1		HONORABLE MARSHA J. PECHMAN	
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
9	WESTERN DISTRIC	T OF WASHINGTON	
10	AT SEATTLE		
11			
12	INTERVAL LICENSING LLC,	Case No. No. 2:10-cv-01385-MJP	
13	Plaintiff,	FACEBOOK'S JOINDER IN DEFENDANTS	
14	v.	GOOGLE INC. AND YOUTUBE, LLC'S Reply in Support of Their Motion to	
15	AOL, INC., et al.,	DISMISS OR SEVER FOR MISJOINDER PURSUANT TO FED. R. CIV. P. 20 AND 21	
16	Defendants.	NOTED ON MOTION CALENDAR: November 12, 2010	
17		Oral Argument Requested	
18			
19	Defendent Feesbook Ing. ("Feesbook") #	aspectfully ising in Defendents Coople Inc. and	
20	Defendant Facebook Inc. ("Facebook") respectfully joins in Defendants Google Inc. and		
21	YouTube, LLC's Reply in Support of Their Motion to Dismiss or Sever for Misjoinder Pursuant		
22	to Fed. R. Civ. P. 20, submitted concurrently with this joinder.		
23	I. ARGUMENT		
24	Interval Licensing LLC's ("Interval") actions so far in this litigation severely undermine		
25	its unsupported statements regarding the similarity of the defendants' products and its		
26	infringement claims. The only commonality Interval can identify among the defendants is that:		
27	(1) they operate websites; and (2) they are all accusing of infringing one or more of the asserted		
28	patents. By suing different defendants on different		
	FACEBOOK, INC.'S JOINDER IN GOOGLE'S REPLY ISO MOTION TO DISMISS OR SEVER 2:10 -cv-01385-MJP	Cooley LLP 719 Second Ave., Ste. 900 Seattle, WA 98104/(206) 452-8700	

requirements for permissive joinder under Rule 20. Thus, defendants, and in particular Facebook,
 will be prejudiced by joinder in this case.

Interval's Complaint accuses some, but not all, defendants of infringement of three of its
four patents, contradicting its assertion that each of the defendants' websites operate in "nearly
identical fashion" and that the defendants "infringe the same claims of the same patents."

6 (*Compare* Compl., D.I. 1 *with* Opp., D.I. 122 at 2-3.) Instead, Interval chose to assert four patents
7 against only four of the defendants, two patents against ten of the defendants, and to assert only
8 one patent against Facebook – the '682 patent.

9 Interval's illustration of OfficeMax's website's features' alleged infringement of an 10 unspecified claim of the '507 patent actually negates its argument. Interval claims that all eleven 11 defendants infringe the '507 in the same way – yet Interval has not even accused Facebook of 12 infringing the '507 patent. Evidently, even Interval cannot keep its infringement cases against 13 each defendant straight. This example further fails to identify any remaining defendants' specific 14 websites and relevant functionality, depriving the Court of the opportunity to make an informed 15 determination as to the actual similarity between defendants. Nor can defendants adequately 16 respond to this unsupported assertion, as Interval has refused to amend its Complaint to set forth 17 which websites, and which features of those websites, it is accusing of infringement. By refusing 18 to provide information as to specific accused products, Interval has entirely failed to show that its 19 cause of action against at least eleven distinct "websites" actually "aris[e] out of the same 20 transaction, occurrence, or series of transactions or occurrences." Fed. R. Civ. P. 20.

21 Finally, as Facebook has been accused of infringing only one patent, it will be particularly 22 prejudiced should the cases not be severed. As the vast majority of the issues raised in an un-23 severed case will have no relevance to Facebook, this case will be "overwhelmed" by issues not 24 relevant to Facebook. See WIAV Networks, Inc. v. 3COM Corp., No. C 10-03448 WHA, 2010 25 WL 3895047, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 1, 2010). Similarly, Facebook and each of "the accused 26 defendants – who will surely have competing interests and strategies – are also entitled to present 27 individualized assaults on questions of non-infringement, invalidity, and claim construction." Id. 28 at *2.

