

**Appeal No. 2019-1464**

---

---

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FEDERAL CIRCUIT**

---

---

ALACRITECH, INC.,

*Appellant,*

v.

INTEL CORPORATION, CAVIUM, LLC, DELL INC.,

*Appellees,*

UNITED STATES,

*Intervenor.*

---

---

**Appeal from the United States Patent and Trademark Office,  
Patent Trial and Appeal Board  
IPR2017-01393**

---

---

**APPELLEES INTEL CORPORATION, CAVIUM, LLC, and DELL INC.  
COMBINED PETITION FOR REHEARING AND REHEARING EN BANC**

Garland T. Stephens  
Melissa L. Hotze  
Richard D. Eiszner  
Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP  
700 Louisiana St., Suite 1700  
Houston, TX 77002  
713-546-5011  
garland.stephens@weil.com  
melissa.hotze@weil.com  
richard.eiszner@weil.com

Anne M. Cappella  
Amanda Branch  
Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP  
201 Redwood Shores Parkway  
Redwood Shores, CA 94065  
650-802-3141  
anne.cappella@weil.com  
amanda.branch@weil.com

*Counsel for Intel Corporation*

*Additional Counsel listed on the following page*

Gregory Silbert  
Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP  
767 Fifth Avenue  
New York, NY 10153  
212-310-8846  
gregory.silbert@weil.com

*Counsel for Intel Corporation*

Kirk T. Bradley  
ALSTON & BIRD LLP  
Bank of America Plaza  
101 S. Tryon St., Suite 4000  
Charlotte, NC 28280  
704-444-1000  
kirk.bradley@alston.com

Brady Cox  
ALSTON & BIRD LLP  
Chase Tower  
2200 Ross Ave., Suite 2300  
Dallas, TX 75201  
214-922-3400  
brady.cox@alston.com

Emily Chambers Welch  
ALSTON & BIRD LLP  
1201 West Peachtree St.  
Atlanta, GA 30309  
404-881-7000  
emily.welch@alston.com

*Counsel for Dell Inc.*

Karineh Khachatourian  
Rimon, P.C.  
2479 E. Bayshore Road, Suite 210  
Palo Alto, CA 94303  
650-461-4433  
karinehk@rimonlaw.com

Nikolaus A. Woloszczuk  
Rimon, P.C.  
2479 E. Bayshore Road, Suite 210  
Palo Alto, CA 94303  
650-461-4433  
nikolaus.woloszczuk@rimonlaw.com

*Counsel for Cavium, LLC*

## CERTIFICATE OF INTEREST FOR INTEL CORPORATION

Counsel for the Appellee, Intel Corporation, certifies the following (use “None” if applicable; use extra sheets if necessary):

1. Full Name of Party Represented by me:

Intel Corporation

2. Name of Real Party in interest (Please only include any real party in interest NOT identified in Question 3) represented by me is:

Intel Corporation

3. Parent corporations and publicly held companies that own 10% or more of stock in the party:

None

4. The names of all law firms and the partners or associates that appeared for the Party or amicus now represented by me in the trial court or agency or are expected to appear in this court (and who have not or will not enter an appearance in this case) are:

Adrian Percer, Justin Constant, William S. Ansley, all of Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP.

Jeremy Jason Lang, formerly of Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP.

5. The title and number of any case known to counsel to be pending in this or any other court or agency that will directly affect or be directly affected by this

court's decision in the pending appeal. *See* Fed. Cir. R. 47.4(a)(5) and 47.5(b). (The parties should attach continuation pages as necessary).

Intel Corporation v. Alacritech, Inc., IPR2018-00226 (PTAB)

Alacritech, Inc. v. CenturyLink, Inc., 2:16-cv-00693-JRG-RSP (E.D. Tex.)

Alacritech, Inc. v. Wistron Corp., 2:16-cv-00692-JRG-RSP (E.D. Tex.)

Alacritech, Inc. v. Dell Inc., 2:16-cv-00695-RWS-RSP (E.D. Tex.)

Alacritech, Inc. v. Intel Corporation, Docket No. 19-1443 (Fed. Cir.)

Alacritech, Inc. v. Intel Corporation, Docket No. 19-1444 (Fed. Cir.)

Alacritech, Inc. v. Intel Corporation, Docket No. 19-1445 (Fed. Cir.)

Cavium, LLC v. Alacritech, Inc., Docket No. 19-1447 (Fed. Cir.)

Dell Inc. v. Alacritech, Inc., Docket No. 19-1449 (Fed. Cir.)

Alacritech, Inc. v. Intel Corporation, Docket No. 19-1450 (Fed. Cir.)

Alacritech, Inc. v. Intel Corporation, Docket No. 19-1464 (Fed. Cir.)

Alacritech, Inc. v. Intel Corporation, Docket No. 19-1466 (Fed. Cir.)

