas Light Co. v. Bennett Regulator Guards, Inc.*, Case IPR2013-00453, slip op. at 11 (PTAB Jan. 6, 2015) (Paper 88)). In addition, Patent Owner contends that Corning Inc. retained counsel for this matter, and that invoices for the matter were sent to, and paid, by Corning Inc. Motion 1, 9–11.

Thus, according to Patent Owner, both Corning Inc. and Corning NC exercised, or could have exercised, control over Petitioner’s participation in this proceeding, and should have been named as real parties-in-interest. *Id.* at 1–2, 6. Patent Owner contends that because the Petition fails to name all real parties-in-interest, its filing date must be vacated, with a new filing date to be set only if and when Petitioner submits an updated mandatory notice. *Id.* at 2, 12. In addition, because Patent Owner served Petitioner with a complaint alleging infringement of the challenged patent more than one year after any possible new filing date, the Petition is barred under 35 U.S.C. § 315(b), and we must terminate the proceeding. *Id.*

Patent Owner also argues that it timely raised the RPI issue in this case. *Id.* at 12–15. Patent Owner explains that it served Petitioner with a complaint alleging infringement of the challenged patents on November 6, 2013. *Id.* at 12.⁷ On

⁷ In IPR2014-00736, Patent Owner asserts that it served Petitioner with a complaint alleging infringement of the ’446 patent on June 11, 2013. Motion 12.

IPR2014-00440 (Patent 8,597,041 B2)

IPR2014-00441 (Patent 8,562,366 B2)

IPR2014-00736 (Patent 6,676,446 B2)

January 21, 2014, Petitioner changed its name from Corning Gilbert Inc. to Corning Optical Communications RF, LLC. *Id.* at 12–13. In a related district court case, on June 12, 2014, Patent Owner took the deposition of Charles Hartfelder, Director of Global Connectivity Products for both Petitioner and Corning NC, who stated that Petitioner was the only Corning entity making, selling, offering for sale, or importing accused products. *Id.* at 13; Ex. 2106, 12:2–9, 15:6–19. According to Patent Owner, Mr. Hartfelder’s statements at that time “served to confirm (incorrectly as it turns out) the Petitioner’s narrative as expressed through its counsel that all that occurred in early 2014 was a name change.” Motion 13–14.

Thereafter, in a related ITC proceeding, in responses to interrogatories dated February 19, 2015, Mr. Hartfelder stated that while Petitioner developed, distributed, and imported accused products, Corning NC marketed and sold those connectors, and both companies had been doing so since April 2014. *Id.* at 14; Ex. 2107, 6, 9. In view of the conflicting statements by Mr. Hartfelder, Patent Owner investigated the RPI issue “using whatever publicly available information it could find” and asked Petitioner for additional information on February 25, 2015. Motion 14. Patent Owner then initiated a call with the Board, which took place on February 27, 2015, leading to our Order authorizing Patent Owner to file a motion for additional discovery on the RPI issue (Paper 31). *Id.* In view of the February 2015 “triggering event” and Patent Owner’s quick activity thereafter, Patent Owner contends it does not raise the RPI issue too late to be considered in this case. *Id.* at 14–15.

IPR2014-00440 (Patent 8,597,041 B2)

IPR2014-00441 (Patent 8,562,366 B2)

IPR2014-00736 (Patent 6,676,446 B2)

B. Petitioner's Response

Petitioner argues that Patent Owner's Motion to Dismiss should be denied because: (1) the Board is precluded from vacating a Decision to Institute (Opp. 1–2, 19–21); (2) Patent Owner waived its right to raise the RPI issue because its Motion to Dismiss is untimely (*id.* at 2–6); (3) Patent Owner fails to establish that either Corning NC or Corning Inc. is an RPI, or that either funded or controlled these proceedings (*id.* at 6–19); and (4) in any event, a failure to name all RPIs does not necessitate dismissal of the Petitions (*id.* at 19–25). We discuss Petitioner's contentions in more detail in our analysis below.

C. Factual Background

In its Response to Patent Owner's Discovery Request, Petitioner acknowledges that six “individuals provided direction to counsel for Petitioner in the IPR, and/or review and/or approval of any papers filed by Counsel in the IPR,” i.e., Michael Bell, Don Burris, Helen Boemmels, Dan Hulme, Jack Vynalek, and Steve Morris. Ex. 2100, 13–14. Both parties discuss four of these people in detail: Mr. Bell, Mr. Hulme, Mr. Vynalek, and Mr. Morris. Motion 4–6; Opp. 3–4, 11–14. Petitioner also provides a Declaration by Ms. Boemmels in her capacity as “Plant Controller” for Petitioner. Ex. 1088. In addition, the parties discuss Tim Aberle, who, along with Mr. Bell and Mr. Hulme, engaged in settlement discussions with Patent Owner to resolve disputes between the parties. Motion 8; Opp. 13–14; Ex. 2131 ¶¶ 10–18.

According to Petitioner, three Corning entities, Petitioner (located in Glendale, Arizona), Corning NC (located in Hickory, North Carolina), and Corning Optical Communications Wireless, Inc. (located in Herndon, Virginia, “Corning Wireless”), “are organized as a business segment named ‘Optical

IPR2014-00440 (Patent 8,597,041 B2)

IPR2014-00441 (Patent 8,562,366 B2)

IPR2014-00736 (Patent 6,676,446 B2)

Connectivity Solutions' (OCS), allowing these entities to share certain services for efficiency and cost purposes.” Opp. 16–17; Ex. 2120.

Michael Bell acts as President of all three entities, i.e., Petitioner, Corning NC, and Corning Wireless. Opp. 17. In addition, Mr. Bell acts as Senior Vice President & General Manager of OCS. Disc. Resp. 11. Mr. Bell receives his compensation from Corning NC, and participates in “long term incentive programs” of Corning Inc. *Id.* Mr. Bell “includes ‘Optical Connectivity Solutions’ in his automatic e-mail signature, and lists his LLC [(i.e., Corning NC)] address, because that is where his mail is sent.” Opp. 17; Ex. 2131 ¶ 20. Steve Morris acts as Secretary for both Petitioner and Corning NC, as well as Chief Compliance Officer for Corning NC. Ex. 2100, 14.

Dan Hulme, Jack Vynalek, Tim Aberle all work as patent counsel for “the Intellectual Property Department/Section of the Corning Law Department,” which Petitioner also calls “Corning IP Department.” *Id.* at 4, 11–12. Corning IP Department is part of Corning Inc., based out of Corning, New York. *Id.* at 4. Mr. Aberle also acts as Assistant Secretary for Corning NC, and receives compensation from Corning NC and/or Corning Inc. *Id.* at 12; Opp. 12. Mr. Hulme and Mr. Vynalek receive compensation from Corning Inc. Ex. 2100, 12–14; Opp. 12. Petitioner states that the “cost of the Intellectual Property Department/ Section of the Corning Law Department is allocated among all of Corning’s reportable segments.” *Id.* at 12.

The parties also discuss Charles Hartfelder, Director of Global Connectivity Products for both Petitioner and Corning NC. Motion 8; Ex. 2106, 12:2–9. In a deposition that took place on June 12, 2014, in a related district court case, Mr. Hartfelder testified that he is responsible for “the management of the product line”

IPR2014-00440 (Patent 8,597,041 B2)

IPR2014-00441 (Patent 8,562,366 B2)

IPR2014-00736 (Patent 6,676,446 B2)

regarding the same products at both companies. *Id.* at 12:17–14:22. When asked how Petitioner relates to Corning NC, Mr. Hartfelder stated “[w]e are part of that entity.” *Id.* at 12:7–10. Mr. Hartfelder receives compensation from Corning NC. *Id.* at 14:6–8.

In the same deposition, Mr. Hartfelder also testified that Petitioner is “the only entity related to Corning, Inc. that is making, selling, offering for sale and/or importing the UltraRange or UltraShield connectors.” Ex. 2106, 15:15–19. By contrast, in a related ITC proceeding, in responses to interrogatories dated February 19, 2015, Mr. Hartfelder states that Petitioner develops, distributes, and imports UltraShield connectors, while Corning NC markets and sells those connectors, and both companies have been doing so since April 2014. Ex. 2107, 6, 9.

