UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

GOOGLE LLC,
Petitioner,

v.

SOUNDCLEAR TECHNOLOGIES LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case No. IPR2025-01597
U.S. Patent No. 11,069,337

MOTION FOR JOINDER TO *INTER PARTES* REVIEW

I. STATEMENT OF THE PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED

Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 315(c) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.122(b), Google LLC ("Petitioner") moves for joinder with the *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent 11,069,337 ("the '337 patent"), *Amazon.com, Inc., Amazon.com Services LLC, and Amazon Web Services, Inc., v. SoundClear Technologies LLC*, IPR2025-00565 ("the Amazon IPR"), which has been instituted on August 27, 2025. IPR2025-00565, Paper 12.

Petitioner requests institution of its Petition for *Inter Partes* Review. Petitioner submits that the request for joinder is consistent with the policy objectives surrounding inter partes reviews, as it is the most expedient way "to secure the just, speedy, and inexpensive resolution of every proceeding." *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.1(b); *see also HTC v. Parthenon Unified Memory Architecture LLC*, IPR2017-00512, Paper 12 at 5-6 (June 1, 2017). The present Petition and the Amazon IPR Petition are substantively identical with respect to the asserted grounds and supporting evidence.

Further, if joined to the Amazon IPR, Petitioner agrees to act as an "understudy" and will not assume a lead role unless Amazon is no longer a party to the proceeding or, otherwise, does not advance arguments for one or more claims or grounds. Accordingly, the proposed joinder will not unduly complicate the Amazon IPR nor adversely impact its schedule. As such, the requested joinder will promote

judicial efficiency in determining the patentability of the ’337 patent without prejudice to Patent Owner. Thus, the Petition warrants institution under 35 U.S.C. § 314, and 35 U.S.C. § 315(c) permits Petitioner’s joinder to the Amazon IPR.

II. BACKGROUND AND RELATED PROCEEDINGS

SoundClear Technologies LLC (“the Patent Owner” or “SoundClear”) is the owner of the ’337 patent. On July 25, 2024, SoundClear asserted the ’337 patent against Google in *SoundClear Technologies LLC v. Google LLC*, 3:24-cv-00540 (E.D. Va.).[1] On June 12, 2025, Google filed an IPR petition, IPR2025-01123, against the ’337 patent. Coinciding with the filing of this motion for joinder, Google will request withdrawal of its IPR2025-01123 petition.

Also on July 25, 2024, SoundClear asserted the ’337 patent against Amazon in *SoundClear Technologies LLC v. Amazon.com, Inc. et al.*, 1:24-cv-01283 (E.D. Va.). Separately, on January 31, 2025, Amazon filed its IPR petition, IPR2025-00565, against the ’337 patent. On August 27, 2025, the Board granted institution on the Amazon IPR. *Amazon.com, Inc., et al. v. SoundClear Technologies*

[1] SoundClear filed its original complaint with the Alexandria Division (Case 1:24-cv-01281), but the Court *sua sponte* transferred the case intradistrict to the Richmond Division where it became redesignated as Case Number 3:24-cv-540.

LLC, IPR2025-00565, Paper 12 (August 27, 2025). Petitioner timely moves for joinder with the Amazon IPR.

III. REASONS FOR REQUESTED RELIEF

A. Legal Standard

The Board may grant a motion for joining an *inter partes* review petition with another *inter partes* review proceeding. 35 U.S.C. § 315(c); *see also Sony Mobile Comms. AB v. Ancora Technologies, Inc.*, IPR2021-00663, Paper 17 at 29-33 (P.T.A.B. June 10, 2021) ("*Sony*"). A petitioner may request joinder up to one month after the institution date of the proceeding to which joinder is requested, without prior authorization. 37 C.F.R. § 42.122(b). The Board, in determining whether to exercise its discretion to grant joinder, considers whether the joinder motion: (1) sets forth the reasons why joinder is appropriate; (2) identifies any new grounds of unpatentability asserted in the petition; (3) explains what impact (if any) joinder would have on the trial schedule for the existing review; and (4) addresses specifically how briefing and discovery may be simplified. *Central Security Group – Nationwide, Inc. d/b/a Alert360 v. Ubiquitous Connectivity, LP*, IPR2019-01610, Paper 12 at 6.