Alacritech, Inc. v. Intel Corporation, Docket No. 19-1467 (Fed. Cir.)

Alacritech, Inc. v. Intel Corporation, Docket No. 19-1468 (Fed. Cir.)

Dated: April 6, 2020

/s/ Garland T. Stephens

Garland T. Stephens

## CERTIFICATE OF INTEREST FOR CAVIUM, LLC

Counsel for the Appellee, Cavium, LLC, certifies the following (use “None” if applicable; use extra sheets if necessary):

1. Full Name of Party Represented by me:

Cavium, LLC

2. Name of Real Party in interest (Please only include any real party in interest NOT identified in Question 3) represented by me is:

None

3. Parent corporations and publicly held companies that own 10% or more of stock in the party:

Marvell Technology Group, Ltd.

Marvell Technology, Inc.

4. The names of all law firms and the partners or associates that appeared for the Party or amicus now represented by me in the trial court or agency or are expected to appear in this court (and who have not or will not enter an appearance in this case) are:

David T. Xue of Rimon, P.C.

5. The title and number of any case known to counsel to be pending in this or any other court or agency that will directly affect or be directly affected by this

court's decision in the pending appeal. *See* Fed. Cir. R. 47.4(a)(5) and 47.5(b). (The parties should attach continuation pages as necessary).

Intel Corporation v. Alacritech, Inc., IPR2018-00226 (PTAB)

Alacritech, Inc. v. CenturyLink, Inc., 2:16-cv-00693-JRG-RSP (E.D. Tex.)

Alacritech, Inc. v. Wistron Corp., 2:16-cv-00692-JRG-RSP (E.D. Tex.)

Alacritech, Inc. v. Dell Inc., 2:16-cv-00695-RWS-RSP (E.D. Tex.)

Alacritech, Inc. v. Intel Corporation, Docket No. 19-1443 (Fed. Cir.)

Alacritech, Inc. v. Intel Corporation, Docket No. 19-1444 (Fed. Cir.)

Alacritech, Inc. v. Intel Corporation, Docket No. 19-1445 (Fed. Cir.)

Cavium, LLC v. Alacritech, Inc., Docket No. 19-1447 (Fed. Cir.)

Dell Inc. v. Alacritech, Inc., Docket No. 19-1449 (Fed. Cir.)

Alacritech, Inc. v. Intel Corporation, Docket No. 19-1450 (Fed. Cir.)

Alacritech, Inc. v. Intel Corporation, Docket No. 19-1464 (Fed. Cir.)

Alacritech, Inc. v. Intel Corporation, Docket No. 19-1466 (Fed. Cir.)

Alacritech, Inc. v. Intel Corporation, Docket No. 19-1467 (Fed. Cir.)

Alacritech, Inc. v. Intel Corporation, Docket No. 19-1468 (Fed. Cir.)

Dated: April 6, 2020

/s/ Karineh Khachatourian  
Karineh Khachatourian

**CERTIFICATE OF INTEREST FOR DELL INC.**

Counsel for the Appellee, Dell Inc., certifies the following (use “None” if applicable; use extra sheets if necessary):

1. Full Name of Party Represented by me:

Dell Inc.

2. Name of Real Party in interest (Please only include any real party in interest NOT identified in Question 3) represented by me is:

N/A

3. Parent corporations and publicly held companies that own 10% or more of stock in the party:

Denali Intermediate Inc.

Dell Technologies, Inc.

4. The names of all law firms and the partners or associates that appeared for the Party or amicus now represented by me in the trial court or agency or are expected to appear in this court (and who have not or will not enter an appearance in this case) are:

Christopher Douglas (Alston & Bird)

5. The title and number of any case known to counsel to be pending in this or any other court or agency that will directly affect or be directly affected by this

court's decision in the pending appeal. *See* Fed. Cir. R. 47.4(a)(5) and 47.5(b). (The parties should attach continuation pages as necessary).

Patent Trial and Appeal Board

Intel Corp. v. Alacritech, Inc., IPR2018-00226 (PTAB)

U.S. District Court

Alacritech, Inc. v. CenturyLink, Inc., 2:16-cv-00693-JRG-RSP (E.D. Tex.)

Alacritech, Inc. v. Wistron Corp., 2:16-cv-00692-JRG-RSP (E.D. Tex.)

Alacritech, Inc. v. Dell Inc., 2:16-cv-00695-RWS-RSP (E.D. Tex.)

Federal Circuit Court of Appeals

Alacritech, Inc. v. Intel Corporation, No. 19-1443 (Fed. Cir.)

Alacritech, Inc. v. Intel Corporation, No. 19-1444 (Fed Cir.)

Alacritech, Inc. v. Intel Corporation, No. 19-1445 (Fed Cir.)