Both parties discuss an engagement letter (Ex. 2101) sent to Petitioner’s outside counsel regarding this proceeding. Motion 5–6; Opp. 11. Mark Lauroesch, Vice President and General Intellectual Property Counsel for Corning Inc., sent the letter to outside counsel. Ex. 2101, COCRFLLC_94–95. The letter states that “we have engaged your firm to represent us in this matter,” i.e., the IPR proceedings, and “[m]ore particularly, we have asked you to represent [Petitioner] Corning Gilbert Inc.” *Id.* at Ex. COCRFLLC_94. The letter further states that “Dan Hulme will be our in-house Case Manager, and will be your primary point of contact and coordination with Corning.” *Id.*

The engagement letter also includes, as an attachment, “Corning Incorporated Outside Counsel Billing and Staffing Guidelines.” *Id.* at COCRFLLC_95–105. The Guidelines state that “questions or suggestions may be directed to the General Counsel, any of his senior deputies, the General IP

IPR2014-00440 (Patent 8,597,041 B2)

IPR2014-00441 (Patent 8,562,366 B2)

IPR2014-00736 (Patent 6,676,446 B2)

Counsel, or the Case Manager.” *Id.* at COCRFLLC_105. The letter also includes, as another attachment, Appendix A, entitled “Intellectual Property Department Electronic Billing Procedure for Vendors.” *Id.* at COCRFLLC_106. Appendix A states that the process “for submitting invoices or statements to the Corning Incorporated Intellectual Property department” “pertains to both Corning Incorporated (Corning, NY) and Corning Cable Systems LLC (Hickory, NC),” i.e., Corning NC.⁸ *Id.*

Consistent with the engagement letter and its attachments, Petitioner acknowledges that its outside counsel “directs its invoices for preparing the Petition and for services rendered in the IPR to the Corning IP Department,” i.e., Corning Inc. Ex. 2100, 4; *see also* Ex. 2012; Ex. 1101 (invoices from outside counsel sent to Corning Inc. IP Department, in Corning, NY). In addition, as stated by Petitioner, “[p]ayments received by Counsel for preparing the Petition and for services rendered in the IPR were sent from Corning Incorporated, through Corning Shared Services—North America [“CSS-NA”] on behalf of Petitioner.”⁹ Ex. 2100, 6; *see also* Ex. 2103; Ex. 1104 (electronic payment notifications from Corning Inc., in Corning, NY); Ex. 1106 (balance sheets titled “Corning

⁸ Corning NC was previously named Corning Cable Systems LLC. Opp. 10.

⁹ Service Level Agreements between Corning Shared Services—North America (“CSS-NA”) and Petitioner indicate that Petitioner is charged for services described in a “Service Description Standard” (not included), which “outlines specific tasks that are performed and who has responsibility for executing them (either Business Unit or CSS-NA).” Ex. 1094; Ex. 1100. According to Petitioner’s witness, Ms. Boemmels, “some entities within the Corning family of companies utilize the services of CSS-NA, which provides invoice processing services on behalf of the Corning entity which agrees to utilize the services of CSS-NA.” Ex. 1088 ¶ 11. Counsel for Petitioner indicated during the oral hearing that CSS-NA “is part of” Corning Inc. Tr. 62:1–2, 68:3–13.

IPR2014-00440 (Patent 8,597,041 B2)
IPR2014-00441 (Patent 8,562,366 B2)
IPR2014-00736 (Patent 6,676,446 B2)

Incorporated – Restricted,” referring to “Balance Sheet – Actuals, Glendale, AZ – Corning Gilbert”).

D. Timeliness of Patent Owner Raising the RPI Issue

As an initial matter, Petitioner asserts that a Decision to Institute is “final,” and, therefore, cannot be vacated. Opp. 1–2 (citing 35 U.S.C. § 314(d)). According to the Petitioner, we are precluded from vacating our Decisions to Institute in these proceedings, citing § 314(d), *In re Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC*, 778 F.3d 1271, 1276 (Fed. Cir. 2015), Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48,756, 48,765 (Aug. 14, 2012) (“Trial Practice Guide”), Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 17(a), and 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.71, 42.106, etc. *Id.* at 1–2, 19–25. As noted by Patent Owner, the Board has addressed these points in other cases, and has clarified that we may terminate an IPR proceeding and vacate our Decisions to Institute if the Petitions fail to identify a real party-in-interest, as required under 35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(2). *See Atlanta Gas*, Case IPR2013-00453, slip op. at 13–15 (Paper 88); *GEA Process Eng’g. Inc. v. Steuben Foods, Inc.*, Case IPR2014-00041, slip op. at 2, 10–13 (PTAB Feb. 11, 2015) (Paper 140); *Medtronic, Inc. v. Robert Bosch Healthcare Sys., Inc.*, Case IPR2014-00488, slip op. at 18–20 (PTAB May 22, 2015) (Paper 61); *Medtronic*, Case IPR2014-00488, slip op. at 2–5 (PTAB May 22, 2015) (Paper 59); Reply 1–2.

Petitioner also contends that Patent Owner offers insufficient excuses for its delay in asserting that Corning Inc. and Corning NC are RPIs. Opp. 2–6. In support, Petitioner points out Patent Owner has sued only Petitioner since 2011 for patent infringement, and that settlement discussions occurred between the parties since early 2013. *Id.* at 3–4. In that capacity, Patent Owner “received a settlement communication from Mr. Bell in November 2013 concerning the litigations that

IPR2014-00440 (Patent 8,597,041 B2)

IPR2014-00441 (Patent 8,562,366 B2)

IPR2014-00736 (Patent 6,676,446 B2)

preceded this IPR with his email signature,” and Patent Owner “was aware of Mr. Hulme’s involvement in earlier IPRs.” *Id.* at 4. In addition, Petitioner contends that Patent Owner “relies on a website as purported evidence that [Corning NC] is selling infringing products.” *Id.* at 4 (citing Motion 7–8, which refers to Ex. 2123). According to Petitioner, the “alleged sales information on the website that PO relies upon has not changed since January 1, 2014, and is not an LLC [(i.e., Corning NC)] website.” *Id.*

Petitioner also contends that Petitioner’s officers and directors were publicly known before the Petition filing date, and Mr. Morris signed a Power of Attorney in this proceeding, as well as the April 2013 Mutual Non-Disclosure Agreement (“Rule 408 Agreement”). *Id.* Petitioner also asserts that Patent Owner relies on March 2014 correspondence among outside counsel regarding whether Petitioner sold accused products, as well as “Mr. Hartfelder’s June 12, 2014 testimony concerning positions at more than one Corning entity as evidence of alleged blurring.” *Id.* at 5.

Patent Owner persuades us, nonetheless, that receipt of responses to interrogatories by Mr. Hartfelder on February 19, 2015, in the related ITC case acted sufficiently as a “triggering” event, prompting Patent Owner to question and investigate who might be RPIs of Petitioner here. *See First Quality Baby Products, LLC, v. Kimberly-Clark Worldwide, Inc.*, Case IPR2014-01024, slip op. at 6 (PTAB July 16, 2015) (Paper 41) (discussing whether a Motion to Dismiss “was precipitated by the discovery of new information,” and whether Petitioner “was aware of the relevant facts for nearly a year or more”). We are not persuaded that noticing an e-mail signature (assuming that occurred) and/or being aware of Mr. Hulme’s involvement in earlier IPRs, Corning websites, or Petitioner’s

IPR2014-00440 (Patent 8,597,041 B2)

IPR2014-00441 (Patent 8,562,366 B2)

IPR2014-00736 (Patent 6,676,446 B2)

corporate structure, necessarily would have triggered Patent Owner to request additional discovery on the issue of RPI. Moreover, we are persuaded that Patent Owner likely was not aware of much of the information and evidence cited in its Motion to Dismiss until after it began an investigation of the RPI issue, and, more specifically, requested and obtained additional discovery, after February 19, 2015. We also are persuaded that after February 19, 2015, Patent Owner acted quickly to obtain information from Petitioner, to seek and obtain additional discovery, and to file the Motion to Dismiss.

Thus, based on the present record, we determine that Petitioner's challenge to the identification of the RPIs in the Petitions is not untimely.

