

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SONY ELECTRONICS INC. and LG ELECTRONICS INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

JAWBONE INNOVATIONS, LLC,
Patent Owner.

IPR2023-01110
IPR2023-01119
Patent 7,246,058 B2

Before GEORGIANNA W. BRADEN, NORMAN H. BEAMER, and
JASON M. REPKO, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

BRADEN, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

ORDER
Consolidation of Proceedings
35 U.S.C. § 315(d); 37 C.F.R. § 42.122(a)

IPR2023-01110
IPR2023-01119
Patent 7,246,058 B2

In separate decisions, the Board instituted *inter partes* review in the above-listed proceedings. *See* IPR2023-01110, Paper 10 (PTAB Jan. 8, 2024); IPR2023-01119, Paper 12 (PTAB Jan. 10, 2024). The proceedings involve the same patent, same prior art, and largely the same arguments. Sony Electronics, Inc. (“Sony”) and LG Electronics, Inc. (“LG”) are Petitioners in the above-listed proceedings.

The Petitioners challenge the same patent and rely on the same prior art and arguments. In fact, each petition was accompanied by a motion for joinder arguing that joinder was proper because the asserted challenges to patentability were substantively identical to those presented in IPR2023-00222, the proceeding sought to be joined. *See* IPR2023-01110, Paper 3 at 5; IPR2023-01119, Paper 3 at 5.¹

In the scheduling order for IPR2023-01110, we directed the parties “to contact the Board within a month of this Order to discuss consolidation and coordination among the petitioners in IPR2023-01110 and IPR2023-01119.” IPR2023-01110, Paper 11, 2 (emphasis removed). Both proceedings follow the same schedule. *See* IPR2023-01110, Paper 11; IPR2023-01119, Paper 13. On January 28, 2024, the parties in the proceedings contacted the Board via email regarding a plan for consolidation. *See* Ex. 3001. The parties indicated they have met and conferred about the consolidation and coordination of these proceedings and have agreed on the following proposal:

¹ The Board denied each motion for joinder as moot because IPR2023-00222 terminated. *See* IPR2023-01110, Paper 10; IPR2023-01119, Paper 12.

- (1) Sony's (IPR2023-01119) and LGE's (IPR2023-01110) IPR proceedings should be consolidated;
- (2) Sony will take the "lead" role; and
- (3) LG will take an "understudy" role.

Id.

We find the joint Consolidation Plan submitted by the parties reasonable and fair. Thus, to secure a just, speedy, and inexpensive resolution to the proceedings, and to administer the proceedings efficiently, we exercise our authority to consolidate IPR2023-01110 with IPR2023-01119. *See* 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.1(b), 42.122(a).

The Consolidation Plan does not expressly define the scope of the understudy role. Petitioner Sony, though, agreed to an understudy role defined in its Motion for Joinder. IPR2023-01119, Paper 3 at 6. Likewise, Petitioner LG agreed to a similar understudy role in its motion. *See* IPR2023-01110, Paper 3 at 5–6.

We define the understudy role consistent with the agreed upon roles from the motions for joinder. That is, for the Consolidated Proceeding, we define the understudy role such that (1) Sony alone is responsible for all petitioner filings in the consolidated proceeding until such time that it is no longer an entity in the proceeding, (2) understudy Petitioner LG is bound by all filings by Sony in the Consolidated Proceeding, except for termination or settlement filings and filings in which the understudy petitioner receives permission to file an independent paper, (3) LG shall not be permitted to raise any new grounds not already instituted by the Board in the Consolidated Proceeding and may not introduce any argument or discovery

IPR2023-01110
IPR2023-01119
Patent 7,246,058 B2

not already not already introduced by Sony, (4) LG shall be bound by any agreement between Patent Owner and Sony concerning discovery and/or depositions, and (5) LG at deposition shall not receive any direct, cross-examination, or redirect time beyond that permitted for Sony alone under either 37 C.F.R. § 42.53 or any agreement between Patent Owner and Sony. LG must obtain prior Board authorization to file any paper or to take any action on their own in the Consolidated Proceeding, as long as Sony remains as a non-terminated petitioner.

LG must file its petition (IPR2023-01110, Paper 2) in the Consolidated Proceeding within ten (10) business days of the entry of this Order. In their email, Petitioners appear to indicate that their petitions are substantively similar versus “Meta’s IPR petition (IPR2023-01352), which is based on different grounds and relies upon the declaration of a different expert (Dr. Anderson) than the expert declaration (Dr. Stern) submitted with Sony’s and LGE’s petitions.” *See* Ex. 3001; IPR2023-01110, Paper 2; IPR2023-01119, Paper 2. Therefore, for clarity of the record, the parties must at least cite to the Petition in IPR2023-01119 when discussing the asserted challenges to patentability in their briefing. Additional citations to the other petition are permitted if helpful or necessary.

ORDER

It is

ORDERED that IPR2023-01110 is consolidated with IPR2023-01119;

FURTHER ORDERED that all future filings in the Consolidated Proceeding are to be made only in IPR2023-01119;

IPR2023-01110
IPR2023-01119
Patent 7,246,058 B2

FURTHER ORDERED that Petitioners from the proceedings will collectively be a joint Petitioner's group led by counsel for Sony;

FURTHER ORDERED that LG will take an understudy role, as defined in this Order;

FURTHER ORDERED that the Consolidated Proceeding will be on all asserted challenges to patentability presented in IPR2023-01110 and IPR2023-01119;

FURTHER ORDERED that, in future briefing, citations to the asserted challenges to patentability must be to the petition in IPR2023-01119;

FURTHER ORDERED that the case caption in IPR2023-01110 is changed to reflect its consolidation with IPR2023-01119 (sample caption appended to this Order); and

FURTHER ORDERED that, within ten (10) business days from the entry of this Order, LG must file, in IPR2024-01119, (1) its Petition from IPR2023-01110 and (2) a new Power of Attorney for the Consolidated Proceeding.

IPR2023-01110
IPR2023-01119
Patent 7,246,058 B2

For PETITIONER:

Gregory S. Gewirtz
Russell W. Faegenburg
Orville R. Cockings
LERNER DAVID LLP
ggewirtz@lernerdavid.com
rfaegenburg@lernerdavid.com
ocockings@lernerdavid.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

Peter Lambrianakos
Vincent Rubino
Enrique Iturralde
Richard Cowell
Jacob Ostling
FABRICANT LLP
plambrianakos@fabricantllp.com
vrubino@fabricantllp.com
eiturralde@fabricantllp.com
rcowell@fabricantllp.com
jostling@fabricantllp.com

IPR2023-01110
IPR2023-01119
Patent 7,246,058 B2

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SONY ELECTRONICS INC. and LG ELECTRONICS INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

JAWBONE INNOVATIONS, LLC,
Patent Owner.

IPR2023-01119
Patent 8,467,543 B2

Before GEORGIANNA W. BRADEN, NORMAN H. BEAMER, and
JASON M. REPKO, *Administrative Patent Judges*.