

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,  
Petitioner,

v.

SANDPIPER CDN, LLC,  
Patent Owner.

---

IPR2026-00095

Patent No. 8,478,903

---

**PETITIONER'S CONDITIONAL MOTION FOR JOINDER UNDER  
35 U.S.C. § 315(C) AND 37 C.F.R. §§42.22 AND 42.122(B)**

## I. STATEMENT OF THE PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED

Petitioner, Microsoft Corporation (“Petitioner” or “Microsoft”) conditionally moves for joinder with the *inter partes* review challenging U.S. Patent No. 8,478,903 (“the ’903 Patent”) in *Google LLC v. Sandpiper CDN LLC*, IPR2025-00969 (“the Google IPR”), filed May 9, 2025. In that IPR, on October 10, 2025, the Director’s designee denied Patent Owner’s request for discretionary denial and referred the Petition to the Board. *See id.*, Paper 13. The Board’s institution decision is due no later than December 16, 2025. This motion is timely filed because it is filed before that institution decision. 37 C.F.R. § 42.122(b) (“no later than one month after the institution date of any inter partes review for which joinder is requested.”).

**Petitioner’s motion for joinder is conditioned on Google’s IPR being instituted and still pending at the time of institution of this IPR.<sup>1</sup>**

Petitioner has conferred with Google, and Google does not oppose this Motion for Joinder. The instant Petition is substantially the same as the Google IPR petition: it involves the same patent, same claims, same grounds of unpatentability, and the

---

<sup>1</sup> For example, if the Google IPR were terminated due to settlement either before or after an institution decision and prior to this motion (and institution of this IPR) being ruled upon by the Board, the Petition in this IPR should be addressed without joinder.

same evidence (including the same prior art combinations supported by the same expert declaration) as the Google IPR. If joined, Petitioner will assume a “silent understudy” role and will not take an active role in the *inter partes* review proceeding unless the Google Petitioner ceases to participate in the instituted IPR. Thus, the proposed joinder will neither unduly complicate the Google IPR nor delay its schedule. Moreover, **Petitioner is not time-barred or estopped in any manner from filing its own separate petition**, but is requesting joinder with the Google IPR in the interest of judicial efficiency, to timely resolve the issue of patentability of the '903 Patent, and to avoid potential inconsistencies between distinct IPR proceedings. As such, joinder will promote judicial efficiency in determining patentability in the Google IPR without prejudice to Patent Owner.

## **II. BACKGROUND**

Sandpiper CDN, LLC (“Sandpiper”) is the purported owner of the '903 Patent. Sandpiper asserted the '903 patent against each of Google and Petitioner in two separate actions: *Sandpiper CDN, LLC v. Google LLC*, No. 2:24-cv-03951 (N.D. Cal., May 10, 2024) and *Sandpiper CDN, LLC v. Microsoft Corp.*, No. 2-25-cv-00664 (E.D. Tex., June 26, 2025). Petitioner was served with the complaint for Case No. 2-25-cv-00664 on July 1, 2025, and therefore, Petitioner is not time-barred under 35 U.S.C. § 315(b) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.101(b). EX1017. The Google IPR is

the only post-grant proceeding that has been filed challenging claims of the '903 Patent.

### **III. STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR RELIEF REQUESTED**

#### **A. Legal Standard**

The Leahy-Smith America Invents Act (AIA) permits joinder of *inter partes* review (IPR) proceedings. Joinder is governed by 35 U.S.C. § 315(c), which states:

(c) JOINDER. – If the Director institutes an inter partes review, the Director, in his or her discretion, may join as a party to that inter partes review any person who properly files a petition under section 311 that the Director, after receiving a preliminary response under section 313 or the expiration of the time for filing such a response, determines warrants the institution of an inter partes review under section 314.

The AIA's legislative history makes clear that joinder is to be liberally granted. 157 Cong. Rec. S1376 (daily ed. Mar. 8, 2011) (statement of Sen. Kyl).

A motion for joinder should “(1) set forth the reasons why joinder is appropriate; (2) identify any new grounds of unpatentability asserted in the petition; (3) explain what impact (if any) joinder would have on the trial schedule for the existing review; and (4) address specifically how briefing and discovery may be simplified.” *Dell Inc. v. Network-1 Sec. Solutions, Inc.*, IPR2013-00385, Paper 17 (July 29, 2013); *Hyundai Motor Co. v. Am. Vehicular Scis. LLC*, IPR2014-01543, Paper 11, at 3 (Oct. 24, 2014); *Macronix Int'l Co. v. Spansion LLC*, IPR2014-00898,

Paper 15, at 4 (Aug. 13, 2014) (quoting *Kyocera Corp. v. Softview LLC*, IPR2013-00004, Paper 15, at 4 (April 24, 2013)).

**B. Microsoft’s Motion for Joinder is Timely**

A motion for joinder is timely if the moving party files no later than one month of institution of the *inter partes* review for which joinder is requested. 37 C.F.R. § 42.122(b). Because Petitioner files this motion before a decision on the institution in the Google IPR (which is no later than one month after such a decision), this motion is timely.

**C. Joinder is Appropriate**

Petitioner respectfully submits that joinder with the Google IPR would be appropriate. Microsoft’s Petition does not raise any new grounds of unpatentability and does “not present new issues that might complicate or delay” the Google IPR. *See Enzymotec Ltd. v. Neptune Techs & Bioresources, Inc.*, IPR2014-00556, Paper 19, at 5 (July 9, 2014). Microsoft’s Petition is substantially identical to the petition in the Google IPR, challenging the same claims of the ’903 Patent on the same grounds and relying on the same expert testimony. The only difference between Microsoft’s Petition and the petition filed in the Google IPR are the removal of sections addressing discretionary denial (including § 325(d) and *Fintiv* (35 U.S.C. § 314(a))) and appropriate updates to the Mandatory Notices.