E. Analysis—Real Parties-In-Interest

1. Burden

A patent owner challenging a petitioner's RPI disclosure must provide sufficient evidence to show the disclosure is inadequate. *Intellectual Ventures Mgmt., LLC v. Xilinx, Inc.*, Case IPR2012-00018, slip op. at 3 (PTAB Jan. 24, 2013) (Paper 12). Prior to institution, when a patent owner provides sufficient evidence that reasonably brings into question the accuracy of a petitioner's identification of RPI, the overall burden remains with the petitioner to establish that it has complied with the statutory requirement to identify all RPI. *Zerto, Inc. v. EMC Corp.*, Case IPR2014-01254, slip op. at 6–7 (PTAB Feb 12, 2015) (Paper 32). If a patent owner raises the RPI issue after institution and after filing a response to the petition, and in the form of a motion as is the case here, however, the burden of proof is on the patent owner as the proponent of the motion. Thus, given the circumstances of this particular case, we consider whether Patent Owner, as the moving party, has met its burden of proof to establish by a preponderance of

IPR2014-00440 (Patent 8,597,041 B2)
IPR2014-00441 (Patent 8,562,366 B2)
IPR2014-00736 (Patent 6,676,446 B2)

the evidence that it is entitled to the requested relief, i.e., dismissing the Petitions and vacating our Decisions to Institute. 37 C.F.R. § 42.20(a), (c); § 42.1(d).

2. *Considerations and Factors*

As stated in the Trial Practice Guide, whether a party who is not a named participant in a given proceeding is a “real party-in-interest” to that proceeding “is a highly fact-dependent question.” 77 Fed. Reg. at 48,759 (citing *Taylor v. Sturgell*, 533 U.S. 880 (2008)). There is no “bright line test.” *Id.* The Supreme Court in *Taylor* sets forth a list of factors that might be relevant in a particular case. 533 U.S. at 893–95. Although “rarely will one fact, standing alone, be determinative of the inquiry” (Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. at 48,759), “[a] common consideration is whether the non-party exercised or could have exercised control over a party’s participation in a proceeding” (*id.* at 48,761 (citations omitted)); *see also Reflectix, Inc. v. Promethean Insulation Tech. LLC*, Case IPR2015-00039, slip op. at 12 (PTAB April 24, 2015) (Paper 18) (“The proper RPI analysis [] focuses on . . . the degree to which [the related non-named entity] exercised, or could have exercised, control over the Petitions.”).

Other considerations may include whether a non-party “funds and directs and controls” an IPR petition or proceeding; the non-party’s relationship with the petitioner; the non-party’s relationship to the petition itself, including the nature and/or degree of involvement in the filing; and the nature of the entity filing the petition. Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. at 48,760; *see also id.* at 48,759 (citing *Taylor*, 533 U.S. at 893–95 & n.6 (2008)). A party does not become a RPI merely through association with another party in an endeavor unrelated to the IPR proceeding. *Id.* at 48,760; *see also Denso Corp. v. Beacon Navigation GmbH*, Case IPR2013-00026, slip op. at 10–11 (PTAB Mar. 14, 2014) (Paper 34) (stating

IPR2014-00440 (Patent 8,597,041 B2)

IPR2014-00441 (Patent 8,562,366 B2)

IPR2014-00736 (Patent 6,676,446 B2)

that the mere fact that parties are co-defendants or concurrent defendants in related litigation does not make them RPI).

A non-party's participation with a petitioner may be overt or covert, and the evidence may be direct or circumstantial, but the evidence as a whole must show that the non-party possessed effective control over the IPR proceeding. *Zoll Lifecor Corp. v. Philips Elec. N. Am. Corp.*, Case IPR2013-00609, slip op. at 10 (PTAB Mar. 20, 2014) (Paper 15). In this regard, we consider "the degree of control the nonparty could exert over the *inter partes* review." *Aruze Gaming Macau, Ltd. v. MGT Gaming, Inc.*, Case IPR2014-01288, slip op. at 11 (PTAB Feb. 20, 2015) (Paper 13).

We may consider whether a non-party "has the actual measure of control or opportunity to control that might reasonably be expected between two formal coparties." Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. at 48,759 (quoting 18A CHARLES ALAN WRIGHT, ARTHUR R. MILLER & EDWARD H. COOPER, FEDERAL PRACTICE & PROCEDURE § 4451 (2d ed. 2011)) (internal quotations omitted). We also may consider whether Petitioner's actions "have blurred sufficiently the lines of corporate separation with [an unnamed related entity], such that [the entity] could have controlled the filing and participation of the IPRs." *Zoll Lifecor Corp. v. Philips Elec. N. Am. Corp.*, Case IPR2013-00606, slip op. at 10 (PTAB Mar. 20, 2014) (Paper 13); *see also Galderma S.A. v. Allergan Industrie, SAS*, Case IPR2014-01422, slip op. at 12 (PTAB Mar. 5, 2015) (Paper 14) (same person serving as President and CEO of both parent and subsidiary determined to have "a significant degree of effective control over the present matter").

IPR2014-00440 (Patent 8,597,041 B2)

IPR2014-00441 (Patent 8,562,366 B2)

IPR2014-00736 (Patent 6,676,446 B2)

3. *Analysis—Real Parties-In-Interest*

Petitioner argues that Patent Owner has not alleged that Corning NC has funded this proceeding. Opp. 8, 10. In relation to Corning Inc., Petitioner contends that Patent Owner “alleges funding, and control solely through counsel, not management.” *Id.* at 8. Petitioner asserts that such “halfway allegations do not establish RPI,” and suggests that our Trial Practice Guide “requires funding, direction, *and* control.” *Id.* (citing Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. at 48760). As discussed above, however, the Trial Practice Guide indicates that whether a party is a RPI “is a highly fact-dependent question,” taking into account number of factual considerations. 77 Fed. Reg. at 48,759–60. Thus, “whether something less than complete funding and control suffices to justify similarly treating the party requires consideration of the pertinent facts.” *Id.* at 48,760.

Here, as discussed in more detail below, we determine that a preponderance of the evidence indicates that “Petitioner’s actions have blurred sufficiently the lines of corporate separation” with Corning NC, such that Corning NC “could have controlled the filing and participation of the IPRs.” *Zoll*, Case IPR2013-00606, slip op. at 10 (Paper 13). Furthermore, we determine that evidence sufficiently establishes that Corning Inc. funded these IPR proceedings, and also exercised or could have exercised control over Petitioner’s participation in these proceedings. Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. at 48,759–60; *Atlanta Gas*, Case IPR2013-00453, slip op. at 8–9 (Paper 88). For the reasons set forth below, Patent Owner persuades us that the Petitions should have named both Corning NC and Corning Inc. as real parties-in-interest.

IPR2014-00440 (Patent 8,597,041 B2)

IPR2014-00441 (Patent 8,562,366 B2)

IPR2014-00736 (Patent 6,676,446 B2)

a. Corning NC

As discussed above, Mr. Bell acts as President of both Petitioner and Corning NC, as well as Corning Wireless, three Corning entities “organized as a business segment” into OCS, where Mr. Bell also acts as Senior Vice President. Opp. 16–17; Ex. 2120; Disc. Resp. 11. Mr. Bell includes OSC in his e-mail signature, and lists his Corning NC address “because that is where his mail is sent.” Opp. 17; Ex. 2131 ¶ 20. Likewise, Mr. Morris acts as Secretary for both Petitioner and Corning NC, as well as Chief Compliance Officer for Corning NC, and Mr. Hartfelder acts as Director of Global Connectivity Products for both Petitioner and Corning NC. Ex. 2100, 14; Motion 8; Ex. 2106, 12:2–9. Mr. Hartfelder manages the same product line at both companies, and has indicated that Petitioner is “part of” Corning NC. *Id.* at 12:7–14:22. Such facts supports a finding that “a pre-existing substantive legal relationship with [Petitioner] justifies binding the third party,” Corning NC—a factor that weighs in favor of finding that Corning NC is a real party-in-interest. *Atlanta Gas*, Case IPR2013-00453, slip op. at 8–9 (Paper 88) (citing Trial Practice Guide at 48,759; *Taylor*, 553 U.S. at 893 n.6 (2008)).

Evidence also suggests that Corning entities refer to Petitioner and Corning NC interchangeably, despite the fact that they are located in different states (Arizona and North Carolina). For example, the engagement letter with Petitioner’s outside counsel refers to Petitioner on the first page, but refers to Corning NC (and not Petitioner) in Appendix A to that letter. Ex. 2101, COCRFLLC_94, COCRFLLC_106; *see also* Ex. 2118 (publicly available profiles for Petitioner’s corporate officers); Ex. 2122, 2 (Petitioner’s 2014 State of Arizona Corporation Annual Report, indicating that Mr. Bell resides in Arizona, and Mr.

IPR2014-00440 (Patent 8,597,041 B2)

IPR2014-00441 (Patent 8,562,366 B2)

IPR2014-00736 (Patent 6,676,446 B2)

Morris and corporate directors reside in North Carolina). In addition, at one point, Mr. Hartfelder testified that Petitioner develops, distributes, and imports UltraShield connectors, while Corning NC markets and sells those connectors. Ex. 2107, 6, 9.

