

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

GLOBALFOUNDRIES U.S. INC.,
Petitioner

v.

GODO KAISHA IP BRIDGE 1,
Patent Owner

IPR2017-00881
U.S. Patent No. 6,197,696

PETITIONER'S UNOPPOSED MOTION TO DISMISS PETITION
FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW

Mail Stop "PATENT BOARD"
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent and Trademark
Office P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

I. INTRODUCTION

The Board authorized Petitioner GlobalFoundries U.S. Inc. (“Global”) to file a motion to dismiss the petition for IPR2017-00881 regarding U.S. Patent No. 6,197,696 (“the ‘696 patent”) in an Order issued on April 4, 2017. Global now so moves. IPR2017-00881 is in its preliminary phase. Patent Owner Godo Kaisha IP Bridge 1 (“IP Bridge”) has not yet filed a Preliminary Response and the Board has yet to reach the merits and issue a decision on institution. Global has filed a new petition for IPR2017-00922 that includes the same invalidity challenges as the petition for IPR2017-00881, but also includes a second real party-in-interest GlobalFoundries, Inc. Therefore, Global requests the Board to dismiss the petition for IPR2017-00881, as the same invalidity challenges are included in the petition for IPR2017-00922, to preserve the Board’s and parties’ resources and to achieve a just, speedy, and inexpensive resolution to this dispute. Furthermore, counsel for Petitioner has conferred with counsel for Patent Owner, and Patent Owner does not oppose the relief sought by this Motion.

II. FACTS

1. IP Bridge is the owner of the ‘696 Patent.
2. On February 13, 2017, Global filed a petition for *inter partes* review of claims 10-12 of the ‘696 Patent (IPR2017-00881). The petition, being assigned IPR2017-00881, includes the same invalidity challenges as in IPR2016-01377. The Petitioner also concurrently filed a motion for joinder of IPR2017-00881 with

IPR2016-01377. IPR2017-00881 was filed with GlobalFoundries U.S. Inc. as the real party-in-interest. *See* IPR2017-00881, Petition, p. 67.

3. On February 16, 2017, Global filed a new petition for *inter partes* review of the ‘696 Patent including the same invalidity challenges as in IPR2017-00881, but with a second real party-in-interest GlobalFoundries, Inc. (designated IPR2017-00922). The petition for IPR2017-00922 indicated the Petitioner’s intent to withdraw IPR2017-00881. *See* IPR2017-00922, Petition, p. 67, Footnote 7.

4. The petition in IPR2017-00922 presents the same invalidity challenges and relies on the same evidence as the petition in IPR2017-00881.

5. On March 31, 2017, counsel for the Petitioner sought authorization to file motions to dismiss the original petitions in Cases IPR2017-00880, IPR2017-00881, IPR2017-00882, and IPR2017-00883 via an email request to the Board. The Board issued an authorization to file the motions to dismiss the petition in each of Cases IPR2017-00880, IPR2017-00881, IPR2017-00882, and IPR2017-00883 on April 4, 2017 via an email. On April 13, 2017, counsel for the Patent Owner indicated that Patent Owner will not oppose the motions to dismiss in each of the Cases IPR2017-00880, IPR2017-00881, IPR2017-00882, and IPR2017-00883.

III. STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR RELIEF REQUESTED

Good cause exists to dismiss Global’s petition in IPR2017-00881. Dismissal would preserve the Board’s and the parties’ resources, and would expeditiously resolve Global’s request, furthering the purpose of IPR challenges. 37 C.F.R. §

42.1(b). IPR2017-00881 is in its preliminary stage as the Board has not yet reached the merits and issued a decision on institution. IP Bridge would not be prejudiced by dismissal.

The Board “may take up petitions or motions for decisions in any order, may grant, deny, or dismiss any petition or motion, and may enter any appropriate order.” 37 C.F.R. § 42.71 (a). The Rules governing IPR proceedings “shall be construed to secure the just, speedy, and inexpensive resolution of every proceeding.” 37 C.F.R. § 42.1(b). The Board has previously granted motions to dismiss using its authority under at least 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.5(a) and 42.71(a). See, e.g., *Samsung Electronics Co. LTD v. Nvidia Corporation*, IPR2015-01270, Paper 11 at p. 3 (PTAB Dec. 9, 2015) (“Nonetheless, the rules provide us the discretion to ‘take up petitions or motions for decisions in any order’ and to ‘grant, deny, or dismiss any petition or motion’ or enter any appropriate order.”).

Given that the petition in IPR2017-00922 includes the same challenges and relies on the same evidence as the petition in IPR2017-00881, the Board should grant Global’s motion because dismissal would further the purpose of the rules by justly and expeditiously resolving this dispute without subjecting the Board and the parties to unnecessary expense involved in further proceedings related to IPR2017-00881. Dismissal is also a just resolution, as IP Bridge will not be prejudiced by this Board dismissing IPR2017-00881, but rather will reap the benefit of preserving its own resources.

IV. CONCLUSION

The Petitioner respectfully requests that the Board dismiss the petition and terminate proceedings for IPR2017-00881.

Date: April 18, 2017

Respectfully submitted,

/Christopher Carroll/

Christopher Carroll
White & Case LLP
75 State Street
Boston, MA 02109-1814
Telephone: (617) 979-9342
Facsimile: (617) 439-6702
Lead Counsel for Petitioner

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that a copy of the foregoing Petitioner's Unopposed Motion to Dismiss Petition for *Inter Partes* Review was served on April 18, 2017, via email directed to counsel of record for the Patent Owner at the following:

Andrew.thomases@ropesgray.com
sbaughman@paulweiss.com
Jordan.rossen@ropesgray.com
James.l.davis@ropesgray.com

/Christopher Carroll/
White & Case LLP
75 State Street
Boston, MA 02109-1814
Telephone: (617) 979-9342
Facsimile: (617) 439-6702
Lead Counsel for Petitioner