FACEBOOK, INC.'S JOINDER IN GOOGLE'S REPLY ISO MOTION TO DISMISS OR SEVER 2:10-cv-01385-MJP

1	Much of Interval's argument relies on its	assertion that, because it believes that the yet	
2	unnamed products work in similar ways, claim construction, invalidity, and infringement issues		
3	will also be similar. However, this is not a case	where the parties are accused of infringing the	
4	same industry standard, or of infringing through	use of the same computer software program –	
5	each defendant in this case has different products	and services which it has developed	
6	independently and which are likely to have been	built in, and function in, different ways. While	
7	Interval may wish to face one unified set of arguments in opposition to its positions on		
8	infringement, claim construction, and invalidity, it forsook this opportunity by choosing to sue		
9	eleven distinct, competing defendants on varying	combinations of patents. Although Facebook is	
10	more than willing to work with the other defendants to maximize judicial efficiency, such		
11	efficiency cannot come at the expense of Facebook or any other defendant's ability to fully		
12	defend itself in this litigation. Thus Facebook's motion should be granted.		
13			
14		OOLEY LLP	
15		<i>Christopher B. Durbin</i> ristopher B. Durbin (WSBA #41159)	
16	CO	OOLEY LLP 9 Second Avenue, Suite 900	
17	Se	attle, WA 98104 l: (206) 452-8700	
18	Fa	x: (206) 452-8800	
19		nail: cdurbin@cooley.com	
20	He	chael G. Rhodes (<i>pro hac vice</i>) idi L. Keefe (<i>pro hac vice</i>)	
21		ark R. Weinstein (<i>pro hac vice</i>) risten M.R. Dubois (<i>pro hac vice</i>)	
22	El	zabeth L. Stameshkin (<i>pro hac vice</i>) 75 Hanover St.	
23		lo Alto, CA 94304-1130	
24	Fa		
25	At	torneys for Defendant FACEBOOK, INC.	
26			
27			
28			
	FACEBOOK, INC.'S JOINDER IN GOOGLE'S REPLY ISO MOTION TO DISMISS OR SEVER 2:10-cv-01385-MJP	Cooley LLP 3. 719 Second Ave., Ste. 900 Seattle, WA 98104 /(206) 452-8700	

1	CERTIFICAT	TE OF SERVICE	
2	I hereby certify that on November 12, 2010, I electronically filed the following		
3	document(s): FACEBOOK'S JOINDER IN DEFENDANTS GOOGLE INC. AND YOUTUBE, LLC'S		
4	REPLY IN SUPPORT OF THEIR MOTION TO DISMISS OR SEVER FOR MISJOINDER PURSUANT TO		
5	FED. R. CIV. P. 20 AND 21 with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system, which will send		
6	an email notification of such filing to the attorn	ey(s) of record listed below.	
7	Justin A. Nelson	By Electronic CM/ECF:	
8	Matthew R. Berry Edgar Guy Sargent	jnelson@susmangodfrey.com	
9	SUSMAN GODFREY	mberry@susmangodfrey.com	
10	1201 Third Avenue, Suite 3800 Seattle, WA 98101	esargent@susmangodfrey.com	
11	Attorneys for Plaintiff Interval Licensing LLC		
12	Eric J. Enger	By Electronic CM/ECF:	
13	Michael F. Heim		
14	Nathan J. Davis	eenger@hpcllp.com	
	HEIM PAYNE & CHORUSH LLP 600 Travis Street, Suite 6710	<u>mheim@hpcllp.com</u> ndavis@hpcllp.com	
15	Houston, TX 77002		
16 17	Attorneys for Plaintiff Interval Licensing LLC		
17 18	Max L. Tribble	By Electronic CM/ECF:	
	SUSMAN GODFREY 1000 Lousiana Street, Suite 5100	mtribble@susmangodfrey.com	
19	Houston, TX 77002	<u>intribule @ susmangourrey.com</u>	
20	Attorneys for Plaintiff Interval Licensing LLC	2	
21		By Electronic CM/ECF:	
22	Cortney S.Alexander	By Electronic CM/ECF:	
23	Gerald F. Ivey Robert L. Burns	<u>cortney.alexander@finnegan.com</u> gerald.ivey@finnegan.com	
24	Elliott C. Cook	robert.burns@finnegan.com	
25	FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP	elliot.cook@finnegan.com	
26	Two Freedom Square 11955 Freedom Drive		
27	Reston, VA 20910		
28			
	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE 1.	Cooley LLP 719 Second Ave., Ste. 900 Seattle, WA 98104/(206) 452-8700	

28		
20 27	Depot, Inc.; and Staples, Inc.	
26	Attorneys for eBay, Inc.; Netflix, Inc.; Office	
25	Seattle, WA 98104	
23 24	TOLLEFSON 999 Third Avenue, Suite 4400	chrisw@dhlt.com
22	Christopher Wion DANIELSON HARRIGAN LEYH &	arthurh@dhlt.com
21 22	Arthur W. Harrigan, Jr.	By Electronic CM/ECF:
20 21	Depot, Inc.; and Staples, Inc.	
19 20	Attorneys for eBay, Inc.; Netflix, Inc.; Office	
18 19	121SW Salmon Street, Suite 1600 Portland, OR 97204	klaus.hamm@klarquist.com
17	Klaus H. Hamm KLARQUIST SPARKMAN	<u>john.vandenberg@klarquist.com</u> <u>kristin.cleveland@klarquist.com</u>
16 17	Kristin L. Cleveland	chris.carraway@klarquist.com
15 16	J. Christopher Carraway John D. Vandenberg	By Electronic CM/ECF:
14 15	Attorneys for Defendant Apple, Inc.	
13	Seattle, WA 98101	
12	YARMUTH WILSDON CALFO PLLC 818 Stewart Street, Suite 1400	jroller@yarmuth.com wilsdon@yarmuth.com
11	Jeremy E. Roller Scott T. Wilsdon	By Electronic CM/ECF:
10	Attorneys for Defendant Apple, Inc.	Dr. Electronic OM/ECE
9		
8	Two Embarcadero Center, 28 th Floor San Francisco, CA 94111	griley@omm.com
7	George A. Riley O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP	dalmeling@omm.com
6	David Almeling	By Electronic CM/ECF:
5	Attorneys for Defendant Apple, Inc.	
4	400 South Hope Street, Suite 1050 Los Angeles, CA 90071	<u>nyan@onini.com</u>
3	O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP	<u>bberliner@omm.com</u> nyan@omm.com
2	Brian M. Berliner Neil L. Yang	By Electronic CM/ECF:
1		