Thus, “[r]ather than maintaining well-defined corporate boundaries,” evidence indicates that Petitioner and Corning NC may be “so intertwined that it is difficult for both insiders and outsiders to determine precisely where one ends and another begins,” notwithstanding their different geographic locations. *Atlanta Gas*, Case IPR2013-00453, slip op. at 11 (Paper 88). Indeed, we are persuaded that “Petitioner’s actions have blurred sufficiently the lines of corporate separation” with Corning NC, such that Corning NC could have controlled the filing and participation of the IPRs. *Zoll*, Case IPR2013-00606, slip op. at 10 (Paper 13). Evidence in this regard again weighs in favor of finding Corning NC to be a real party-in-interest.

Additionally, Petitioner acknowledges that individuals who “provided direction to counsel for Petitioner in the IPR, and/or review and/or approval of any papers filed by Counsel in the IPR” include Mr. Bell and Mr. Morris, along with two attorneys (Mr. Hulme and Mr. Vynalek) who work as counsel in Corning Inc.’s IP Department. Ex. 2100, 13–14. In addition, Mr. Bell, along with Mr. Aberle and Mr. Hulme, who both work in Corning Inc.’s IP Department, engaged in settlement discussions with Patent Owner to resolve disputes between the parties. Motion 8; Opp. 12–13; Ex. 2131 ¶¶ 10–18. Because Mr. Bell and Mr. Morris act as corporate officers with the same titles for both Petitioner and Corning NC, and because Mr. Aberle also acts as Assistant Secretary for Corning NC (Ex.

IPR2014-00440 (Patent 8,597,041 B2)

IPR2014-00441 (Patent 8,562,366 B2)

IPR2014-00736 (Patent 6,676,446 B2)

2100, 11–12), for example, the above-mentioned facts once again weigh in favor of finding Corning NC to be a real party-in-interest.

We are not persuaded by Petitioner’s assertions that Patent Owner “does not allege actual control by [Corning NC], but instead asserts opportunity to control through attorneys,” or that Mr. Bell, only in his capacity of President and CEO of Petitioner, “authorized the preparation and filing of the Petition on behalf of Petitioner.” Opp. 15. While it is correct that Petitioner’s corporate filing lists Mr. Bell and Mr. Morris as corporate officers (*id.* (citing Ex. 2122)), the totality of the evidence before us suggests that both individuals have acted as corporate officers for both Petitioner and Corning NC at the same time, interchangeably, as discussed above. Evidence before us also indicates that Corning NC has a close relationship with Petitioner. We are persuaded that Corning NC at least could have exercised control over the proceeding, a factor weighing in favor of finding Corning NC to be a real party-in-interest. A relationship between an unnamed entity and a petitioner that have “blurred the lines of corporate separation such that the [non-named entity] could control conduct of the *inter partes* review” indicates that the unnamed entity is an RPI. *Aruze Gaming Macau*, Case IPR2014-01288, slip op. at 11–12 (Paper 13).

Thus, based on the particular facts of this case, we determine that Corning NC was an RPI of the instant proceedings that was not identified in the Petitions.

b. Corning Inc.

We are persuaded that a preponderance of the evidence establishes that Corning Inc. hired outside counsel to handle these IPR proceedings, and paid for the proceedings. Ex. 2100, 4, 11–14; Ex. 2101, COCRFLLC_94. As discussed above, consistent with the engagement letter and its attachments, outside counsel

IPR2014-00440 (Patent 8,597,041 B2)

IPR2014-00441 (Patent 8,562,366 B2)

IPR2014-00736 (Patent 6,676,446 B2)

directs its invoices to Corning Inc. Ex. 2100, 4; *see also* Ex. 2012; Ex. 1101. Similarly, payments received by outside counsel are sent from Corning Inc., through CSS-NA, on behalf of Petitioner. Ex. 2100, 6; Ex. 2103; Ex. 1104; Ex. 1106. Despite Petitioner’s assertions that Petitioner entered into a financial services agreement with CSS-NA, and that CSS-NA acts on Petitioner’s behalf in processing invoices (Opp. 8–10), we are persuaded that a preponderance of the evidence establishes that Corning Inc. paid for the IPRs, even if it does so on behalf of Petitioner. Evidence in this regard weighs in favor of finding Corning Inc. to be a real party-in-interest. *See GEA*, Case IPR2014-00041 (Paper 140) (finding a nonparty that paid petitioner’s legal fees for an IPR to be a real party-in-interest).

We recognize that Petitioner contends, despite the fact that outside counsel receives payment from Corning Inc. regarding the IPRs, that Petitioner “funds the payment of Counsel’s invoices.” Opp. 9; Tr. 59:21–22. Relying on a Declaration by Ms. Boemmels (Ex. 1088), Petitioner asserts that “CSS-NA processes payment of Buchanan’s invoices on behalf of Petitioner,” and Ms. Boemmels, as Plant Controller for Petitioner, “validates that Buchanan’s invoices have been appropriately allocated to and funded by Petitioner.”¹⁰ Opp. 9 (citing Ex. 1088 ¶¶ 24–32; Ex. 1094; Exs. 1100–1105, Ex. 1107). Petitioner also alleges that its “financial records reflect that all of Buchanan’s invoices have been funded by Petitioner.” *Id.* (citing Ex. 1088 ¶¶ 24–72; Ex. 1094, Exs. 1101–1109; Ex. 2101).

Considering all evidence before us, however, we are not persuaded that the evidence cited by Ms. Boemmels shows sufficiently that Petitioner actually

¹⁰ “Buchanan” refers to “Buchanan, Ingersoll & Rooney PC,” the law firm that acts as outside counsel for Petitioner. Paper 3.

IPR2014-00440 (Patent 8,597,041 B2)

IPR2014-00441 (Patent 8,562,366 B2)

IPR2014-00736 (Patent 6,676,446 B2)

reimbursed or otherwise paid Corning Inc. in relation to the IPRs in question. Ex. 1088 ¶¶ 24–72; Exs. 1101–1109; Tr. 59:21–71:14, 78:19–79: 8, 80:13–81:6. For example, Exhibits 1101–1109 do not show persuasively any transfer of money from an account of Petitioner to an account of Corning Inc. Rather, the various “ledgers,” “balance sheets,” and other accounting information reveal costs attributed to Petitioner, which Petitioner acknowledges were paid by Corning Inc., without showing sufficiently that funds went from Petitioner to Corning Inc. In any event, even assuming Petitioner reimbursed Corning Inc. in relation to all costs associated with the IPRs, Corning Inc.’s receipt and review of relevant invoices (Ex. 1088 ¶ 5), as well as initial payment by Corning Inc. (Ex. 2100, 6; Ex. 1104), still weighs in favor of finding Corning Inc. to be a real party-in-interest.

We also are persuaded that Corning Inc., through attorneys in its IP Department (Mr. Hulme and Mr. Vynalek), provided direction to outside counsel in relation to these proceedings. Ex. 2100, 13–14. A relevant engagement letter clarifies that Corning Inc. hired outside counsel, even if on Petitioner’s behalf, and states that Mr. Hulme acts as Corning Inc.’s in-house Case Manager. Ex. 2101, COCRFLLC_94 (stating in the engagement letter from a corporate officer of Corning Inc, not Petitioner, that “Dan Hulme will be our in-house Case Manager”). We also are persuaded that Corning exerted control over the proceedings via Mr. Hulme and/or Mr. Aberle (both patent counsel with Corning Inc.’s IP Department), who engaged in settlement discussions with Patent Owner to resolve disputes between the parties, along with Mr. Bell. Motion 8; Ex. 2131 ¶¶ 10–18; Ex. 2100, 12–14.

We are not persuaded otherwise by Petitioner’s assertion that Corning Inc.’s IP Department “functions and supports” Corning entities “like a law firm,” such

IPR2014-00440 (Patent 8,597,041 B2)

IPR2014-00441 (Patent 8,562,366 B2)

IPR2014-00736 (Patent 6,676,446 B2)

that Mr. Hulme and Mr. Vynalek are “professionally obligated to serve their client’s [(i.e., Petitioner’s)] interests, *not* the interests of entities that issue their paycheck,” i.e., Corning Inc. Opp. 12–13. Petitioner does not point us to credible evidence indicating that if interests of Corning Inc. and Petitioner ever diverged, Mr. Hulme and Mr. Vynalek, who are employees of Corning Inc. (Ex. 2100, 12–14), would act in a matter contrary to Corning Inc.’s interests. We note further that neither Mr. Hulme nor Mr. Vynalek submitted testimony indicating that they represented the interests of Petitioner and not the interests of Corning Inc.