B. Petitioner's Motion for Joinder is Timely

Joinder may be requested "no later than one month after the institution date of any *inter partes* review for which joinder is requested." 37 C.F.R. § 42.122(b). The Amazon IPR was instituted on August 27, 2025. Petitioner's motion for joinder

is timely because it is being filed within one month after the instituted date. 37 C.F.R. § 1.7(a).

C. The Four Factors Favor Joinder

Each of the four factors weighs in favor of granting Petitioner's Motion for Joinder. The Petition here is substantively identical to the petition in the Amazon IPR. It presents no new grounds of unpatentability, and it relies on the same prior art. Joinder will have no impact on the schedule of the Amazon IPR. Moreover, briefing and discovery will be simplified by resolving all issues in a single proceeding.

1. Joinder Will Promote an Efficient Determination of the Validity of the '337 patent Without Prejudice to Any Party

The Board "routinely grants motions for joinder where the party seeking joinder introduces identical arguments and the same grounds raised in the existing proceeding." *Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd. v. Raytheon Co.*, IPR2016-00962, Paper 12 at 9 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 24, 2016) (internal quotations and citations omitted); *see Sony*, Paper 17 at 31. Here, joinder with the Amazon IPR is appropriate because Petitioner asserts the same unpatentability arguments and the same grounds in its Petition as those raised in the Amazon IPR. Both petitions contain identical grounds based on the same prior art combinations against the same claims. Petitioner also relies on substantially the same supporting evidence in its Petition as is relied on in the Amazon IPR. Thus, the Petition and the Amazon IPR involve identical grounds and

substantially the same arguments and evidence. Accordingly, if joinder is granted, the validity of the grounds raised in the Amazon IPR and the Petition here can be determined in a single proceeding. Because these proceedings introduce substantially identical unpatentability arguments and the same grounds, good cause exists for joinder, so that the Board, consistent with 37 C.F.R. § 42.1(b), can efficiently "secure the just, speedy, and inexpensive resolution" of the Petition and the Amazon IPR.

2. Joinder Will Not Add Any New Grounds of Unpatentability

The Petition is based on the same grounds and combinations of prior art that the Board considered in deciding to institute the Amazon IPR. Petitioner's supporting materials are substantially identical to those presented in the Amazon IPR. As a condition of joinder, Petitioner agrees to proceed based on Amazon's expert declaration and petition. Petitioner does not seek to introduce grounds or claims not in the Amazon IPR and seeks only to join the proceeding as instituted. Patent Owner should not require any discovery beyond that which it may need in the Amazon IPR, nor should the Board permit any. The Petition introduces no new substantive issues relative to the Amazon IPR and does not seek to broaden the scope of the Amazon IPR. *See Sony Corp. v. Memory Integrity*, LLC, IPR2015-01353, Paper 11 at 5-6 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 5, 2015) ("*Memory*") (granting motion for joinder

where petitioners relied "on the same prior art, same arguments, and same evidence, including the same expert and a substantively identical declaration").

3. Joinder Will Not Affect the Schedule in the Amazon IPR

Joinder will not impact the Amazon IPR trial schedule because the present Petition presents no new issues or grounds of unpatentability. *See Memory*, IPR2015-01353, Paper 11 at 6 (instituting IPR and granting motion for joinder where "joinder should not necessitate any additional briefing or discovery from Patent Owner beyond that already required in [the original IPR]"). Further, Petitioner consents to any trial schedule adopted in the Amazon IPR. There are no new issues for the Board to address and Patent Owner will not be required to present any additional evidence or argument. The Patent Owner's Response, if any, will also not be negatively impacted because the substantive issues presented in the Petition are identical to the issues presented in the Amazon IPR. Patent Owner will not be required to provide any additional analysis or argument beyond what it will already provide in the Amazon IPR. Accordingly, joinder with the Amazon IPR should not unduly burden or negatively impact any trial schedule.