By joinder, a single Board decision may dispose of the issues raised in the Google IPR for all interested parties. **Petitioner Microsoft will not file a separate IPR petition on the '903 Patent if the instant joinder request is granted.**

Joinder would have little, if any, impact on the Google IPR: the schedule would not be affected, no additional briefing or discovery would be required, and no additional burdens would be placed on any party or the PTAB, as detailed below. In fact, joinder will help efficiently resolve the disputes among the parties.

**1. Petitioner Will Not File a Separate IPR Petition if Its Copycat Petition is Granted**

Although Petitioner is not time-barred or otherwise estopped from filing its own IPR petition, Petitioner will not file another IPR petition challenging the '903 Patent if its copy-cat IPR Petition (IPR2026-00095) is granted and the proceeding is joined with the Google IPR. This will not only enhance judicial efficiency, but also reduce burden on the Patent Owner by determining the patentability of the challenged claims in a single proceeding.

**2. No New Grounds of Unpatentability in the Petition**

Microsoft's Petition does not assert any new grounds of unpatentability. It challenges the same claims (1, 2, 22-24, and 26-46) of the '903 Patent based on the same arguments and analysis, prior art, evidence (including expert declaration), and four grounds of unpatentability as the Google IPR. *See, e.g., Hyundai*, IPR2014-01543, Paper 11, at 2-4; *Dell*, IPR2013-00385, Paper 17, at 6-10.

### **3. No Impact on the Schedule for the Existing IPR Proceeding**

Because Microsoft's Petition raises no new grounds of unpatentability, and because a Scheduling Order for the Google IPR is not expected until December, joinder should have no impact on the schedule of the Google IPR. *See Sony Corp. v. Memory Integrity, LLC*, IPR2015-01353, Paper 11, at 6 (Oct. 15, 2015) (granting IPR and motion for joinder where "joinder should not necessitate any additional briefing or discovery from Patent Owner beyond that already required in [the original IPR]"). If joinder is granted, Petitioner will adhere to all applicable deadlines set in the Scheduling Order for the Google IPR.

As discussed further below, Petitioner is willing to limit its participation in this proceeding to a "silent understudy." In the event that the Google IPR is terminated with respect to the Google Petitioner, only then does Petitioner intend to "step into the shoes" of the dismissed petitioner and materially participate in the joined proceedings. Accordingly, for the reasons stated above, joinder of Petitioner to the Google IPR will not affect the Board's ability to complete its review and final decision within the statutory time limits under 35 U.S.C. § 316(a)(11) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.100(c).

#### **4. Briefing and Discovery Will Be Simplified**

As a “silent understudy,” Petitioner agrees that, if joined, the following conditions will apply so long as Google remains an active party, as previously approved by the Board in other joinder circumstances:

(a) All filings by Petitioner in the joined proceeding be consolidated with the filings of Google, unless a filing solely concerns issues that do not involve Google;

(b) Petitioner shall not be permitted to raise any new grounds not instituted by the Board in the Google IPR, or introduce any argument not already introduced by Google;

(c) With regard to taking of testimony, Petitioner will abide by 37 C.F.R. § 42.53 or any agreement between the Patent Owner and Google. *See Mylan Pharms. Inc. v. Novartis AG*, IPR2015-00268, Paper 17, at 5-6 (Apr. 10, 2015) (finding the same proposed limitations “are consistent with the ‘understudy’ role that Petitioner agrees to assume, as well as Petitioner’s assertion that its presence would not require introducing any additional arguments, briefing or discovery”). Petitioner also is willing to abide by any additional conditions the Board deems appropriate.

#### **5. No Prejudice to Patent Owner**

Joinder of Petitioner to the Google IPR will not create any additional burden on Patent Owner. Patent Owner need not expend any additional resources above and beyond those required in the current Google IPR.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Petitioner respectfully requests that **if, and only if**, Google's IPR has been instituted and is still pending at the time of institution of this IPR, then Microsoft's Petition for *inter partes* review of the '903 Patent (IPR2026-00095) be joined with the Google IPR (IPR2025-00969).

Respectfully submitted,

*/ Jessica Kaiser /*

Jessica Kaiser  
Reg. No. 58,937  
Attorney for Petitioner

Dated: November 3, 2025

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on October 3, 2025 true and correct copies of the foregoing **PETITIONER’S MOTION FOR JOINDER UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 315(C) AND 37 C.F.R. §§42.22 AND 42.122(B)**, I caused to be served a true and correct copy of the foregoing and any accompanying exhibits by FedEx on the following counsel:

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.  
1101 K Street, NW  
10th Floor  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

A courtesy copy was also sent via electronic mail to Patent Owner’s litigation counsel listed below:

Andrea Leigh Fair - andrea@millerfairhenry.com  
Carolyn E Drell - cdrell@bsfllp.com  
Garrett C. Parish - garrett@millerfairhenry.com  
Mark D. Schafer - mschafer@bsfllp.com  
Philip Eckert - peckert@bsfllp.com  
Ryan D. Dykal - rdykal@bsfllp.com

Respectfully submitted,  
*/ Jessica Kaiser /*

Jessica Kaiser  
Reg. No. 58,937  
Attorney for Petitioner

Dated: November 3, 2025