Nor are we persuaded by Petitioner’s contention that “Mr. Hulme advises, and takes direction from” Mr. Bell. *Id.* at 13. Even assuming Mr. Hulme takes direction from Mr. Bell, that assumption does not negate evidence establishing that: (i) Mr. Hulme and Mr. Vynalek provided direction in these proceedings; (ii) Corning Inc. provides payment for the proceedings; (iii) Mr. Hulme and Mr. Vynalek work for Corning Inc.; and (iv) a relevant engagement letter with outside counsel states that Mr. Hulme acts as Corning Inc.’s in-house Case Manager. We also do not find dispositive Petitioner’s assertions that Patent Owner has not sued Corning NC or Corning Inc., or that no indemnification agreement exists between Petitioner and Corning NC or Corning Inc. *Id.* at 7–8, 16.

We agree with Petitioner that Corning Inc. being the ultimate parent of Petitioner is not sufficient evidence, by itself, that Corning Inc. exerts control over these proceedings. As discussed above, however, other evidence sufficiently establishes that Corning Inc. not only had an opportunity to control, but actually exerted control, over the proceedings. Thus, multiple factors support a determination that Corning Inc. is a real party-in-interest to Petitioner. *See* Trial

IPR2014-00440 (Patent 8,597,041 B2)
IPR2014-00441 (Patent 8,562,366 B2)
IPR2014-00736 (Patent 6,676,446 B2)

Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. at 48,759 (citing *Taylor*, 553 U.S. 880); *Atlanta Gas*, Case IPR2013-00453, slip op. at 8–9 (Paper 88).

Accordingly, based on the particular facts of this case, we determine that Corning Inc. was an RPI of the instant proceedings that was not identified in the Petitions.

F. Analysis—Amending the Petition to Reflect RPIs

Under 35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(2), we may consider a petition for *inter partes* review “only if . . . the petition identifies all real parties in interest.” Our rules require Petitioners and Patent Owners to “[i]dentify each real party-in-interest for the party.” 37 C.F.R. § 42.8.

Petitioner contends that even if we find that “a non-named party is an RPI, Petitioner should be permitted to amend its Petition and retain its filing date.” Opp. 1, 19–25 (arguing that 35 U.S.C. § 312(a) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.106 and other rules do not require that a petition list all RPIs to obtain a filing date). As noted by Patent Owner (Reply 11–15), however, prior panels have terminated proceedings where a petitioner has failed to name all RPIs, and consistently found that any Petition corrected to disclose additional RPIs must be given a new filing date. *Medtronic*, Case IPR2014-00488, slip op. at 19 (Paper 61); *Reflectix*, Case IPR2015-00039, slip. op at 15–16 (Paper 18); *Galderma*, Case IPR2014-01422, slip op. at 13 (Paper 14); *Zerto, Inc. v. EMC Corp.*, Case IPR2014-01254, slip op. at 15 (PTAB Mar. 3, 2015) (Paper 35); *Atlanta Gas*, Case IPR2013-00453, slip op. at 14 (Paper 88); *GEA*, Case IPR2014-00041, slip op. at 21–26 (Paper 135); *Zoll*, Case IPR2013-00606, slip op. at 12 (Paper 13); *Askeladden LLC v. McGhie*, IPR2015-00122, slip op. at 15–16 (PTAB Mar. 6, 2015) (Paper 30); *First Data*

IPR2014-00440 (Patent 8,597,041 B2)

IPR2014-00441 (Patent 8,562,366 B2)

IPR2014-00736 (Patent 6,676,446 B2)

Corp. v. Cardsoft, LLC, Case IPR2014-00715, slip op. at 10 (PTAB Oct. 17, 2014) (Paper 9).

Petitioner provides similar reasoning to that rejected in *Reflectix* and *Medtronic* based on, for example, Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 17. See *Reflectix*, Case IPR2015-00039, slip. op at 13–18 (Paper 18); *Medtronic*, Case IPR2014-00488, slip op. at 18–20 (Paper 61). As stated in *Medtronic*, an IPR petition may be considered “only if” it meets certain statutory requirements, including identification of “all” real parties-in-interest. *Medtronic*, Case IPR2014-00488, slip op. at 18–19 (Paper 61) (citing 35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(2)). Because Petitioner here has failed to name all real parties-in-interest, the Petitions have not met the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(2), and, therefore, are incomplete and cannot be considered. *Id.*

Furthermore, even if Petitioner amended its Petitions, those Petitions would receive a new filing date. *Id.* (citing 37 C.F.R. § 42.106(b)). Petitioner disagrees with Patent Owner’s assertion that § 42.106 requires compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 42.8 to obtain a filing date. Opp. 24. Petitioner argues that § 42.106 “requires compliance with 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.104, 42.105(a), and 42.15(a),” but not the “additional requirements of 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.6, 42.8, 42.22, and 42.24.” *Id.*

We disagree. Rule 42.106 states that an IPR petition “will not be accorded a filing date until the petition satisfies all of the following requirements: (1) Complies with § 42.104. . . .” 37 C.F.R. § 42.106(a)(1). Rule 42.104, in turn, states “[i]n addition to the requirements of §§ 42.6, 42.8, 42.22, and 42.24, the petition must set forth” grounds for standing and an identification of each challenge. 37 C.F.R. § 42.104. A straightforward reading of the language of § 42.104 indicates that this rule requires compliance with, among other things,

IPR2014-00440 (Patent 8,597,041 B2)

IPR2014-00441 (Patent 8,562,366 B2)

IPR2014-00736 (Patent 6,676,446 B2)

§ 42.8, which states mandatory notices that “must be filed,” including “each real party-in-interest for the party.” 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1). Although we recognize that the above-mentioned rules are regulatory, not statutory, and, therefore, may be waived by the Board (37 C.F.R. § 42.5(b)), we are not persuaded that sufficient reason exists to do so in these cases, especially in view of 35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(2). *See also Reflectix*, Case IPR2015-00039, slip. op at 13–18 (Paper 18) (explaining why Petitioner “has not provided a sufficient showing of good cause or otherwise convinced us that it would be in the interests of justice to allow correction of the RPIs identified in its Petition without loss of the original filing date”) (*id.* at 18).

Here, a new filing date necessarily would be more than one year after the date on which Petitioner was served with a complaint alleging infringement of the challenged patents, making the Petitions time-barred under 35 U.S.C. § 315(b). Because we cannot consider the Petitions, and should not have considered them at the time of institution, the appropriate remedy is to grant Patent Owner’s Motions to Dismiss, terminate the instant proceedings, and vacate our Decisions on Institution.

III. CONCLUSION

Under 35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(2) an IPR petition may be considered “only” if it identifies “all” real parties-in-interest. We are persuaded that Patent Owner has established by a preponderance of the evidence that Petitioner is not the sole RPI, as stated in the Petition (Pet. 1). Based on all evidence of record before us, we conclude that Corning NC and Corning Inc. should have been named as real parties-in-interest in these proceedings. Accordingly, we grant Patent Owner’s Motions to Dismiss, vacate the Decisions on Institution, and do not issue final

IPR2014-00440 (Patent 8,597,041 B2)

IPR2014-00441 (Patent 8,562,366 B2)

IPR2014-00736 (Patent 6,676,446 B2)

written decisions under 35 U.S.C. § 318(a) with respect to the patentability of the challenged claims.

In consideration of the foregoing, it is:

ORDERED that Patent Owner's Motions to Dismiss the Petition for Failure to Name All Real Parties-In-Interest are *granted*;

FURTHER ORDERED that the instant proceedings are *terminated*; and

FURTHER ORDERED that the Decisions on Institution in the instant proceedings are *vacated*.

IPR2014-00440 (Patent 8,597,041 B2)

IPR2014-00441 (Patent 8,562,366 B2)

IPR2014-00736 (Patent 6,676,446 B2)

For PETITIONER:

Todd Walters

Roger Lee

Buchanan Ingersoll & Rooney

todd.walters@bipc.com

roger.lee@bipc.com

For PATENT OWNER:

Denis Sullivan

Douglas Nash

Hiscock & Barclay, LLP

dsullivan@hblaw.com

dnash@hblaw.com

ATTACHMENT B

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

CORNING OPTICAL COMMUNICATIONS RF, LLC,
Petitioner,

v.