1	4		
1			
2	Aneelah Afzali Scott A.W. Johnson		By Electronic CM/ECF:
3	Shannon M. Jost		aneelah.afzali@stokeslaw.com
3	STOKES LAWRENCE		sawj@stokeslaw.com
4	800 5 th Avenue, Suite 4000 Seattle, WA 98104-3179		shannon.jost@stokeslaw.com
5			
6	Attorneys for Defendants Google, Inc. and YouTube LLC		
7	Dimitrios T. Drivas		By Electronic CM/ECF:
8	John Handy		•
0	Kevin X. McGann		ddrivas@whitecase.com
9	Aaron Chase		jhandy@whitecase.com
10	WHITE & CASE 1155 Avenue of the Americas		kmcgann@whitecase.com
	New York, NY 10036		aaron.chase@whitecase.com
11	1000 1018,111 10050		
12	Attorneys for Defendants Google, Inc. and		
10	YouTube LLC		
13	Warren S. Heit		By Electronic CM/ECE:
14	Warren S. Heit Wendy Schepler		By Electronic CM/ECF:
	WHITE & CASE		wheit@whitecase.com
15	3000 El Camino Real		wschepler@whitecase.com
16	Bldg. 5, 9 th Floor		
	Palo Alto, CA 94306		
17			
18	Attorneys for Defendants Google, Inc. and YouTube LLC		
	YouTube LLC Kevin C. Baumgardner		By Electronic CM/ECF:
19	Steven W. Fogg		By Electronic CW/ECF.
20	CORR CRONIN MICHELSON		kbaumgardner@corrcronin.com
	BAUMGARDNER & PREECE		sfogg@corrcronin.com
21	1001 4 th Avenue, Suite 3900		
22	Seattle, WA 98154		
23	Attorneys for Defendant OfficeMax Inc.		
24	Jeffrey D. Neumeyer OFFICEMAS INCORPORATED		By Electronic CM/ECF:
25	1111 West Jefferson Street		JeffNeumeyer@officemax.com
	P.O. Box 50		<u>Jennedmeyer@ontcentax.com</u>
26	Boise, ID 83728		
27			
28	Attorneys for Defendant OfficeMax Inc.		
20	a a		Cooley
	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE 2:10 -cv-01385-MJP	3.	719 Second Ave., Ste.
			Seattle, WA 98104 / (206) 452-8

1		
2	Douglas S. Rupert John L. Letchinger	By Electronic CM/ECF:
3	WILDMAN, HÄRROLD ALLEN & DIXON	
4	225 West Wacker Drive, Suite 2700 Chicago, IL 60606	letchinger@wildman.com
5	Attorneys for Defendant OfficeMax Inc.	
6	Eric W. Ow	By Electronic CM/ECF:
7	Francis Ho Michael I. Kreeger	eow@mofo.com
8	Michael A. Jacobs	fho@mofo.com
	Richard S. J. Hung	mkreeger@mofo.com
9	MORRISON & FOERSTER 425 Market Street	<u>mjacobs@mofo.com</u> <u>rhung@mofo.com</u>
10	San Francisco, CA 94105	mang e moroteom
11	Attorneys for Defendants Yahoo! Inc.	
12		
13	Mark P. Walters Dario A. Machleidt	By Electronic CM/ECF:
	FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP	dmachleidt@flhlaw.com
14	1191 Second Avenue	mwalters@flhlaw.com
15	Seattle, WA 98101 Attorneys for Defendants Yahoo! Inc.	
16		
17		
18		/s/Christopher B. Durbin
19		Christopher B. Durbin (WSBA #41159)
		COOLEY LLP 719 Second Avenue, Suite 900
20		Seattle, WA 98104-1732
21		Telephone: (262) 452-8700 Facsimile: (262) 452-8800
22		Email: cdurbin@cooley.com
23		Attorneys for Defendant
24		FACEOOK, INC.
25		
26		
27		
28		
	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE 2:10 -cv-01385-MJP	COOLEY 4. 719 Second Ave., Ste Seattle, WA 98104 / (206) 452-8