4. Joinder Will Simplify Briefing Because Petitioner Agrees to Consolidated Filings and to Participate in an Understudy Role if Amazon Remains

Petitioner agrees to take an "understudy" role in a joined proceeding, which will simplify briefing and discovery. For efficiency's sake, Petitioner will:

1. Adhere to all applicable deadlines in the Amazon IPR;
2. Submit "consolidated" filings with the Amazon, as set forth above in the statement of precise relief requested;
3. Refrain from requesting or reserving any additional depositions or deposition time;
4. Refrain from requesting or reserving additional oral hearing time; and
5. Assume a second-chair role as long as Amazon remains in the proceeding.[2]

See, e.g., *HTC Corp. v. Uniloc 2017 LLC*, IPR2018-01631, Paper 9 at 7 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 25, 2019) (agreeing to "second-chair" role and other procedural concessions, such as "consolidated" responses); *Enzymotech Ltd. v. Neptune Techs.*, IPR2014-00556, Paper 19 (P.T.A.B. July 9, 2014) (agreeing to similar procedural concessions); *Gillette Co. v. Zond*, IPR2014-01016, Paper 13 (P.T.A.B. Nov. 10, 2014) (same). By Petitioner accepting an "understudy" role, the parties can comply with the trial schedule assigned to the Amazon IPR without any duplicative efforts by the Board or Patent Owner. These steps minimize the possibility of any

[2] For clarity, should Amazon's participation in the Amazon IPR terminate, Petitioner would take over primary responsibility for subsequent filings and discovery.

complication or delay from joinder. *See Memory*, IPR2015-01353, Paper 11 at 6-7. Joinder will further simplify briefing because Patent Owner will no longer be burdened with preparing this response.

5. Joinder Will Not Prejudice Patent Owner

As noted above, Petitioner's joinder in the Amazon IPR proceeding will not result in any prejudice to Patent Owner. No additional grounds or arguments are being introduced; no issues are being added; and no additional discovery, briefing, or oral argument should be necessary because of Petitioner's joinder. Rather than prejudice Patent Owner, joinder would beneficially allow Patent Owner to litigate the same patentability issues with both Amazon and Petitioner efficiently and in a coordinated manner. Thus, joinder is in the interest of not only the Board and Petitioner, but also Patent Owner.

IV. CONCLUSION

Petitioner's requested joinder will not affect the substance, procedure, or scheduling of the Amazon IPR. Petitioner files this motion under the statutory joinder provisions as contemplated by the AIA. Joinder will simplify the issues and promote efficiency, justice, and speed. Petitioner thus respectfully requests *inter partes* review of the '337 patent and joinder with the Amazon IPR.

Dated: September 29, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

/Erika H. Arner/

Erika H. Arner
Lead Counsel
Reg. No. 57,540

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that a copy of the foregoing **PETITIONER'S MOTION FOR JOINDER** was served on September 29, 2025, via USPS Priority Mail Express on the correspondence address of record indicated in the Patent Office's Patent Center system for U.S. Patent No. 11,069,337.

DAIGNAULT IYER LLP
8229 Boone Boulevard
Suite 450
Vienna, VA 22182

A courtesy copy is also being sent via email to Patent Owner's counsel in *Google LLC v. SoundClear Technologies LLC*, IPR2025-01123:

DI-SoundClear@daignaultiyer.com

Steven J. Reynolds
Email: sreynolds@daignaultiyer.com

Kevin H. Sprenger
Email: ksprenger@daignaultiyer.com

Chandran B. Iyer
Email: cbiyer@daignaultiyer.com

Erin Hadi
Email: ehadi@daignaultiyer.com

Louay Meroueh
Email: lmeroueh@daignaultiyer.com

Dated: September 29, 2025

By: /Lisa C. Hines/
Lisa C. Hines
Case Manager
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, LLP