PPC BROADBAND, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2014-00440 (Patent 8,597,041 B2)
Case IPR2014-00441 (Patent 8,562,366 B2)
Case IPR2014-00736 (Patent 6,676,446 B2)¹

Before JAMESON LEE, JOSIAH C. COCKS, and
JACQUELINE WRIGHT BONILLA, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

BONILLA, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION
Denying Petitioner's Request for Rehearing
37 C.F.R. § 42.71

¹ This Decision addresses common issues raised in all three cases. Papers, arguments, and evidence submitted by Patent Owner and Petitioner as it relates to the issue at hand are largely the same in each case. Thus, we issue one Decision to be entered in each case. The parties are not authorized to use this caption without prior authorization of the Board.

IPR2014-00440 (Patent 8,597,041 B2)
IPR2014-00441 (Patent 8,562,366 B2)
IPR2014-00736 (Patent 6,676,446 B2)

I. INTRODUCTION

Corning Optical Communications RF, LLC (“Petitioner”) filed a Request for Rehearing of our Decision dated August 18, 2015 (Paper 68, “Dec.” or “Decision”), granting a Motion by PPC Broadband, Inc. (“Patent Owner”) to dismiss the Petition for failure to name all real parties-in-interest in each of the three above-captioned cases. Paper 69 (“Req. Reh’g.” or “Request”).² Because the real parties-in-interest (“RPI”) issue is common to all three cases, and both parties filed similar papers in all cases as it relates to this issue, we consider the three cases together here.

In our Decision, we determined that Patent Owner had established by a preponderance of the evidence that the three Petitions should have identified Petitioner’s parent company, Corning Incorporated (“Corning Inc.”), and Petitioner’s sister company, Corning Optical Communications LLC (“Corning NC”), as RPIs. Dec. 25–26. Because the Petitions failed to identify all RPIs as required by 35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(2), we granted Patent Owner’s Motions to Dismiss (Paper 43, “Motion”), vacated our Decisions to Institute (Paper 10), and terminated the reviews. Dec. 1–3, 25–26.

In its Request, Petitioner contends that we committed legal error regarding applicable standards and burden, and also misrepresented or overlooked evidence, such as evidence relating to funding and Patent Owner’s delay in raising the RPI issue. Req. Reh’g. 1–11. Petitioner also asserts that we should have allowed it to correct the Petitions to identify all RPIs, without loss of the original filing date of

² For clarity and expediency, we treat IPR2014-00440 as representative of all three cases, and all citations herein are to IPR2014-00440 unless otherwise noted.

IPR2014-00440 (Patent 8,597,041 B2)
IPR2014-00441 (Patent 8,562,366 B2)
IPR2014-00736 (Patent 6,676,446 B2)

the Petitions, thereby avoiding an application of the time-bar under 35 U.S.C. § 315(b). *Id.* at 12–15.

Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.71(c), “[w]hen rehearing a decision on petition, a panel will review the decision for an abuse of discretion.” An abuse of discretion occurs when a “decision was based on an erroneous conclusion of law or clearly erroneous factual findings, or . . . a clear error of judgment.” *PPG Indus. Inc. v. Celanese Polymer Specialties Co. Inc.*, 840 F.2d 1565, 1567 (Fed. Cir. 1988) (citations omitted). A request for rehearing “must specifically identify all matters the party believes the Board misapprehended or overlooked, and the place where each matter was previously addressed.” 37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d).

II. ANALYSIS

A. Petitioner’s Contentions Regarding Legal Error

As an initial matter, Petitioner asserts that we committed error in our Decision by failing to follow “standards” presented by a different panel in *Jiawei Technology (HK) Ltd. et al. v. Simon Nicholas Richmond*, Case IPR2014-00935 (PTAB Aug. 21, 2015) (Paper 52). Req. Reh’g. 2–4, 7–8, 11–13, 15. Petitioner contends that the “opposite results” in the *Jiawei* case “demonstrate that Petitioner’s decision to name itself as the RPI was correct and was certainly reasonable when the Petitions were filed” in the instant cases. *Id.* at 3.

As stated in *Jiawei* (Case IPR2014-00935, slip. op at 5–6 (Paper 52)), and in our Decision here (Dec. 14–15), whether a non-named party is a RPI “is a highly fact-dependent question.” Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48,756, 48,759 (Aug. 14, 2012) (“Trial Practice Guide”) (citing *Taylor v. Sturgell*, 533 U.S. 880 (2008)). There is no “bright line test.” *Id.* Although “rarely will one fact, standing alone, be determinative of the inquiry” (*id.* at 48,760), “[a] common

IPR2014-00440 (Patent 8,597,041 B2)

IPR2014-00441 (Patent 8,562,366 B2)

IPR2014-00736 (Patent 6,676,446 B2)

consideration is whether the non-party exercised or could have exercised control over a party's participation in a proceeding" (*id.* at 48,759 (citations omitted)). Other considerations may include whether a non-party "funds and directs and controls" an IPR petition or proceeding; the non-party's relationship with the petitioner; the non-party's relationship to the petition itself, including the nature and/or degree of involvement in the filing; and the nature of the entity filing the petition. *Id.* at 48,759–60.

That a different panel, when taking into account the above-mentioned considerations in another case involving different facts and evidence, came to a different conclusion does not persuade us that we "ignored" or failed to apply relevant "standards" for determining RPI in our Decision. Req. Reh'g. 1–4. To the contrary, we took into account the same considerations—as outlined in our Trial Practice Guide and mentioned in our Decision—but came to a different conclusion based on the particular facts and evidence before us. Dec. 14–23. For example, even if "only Petitioner has been sued" and Patent Owner has never sued Corning Inc. or Corning NC, we explained previously that such information alone is not dispositive. Req. Reh'g. 3–4; Dec. 22.

Petitioner also contends that we erred by citing "contradictory 'opportunity to control' and 'effective control' standards" in our Decision, and by "finding control" merely based on "officers who wear multiple hats and lawyers who are employed by" Corning Inc. and who acted "on behalf of Petitioner in these proceedings." Req. Reh'g. 7–8. Such statements, rehashing arguments raised previously by Petitioner, which we addressed already in our Decision, do not persuade us to come to a different conclusion now. Dec. 7–23 (citing, for example, Opp. 6–19).

IPR2014-00440 (Patent 8,597,041 B2)

IPR2014-00441 (Patent 8,562,366 B2)

IPR2014-00736 (Patent 6,676,446 B2)

Petitioner also asserts in its Request that we failed to address certain listed evidence when considering Patent Owner’s delay in filing its Motions to Dismiss, and that we failed to address how “the alleged ‘triggering’ event” had “any nexus to the RPI inquiry.” Req. Reh’g. 10–11. Generally speaking, Petitioner’s assertions in this regard again rehash arguments and cite evidence that we addressed in our Decision. Dec. 5–6, 11–13 (citing Motion 12–15; Opp. 2–6). Petitioner’s relatively cursory contentions in its Request now (Req. Reh’g. 10–11) do not persuade us to come to a different conclusion. For example, although we did not use the word “nexus” per se, the Decision addressed the nexus point raised by Petitioner in its Request. Dec. 5–6, 12–13 (citing Motion 13–14; Opp. 2–6).

In addition, Petitioner argues that we “impermissibly placed the burden of proof on Petitioner.” Req. Reh’g. 9–10. As noted in our Decision, we placed the ultimate burden of proof, i.e., burden of persuasion, on Patent Owner, not Petitioner. Dec. 13–14 (stating that if “a patent owner raises the RPI issue after institution and after filing a response to the petition, and in the form of a motion . . . , the burden of proof is on the patent owner as the proponent of the motion”). As explained recently by the Federal Circuit, the “burden of persuasion ‘is the ultimate burden assigned to a party who must prove something to a specified degree of certainty,’ such as by a preponderance of the evidence.” *Dynamic Drinkware, LLC v. Nat’l Graphics, Inc.*, 800 F.3d 1375, 1378 (Fed. Cir. 2015) (quoting *Tech. Licensing Corp. v. Videotek, Inc.*, 545 F.3d 1316, 1326–27 (Fed. Cir. 2008)).

