

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

FUJITSU SEMICONDUCTOR LIMITED, FUJITSU SEMICONDUCTOR AMERICA, INC., ADVANCED MICRO DEVICES, INC., RENESAS ELECTRONICS CORPORATION, RENESAS ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., GLOBAL FOUNDRIES U.S., INC., GLOBALFOUNDRIES DRESDEN MODULE ONE LLC & CO. KG, GLOBALFOUNDRIES DRESDEN MODULE TWO LLC & CO. KG, TOSHIBA AMERICA ELECTRONIC COMPONENTS, INC., TOSHIBA AMERICA INC., TOSHIBA AMERICA INFORMATION SYSTEMS, INC., TOSHIBA CORPORATION, and THE GILLETTE COMPANY,  
Petitioner,

v.

ZOND, LLC,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2014-00781  
Patent 7,147,759 B2<sup>1</sup>

---

Before KEVIN F. TURNER, DEBRA K. STEPHENS, JONI Y. CHANG, SUSAN L.C. MITCHELL, and JENNIFER M. MEYER,  
*Administrative Patent Judges.*

CHANG, *Administrative Patent Judge.*

ORDER  
Granting Petitioner's Request for a Ten-Page Extension  
*37 C.F.R. §§ 42.5 and 42.24*

---

<sup>1</sup> Because this Order addresses the same issue in the proceedings listed in the Appendix, we enter this Order in this case as representative.

A conference call was held on April 13, 2015, between respective counsel for the parties and Judges Turner, Stephens, Chang, Mitchell, and Meyer. During the conference call, Petitioner requested an additional ten (10) pages for its Reply to Patent Owner’s Response—a total of twenty-five (25) pages for a Reply—consistent with the United States Patent and Trademark Office Director Michelle K. Lee’s Posting on March 27, 2015 (Ex. 3001<sup>2</sup>, “the Director’s Posting”), for each proceeding listed in the Appendix.

Patent Owner opposed Petitioner’s Request, arguing that no additional pages would be necessary, because Petitioner filed multiple Petitions challenging each of its patents, the *inter partes* reviews at issue involve overlapping issues, and Petitioner also may file a Response to Observation in each proceeding. As noted by Petitioner, however, each *inter partes* review involves different claims, addressing different substantive issues. We also observed that Petitioner may file a Response to a Motion for Observation, *only if* Patent Owner files a Motion for Observation, and Petitioner’s Response to the Motion for Observation is limited to the issues raised in the Motion. Moreover, as indicated in the Director’s Posting, fifteen (15) pages for a Reply is not a commensurate number of pages to respond to a sixty-page (60) Patent Owner’s Response. Upon consideration

---

<sup>2</sup> The Director’s Posting is also available at:  
[http://www.uspto.gov/blog/director/entry/ptab\\_s\\_quick\\_fixes\\_for](http://www.uspto.gov/blog/director/entry/ptab_s_quick_fixes_for)

IPR2014-00781  
Patent 7,147,759 B2

of the facts before us, we are not persuaded by Patent Owner's argument that a ten-page extension is not necessary.

For the foregoing reasons, we, hereby, exercising our discretion under 37 C.F.R. § 42.5(b), grant Petitioner's Request for a ten-page extension, consistent with the Director's Posting.

Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that, notwithstanding the page limit set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 42.24(c), the page limit for Petitioner's Reply to Patent Owner's Response is increased to a total of twenty-five (25) pages, for each proceeding listed in the Appendix of this Order. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.5(b).

**APPENDIX**

<b>U.S. Patent Numbers</b>	<b><i>Inter Partes</i> Reviews</b>
6,805,779 B2	IPR2014-00828 IPR2014-00829 IPR2014-00917 IPR2014-01073 IPR2014-01076
6,806,652 B1	IPR2014-00861 IPR2014-01088 IPR2014-01089
6,853,142 B2	IPR2014-00818 IPR2014-00819 IPR2014-00821 IPR2014-00827 IPR2014-01098
7,147,759 B2	IPR2014-00781 IPR2014-00782 IPR2014-01083 IPR2014-01086 IPR2014-01087
7,604,716 B2	IPR2014-00807 IPR2014-00808 IPR2014-01099 IPR2014-01100
7,811,421 B2	IPR2014-00800 IPR2014-00802 IPR2014-00805

IPR2014-00781  
Patent 7,147,759 B2

For PATENT OWNER:

Gregory J. Gonsalves  
[gonsalves@gonsalveslawfirm.com](mailto:gonsalves@gonsalveslawfirm.com)

Bruce J. Barker  
[bbarker@chsblaw.com](mailto:bbarker@chsblaw.com)

Tarek Fahmi  
[tarek.fahmi@ascendalaw.com](mailto:tarek.fahmi@ascendalaw.com)

For PETITIONER:

*Fujitsu:*

David M. O'Dell  
[david.odell.ipr@haynesboone.com](mailto:david.odell.ipr@haynesboone.com)

David L. McCombs  
[david.mccombs.ipr@haynesboone.com](mailto:david.mccombs.ipr@haynesboone.com)

Richard C. Kim  
[rckim@duanemorris.com](mailto:rckim@duanemorris.com)

*GlobalFoundries:*

David M. Tennant  
[dtennant@whitecase.com](mailto:dtennant@whitecase.com)

Dohm Chankong  
[dohm.chankong@whitecase.com](mailto:dohm.chankong@whitecase.com)

*Gillette:*

David L. Cavanaugh  
[david.cavanaugh@wilmerhale.com](mailto:david.cavanaugh@wilmerhale.com)

Larissa B. Park  
[larissa.park@wilmerhale.com](mailto:larissa.park@wilmerhale.com)

IPR2014-00781  
Patent 7,147,759 B2

*AMD:*

Brian M. Berliner  
[bberliner@omm.com](mailto:bberliner@omm.com)

Ryan K. Yagura  
[ryagura@omm.com](mailto:ryagura@omm.com)

Xin-Yi Zhou  
[vzhou@omm.com](mailto:vzhou@omm.com)

*Toshiba:*

Robinson Vu  
[robinson.vu@bakerbotts.com](mailto:robinson.vu@bakerbotts.com)

*Renesas:*

John J. Feldhaus  
[jfeldhaus@foley.com](mailto:jfeldhaus@foley.com)

Pavan K. Agarwal  
[pagarwal@foley.com](mailto:pagarwal@foley.com)

Michael R. Houston  
[mhouston@foley.com](mailto:mhouston@foley.com)