Notwithstanding Patent Owner’s burden of persuasion, however, once it came forward with sufficient evidence indicating that Petitioner should have identified Corning Inc. and Corning NC as RPIs (as cited and discussed in Patent

IPR2014-00440 (Patent 8,597,041 B2)

IPR2014-00441 (Patent 8,562,366 B2)

IPR2014-00736 (Patent 6,676,446 B2)

Owner's Motion), a "shifting burden" came into play, i.e., a "burden of production" on Petitioner. *Id.* at 1379. To address that burden of production, Petitioner had an opportunity to "produc[e] additional evidence and present[] persuasive argument based on new evidence or evidence already of record" in its Opposition to Patent Owner's Motion to Dismiss. *Id.* (citations omitted). It was in this capacity, only after determining that Patent Owner had made a sufficient showing regarding RPI, that we stated that Petitioner did not point "to credible evidence indicating that if interests of Corning Inc. and Petitioner ever diverged, Mr. Hulme and Mr. Vynalek, who are employees of Corning Inc. (Ex. 2100, 12–14), would act in a matter contrary to Corning Inc.'s interests." Dec. 22; Req. Reh'g. 9.

Thereafter, based on all evidence before us, we concluded that Patent Owner had established by a preponderance of the evidence that Corning NC and Corning Inc. should have been named as RPIs in these proceedings. Dec. 13–14, 16, 25. Thus, Petitioner does not persuade us that we impermissibly placed the burden of persuasion on Petitioner.

In relation to the "preponderance of the evidence" standard, Petitioner also argues that we erred by relying on that standard in our Decision, rather than an "abuse of discretion standard" that we should have applied when "reconsidering" our Decision to Institute. Req. Reh'g. 11–12. Our Decision did not, however, address a Request for Rehearing in relation to the Decision to Institute, a situation where we would have applied the abuse of discretion standard (as we do here when considering this Request). In relation to a motion filed during trial, we consider whether the moving party has met its burden of proof to establish by a

IPR2014-00440 (Patent 8,597,041 B2)

IPR2014-00441 (Patent 8,562,366 B2)

IPR2014-00736 (Patent 6,676,446 B2)

preponderance of the evidence that it is entitled to the requested relief. 37 C.F.R. § 42.20(a), (c); § 42.1(d).

B. “Funding” Evidence

Petitioner argues that we misapprehended evidence relating to “funding” by Petitioner, as relevant to our determination regarding Petitioner’s parent company, Corning Inc. Req. Reh’g. 4–7. Although Petitioner may disagree with our assessment of evidence, we are not persuaded that we misapprehended the evidence cited by Petitioner in this regard.

When discussing funding, Petitioner refers to Ex. 1088 (Declaration by Helen Boemmels), Ex. 1102 (Corning “Project Costing Resource Transaction Report” for “Business Unit” Petitioner), Ex. 1103 (“Journal Template” entries), Ex. 1104 (“Electronic Payment Notification” from Corning Inc. to outside counsel), Ex. 1105 (“Voucher Accounting Entries”), and Exs. 1094 and 1100 (“Service Level Agreements” between Corning Shared Services—North America (“CSS-NA”) and “Business Unit” Corning Gilbert, i.e., Petitioner).³ Req. Reh’g. 4–7. Petitioner cites that evidence to support its contention in its Request that “Petitioner *funds* [outside counsel] Buchanan’s invoices at the time the invoices

³ In its Request for Rehearing, Petitioner also cites Ex. 2116, a printout of a “LinkedIn” Profile for Ms. Boemmels. Req. Reh’g. 4–5. Petitioner did not cite Ex. 2116 in its Opposition to Patent Owner’s Motion to Dismiss. Paper 54 (“Opp.”). Although Petitioner may not rely on evidence for the first time in a Request for Rehearing, we nonetheless note that Ex. 2116 suggests that Ms. Boemmels considers Petitioner (located in Glendale, Arizona) to be “Corning Incorporated” located in “Glendale, AZ,” the location where Ms. Boemmels has worked as a “Plant Controller” since 2006. Ex. 2116; Decision 7–8. Such evidence indicates that Ms. Boemmels may consider Petitioner to be interchangeable with, or at least have similar interests to, Corning Inc., the parent company of Petitioner.

IPR2014-00440 (Patent 8,597,041 B2)

IPR2014-00441 (Patent 8,562,366 B2)

IPR2014-00736 (Patent 6,676,446 B2)

are inputted into the accounting system, which occurs *before payment* of Buchanan's invoices." *Id.* at 5 (citing Petitioner's Opposition to the Motion to Dismiss (Paper 54, "Opp.") at 8–10).

We considered such evidence in our Decision and were not persuaded. Dec. 20–21. Petitioner focuses on the "reimbursement" and "payment" aspect of our analysis to argue in its Request that "[n]o additional 'reimbursement' step is appropriate because *funding by Petitioner has already occurred* at the time the invoices are entered into the accounting system, and before Buchanan's invoices are paid." Req. Reh'g. 5 (emphasis in original). Our finding, however, was not limited to subsequent reimbursement. Rather, we determined that Petitioner did not show sufficiently that it "actually reimbursed or otherwise paid Corning Inc. in relation to the IPRs in question." Dec. 20–21. The parties do not dispute that outside counsel billed Corning Inc. (not Petitioner) in relation to these proceedings, or that Corning Inc. paid those bills. *See, e.g.*, Ex. 1101 (invoice from outside counsel sent to Corning Inc.); Ex. 2100, 5–6 (Petitioner stating that relevant payments were sent to outside counsel "from Corning Incorporated, through Corning Shared Services—North America on behalf of Petitioner."); Ex. 1104 ("Electronic Payment Notification" indicating that Corning Inc. provided payment to outside counsel).

In its Opposition to Patent Owner's Motion to Dismiss, Petitioner argued that the Law Department of parent Corning Inc. received and reviewed relevant invoices "on behalf of Petitioner," CSS-NA processed payment of the invoices "on behalf of Petitioner," and "the Plant Controller of Petitioner validate[d] that Buchanan's invoices ha[d] been appropriately allocated to and funded by

IPR2014-00440 (Patent 8,597,041 B2)

IPR2014-00441 (Patent 8,562,366 B2)

IPR2014-00736 (Patent 6,676,446 B2)

Petitioner” (citing Ex. 1088 ¶ 32). Opp. 9–10 (citing Ex. 1088 ¶¶ 24–72; Ex. 1101–1106, 1108, 1109).

In our Decision, we understood that Ms. Boemmels, as Plant Controller for Petitioner, testified that she “verified” that transactions set forth in a Transaction Report (Ex. 1102) were “funded by” Petitioner, “as reflected” in Exhibit 1102. Ex. 1088 ¶¶ 32, 21–22; Dec. 20 (citing Opp. 9 (citing Ex. 1088 ¶¶ 24–32; Ex. 1094; Exs. 1100–1105, Ex. 1107)). We were not persuaded, however, that Exhibit 1102 itself (or any of Exhibits 1101–1106) adequately provided such a showing. Dec. 20–21.

As stated in our Decision, Exhibit 1102 and other evidence revealed “costs attributed to Petitioner, which Petitioner acknowledges were paid by Corning Inc., without showing sufficiently that funds went from Petitioner to Corning Inc.” *Id.* While the Decision did not say so expressly, our statement also implied directly that the evidence overall, notwithstanding Ms. Boemmels testimony, failed to show “sufficiently that funds went from Petitioner” to any entity, such as Corning Inc., the entity that actually paid the invoices. *Id.* Thus, even if our Decision referred to reimbursement or payment to Corning Inc. by Petitioner, we determined overall that evidence before us established that Corning Inc. paid relevant invoices, without establishing sufficiently that Petitioner ever “funded” those invoices at any point, either before or after Corning paid the invoices. *Id.*

Moreover, even assuming certain evidence (i.e., Ms. Boemmels’ testimony) indicated that Petitioner “funded” relevant invoices at some point, other evidence, including “Corning Inc.’s receipt and review of relevant invoices (Ex. 1088 ¶ 5), as well as initial payment by Corning Inc. (Ex. 2100, 6; Ex. 1104), still weigh[ed] in favor of finding Corning Inc. to be a real party-in-interest.” Dec. 21. In addition,

IPR2014-00440 (Patent 8,597,041 B2)

IPR2014-00441 (Patent 8,562,366 B2)

IPR2014-00736 (Patent 6,676,446 B2)

other evidence, such as the engagement letter (Ex. 2101) from Corning Inc. to outside counsel regarding the proceedings, as well as evidence indicating the involvement of patent counsel Mr. Hulme and Mr. Vynalek, both employees of Corning Inc., further suggested that Corning Inc. not only had an opportunity to control, but actually exerted control, over the proceedings. Dec. 8–10, 21–22.

Thus, we are not persuaded to reconsider and reverse our Decision based on Petitioner’s assertion that we misapprehended evidence in relation to the “funding” of these proceedings.

C. Petitioner’s Contentions Regarding Correction of its Petitions

Petitioner argues that, in the interests of justice, we should permit it to amend its Petitions, and maintain original Petition filing dates, in view of the asserted errors and misapprehension of evidence discussed above. Req. Reh’g. 12–13. In addition, Petitioner again cites the *Jiawei* decision, discussed above, stating that our Decision here directly conflicts with that decision, and “creates great uncertainty about what parties should be named as RPI.” *Id.* at 13–14. For the reasons discussed above, such arguments do not persuade us to reconsider and reverse our Decision.

Petitioner further argues that we abused our discretion “by failing to weigh and articulate any relevant factors in deciding that there is no ‘good cause’ to permit Petitioner to amend” its Petitions regarding RPIs. *Id.* at 12, 14–15 (citing Dec. 25). Petitioner contends that we

improperly overlooked: (1) Petitioner’s good faith response to the [Trial Practice Guide] requirements, in the absence of the guidance from later RPI decisions, at the time of filing; (2) no evidence of any bad faith, effort to avoid statutory bars or estoppel, or similar tactic by Petitioner; and (3) the Board’s own, simultaneous finding of ‘good cause’ to allow Patent Owner to belatedly raise the RPI issue.

IPR2014-00440 (Patent 8,597,041 B2)

IPR2014-00441 (Patent 8,562,366 B2)

IPR2014-00736 (Patent 6,676,446 B2)

Id. at 14–15 (citations omitted). Petitioner also argues that even if we “were to disagree with *Jiawei* and every legal and evidentiary point above, [we] would still clearly have, and should use, the discretion to avoid this patent injustice by granting the requested leave to amend.” *Id.* at 15.

As an initial matter, we note that Petitioner did not request authorization to correct its Petitions in these cases, even after we authorized Patent Owner to file a Motion to Dismiss during trial in an Order dated March 27, 2015 (Paper 41). Instead, in its Opposition to Patent Owner’s Motion to Dismiss, Petitioner argued that: (1) a failure to name all RPIs did not necessitate dismissal of the Petitions; (2) 35 U.S.C. § 312(a) and our rules did not require that Petitions list all RPIs to obtain a filing date; and (3) our rules did not require rescinding the Petitions filing dates. *Opp.* 19–25. In this capacity, Petitioner also suggested that “[e]ven if the Board finds that a non-named party is an RPI, Petitioner should be permitted to amend its Petition and retain its filing date.” *Id.* at 1, 22, 23 (stating that the “proper course of conduct is to permit Petitioner to amend its Petition if the Board finds that a non-named party is an RPI”), 25.

Thus, “[a]t best, and only after institution of trial, Petitioner has *suggested* that correction of the Petition is a potential remedy—without actively and affirmatively seeking authorization to make such a correction and while simultaneously resisting acknowledging that [Corning Inc. or Corning NC] is a real party in interest.” *Atlanta Gas Light Co. v. Bennett Regulator Guards, Inc.*, Case IPR2013-00453, slip op. at 14 (PTAB Jan. 6, 2015) (Paper 88); *Opp.* 1, 22, 23, 25. Petitioner, therefore, “has failed to take the necessary steps to put the merits of its position squarely before us.” *Atlanta Gas*, Case IPR2013-00453, slip op. at 14 (Paper 88).

IPR2014-00440 (Patent 8,597,041 B2)

IPR2014-00441 (Patent 8,562,366 B2)

IPR2014-00736 (Patent 6,676,446 B2)

In any event, as discussed in our Decision, we are not persuaded that sufficient “good cause” exists to waive our rules to allow correction of the RPIs identified in the Petitions without a loss of original filing dates. Dec. 24–25 (citing *Reflectix, Inc. v. Promethean Insulation Tech. LLC*, Case IPR2015-00039, slip op. at 13–18 (PTAB April 24, 2015) (Paper 18)). Petitioner’s incorrect determination of RPIs in its Petition, as argued in its Opposition to Patent Owner’s Motion to Dismiss and its Request now, “did not arise out of some mistake of fact.” *Reflectix*, Case IPR2015-00039, slip. op. at 14 (Paper 18). Rather, Petitioner asserted that it “designated itself as the only RPI in good faith at the time the Petitions were filed, based on the guidance in the [Trial Practice Guide] before the Board’s RPI decisions cited in the Decision even existed.” Req. Reh’g. 12, 14–15. In other words, Petitioner “misunderstood the law as it applies to the RPI determination.” *Reflectix*, Case IPR2015-00039, slip. op. at 14 (Paper 18).

We agree with our colleagues in *Reflectix* that the Trial Practice Guide provides notable guidance, “as it devotes over a page of the Federal Register to discussing RPI and privity, and cites to precedent including the Supreme Court decision in *Taylor v. Sturgell*.” *Id.* at 14–15 (citing 77 Fed. Reg. at 48,759 (citing 553 U.S. 880 (2008))). Furthermore, a number of relevant Board decisions concerning RPI had issued by March 2, 2015, when we authorized Patent Owner to file its Motion for Additional Discovery regarding whether Corning Inc. and Corning NC should have been listed as RPIs. Paper 31. Petitioner did not request authorization to correct its Petitions thereafter, but instead suggested the possibility of correction in its Opposition to Patent Owner’s Motion to Dismiss. Opp. 1, 22, 23, 25. Our determination that Petitioner’s Motion to Dismiss was timely did not undercut the significance of Petitioner’s actions here. Req. Reh’g. 14–15.

IPR2014-00440 (Patent 8,597,041 B2)

IPR2014-00441 (Patent 8,562,366 B2)

IPR2014-00736 (Patent 6,676,446 B2)

We are not persuaded, given the facts of this case, that Petitioner's failure to name all RPIs in its Petitions, and its failure to request authorization to correct its Petitions regarding RPIs during trial, constitute a type of "error" that warrants permitting correction at this stage, without altering filing dates of the Petitions, even assuming no evidence of bad faith by Petitioner exists. Req. Reh'g. 15, 14. In addition, regardless of whether Petitioner "erred" when preparing its Petitions, Petitioner continued to maintain strongly its position regarding RPIs, even after it had access to all facts and evidence before us when we issued our Decision, thereby indicating that its position was not an "error" on Petitioner's part, but rather a strategic position.

As stated in 35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(2) (emphasis added), a petition for *inter partes* review "may be considered *only if*— . . . the petition identifies all real parties in interest." In view of Petitioner's actions here, we are not persuaded that we abused our discretion in determining the appropriate remedy here was to grant Patent Owner's Motions to Dismiss, terminate the instant proceedings, and vacate our Decisions on Institution.

III. CONCLUSION

We *deny* Petitioner's Request for Rehearing.

IPR2014-00440 (Patent 8,597,041 B2)

IPR2014-00441 (Patent 8,562,366 B2)

IPR2014-00736 (Patent 6,676,446 B2)

For PETITIONER:

Todd Walters

Roger Lee

Buchanan Ingersoll & Rooney

todd.walters@bipc.com

roger.lee@bipc.com

For PATENT OWNER:

Denis Sullivan

Douglas Nash

Hiscock & Barclay, LLP

dsullivan@hblaw.com

dnash@hblaw.com

CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

I hereby certify that the original foregoing NOTICE OF APPEAL is being hand delivered this 10th day of February, 2016 to:

Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office
c/o Office of the General Counsel, 10B20
Madison Building East
600 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314.

I hereby certify that the foregoing NOTICE OF APPEAL and docketing fee of \$500 are being filed with the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, via CM/ECF, this 10th day of February, 2016.

I hereby certify that the foregoing NOTICE OF APPEAL is being served, via electronic mail, to counsel for Appellee this 10th day of February 2016, as follows:

Denis J. Sullivan
Douglas J. Nash
HISCOCK & BARCLAY, LLP
One Park Place, 300 South
State Street
Syracuse, NY 13202
Tel (315) 425-2700
dsullivan@hblaw.com
dnash@hblaw.com

Robert L. Burns
Finnegan, Henderson,
Farabow, Garrett &
Dunner, LLP
11955 Freedom Drive
Reston, VA 20190
Tel (571) 203-2736
robert.burns@finnegan.com

David C. Reese
Finnegan, Henderson,
Farabow, Garrett &
Dunner, LLP
901 New York Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20001-4413
Tel (202) 408-6098
david.reese@finnegan.com

Date: February 10, 2016

/s/ Roger H. Lee
Roger H. Lee, Esq.
BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC
1737 King Street, Suite 500
Alexandria, VA 22314
roger.lee@bipc.com
Counsel for Appellant