Cavium, LLC v. Alacritech, Inc., No. 19-1447 (Fed Cir.)

Dell Inc. v. Alacritech, Inc., No. 19-1449 (Fed Cir.)

Alacritech, Inc. v. Intel Corporation, No. 19-1450 (Fed Cir.)

Alacritech, Inc. v. Intel Corporation, No. 19-1464 (Fed Cir.)

Alacritech, Inc. v. Intel Corporation, No. 19-1466 (Fed Cir.)

Alacritech, Inc. v. Intel Corporation, No. 19-1467 (Fed Cir.)

Alacritech, Inc. v. Intel Corporation, No. 19-1468 (Fed Cir.)



Dated: April 6, 2020

/s/ Kirk T. Bradley

Kirk T. Bradley

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
CERTIFICATE OF INTEREST FOR INTEL CORPORATION .....	i
CERTIFICATE OF INTEREST FOR CAVIUM, LLC .....	iii
CERTIFICATE OF INTEREST FOR DELL INC. ....	v
STATEMENT OF RELATED CASES .....	x
FEDERAL CIRCUIT RULE 35(b)(2) STATEMENT OF COUNSEL .....	1
INTRODUCTION .....	2
FACTUAL BACKGROUND.....	3
ARGUMENT .....	4
I. Panel Rehearing Is Warranted Because Both Appellant Alacritech and Appellee Intel Agree This Case Should Not Be Remanded and Instead Should Proceed On The Merits Absent <i>En Banc</i> Intervention.....	6
II. If Panel Rehearing is Denied, <i>En Banc</i> Rehearing Is Warranted On Whether The Case Should Be Remanded .....	7
CONCLUSION.....	9

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Arthrex, Inc. v. Smith &amp; Nephew, Inc.</i> , 941 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2019) .....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Arthrex, Inc. v. Smith &amp; Nephew, Inc.</i> , No. 18-2140, D.I. 115 (Fed. Cir. Mar. 23, 2020) .....	2
<i>Edmond v. United States</i> , 520 U.S. 651 (1997).....	1
<i>Free Enterprise Fund v. PCAOB</i> , 561 U.S. 477 (2010).....	1
<i>Freytag v. Comm’r</i> , 501 U.S. 868 (1991).....	1, 7
<i>Koninklijke Philips N.V. v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , No. 19-1178, D.I. 77 (Fed. Cir. Nov. 18, 2019) .....	6
<i>L’Oreal USA, Inc. v. Liqwd, Inc.</i> , No. 19-2410, D.I. 24 (Fed. Cir. Mar. 4, 2020) .....	7
<i>Polaris Innovations Ltd. v. Kingston Tech. Co., Inc.</i> No. 18-1831, D.I. 106 (Fed. Cir. Mar. 16, 2020) .....	2, 6
<b>Other Authorities</b>	
U.S. CONST., art. II, § 2, cl.2.....	3

## STATEMENT OF RELATED CASES

No other appeal in or from this case has been before this Court or any other court of appeals. This appeal involves the Final Written Decision by the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (“the Board”) in *Inter Partes* Review (“IPR”) case number IPR2017-01393 concerning U.S. Patent No. 9,055,104 (“the 104 Patent”), which is assigned to Appellant Alacritech, Inc. (“Alacritech”).

A number of related appeals are also pending before this Court from IPR proceedings in which Appellee Intel Corporation (“Intel”) challenged claims of other related patents owned by Alacritech. The Court ordered that the appeals be treated as four companion cases. The Court described the appeal at issue herein as “Group III.” “Group I” consists of Appeal Nos. 2019-1443, -1447, -1449, and -1450. “Group II” consists of Appeal Nos. 2019-1444, -1445, and -1466. “Group IV” consists of Appeal Nos. 2019-1467 and 2019-1468. Each of these appeals has been assigned to the same merits panel for oral argument.

The Court’s decision in this case may affect or be affected by the following related cases pending before the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Texas: *Alacritech, Inc., v. CenturyLink, Inc.*, Case No. 2:16-cv-00693-RWS-RSP (LEAD CASE), *Alacritech, Inc., v. Dell Inc.*, Case No. 2:16-cv-00695-RWS-RSP, and *Alacritech, Inc., v. Wistron Corp.*, Case No. 2:16-cv-00692-JRG-RSP. Intel intervened in all three cases and Cavium, Inc. (“Cavium”) intervened in the Dell Inc.

(“Dell”) case. The 104 Patent at issue in this appeal was previously asserted in those cases. These district court cases are currently stayed.

**FEDERAL CIRCUIT RULE 35(b)(2) STATEMENT OF COUNSEL**

Based on my professional judgment, I believe the panel decision is contrary to the following decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States: *Free Enterprise Fund v. PCAOB*, 561 U.S. 477 (2010); *Edmond v. United States*, 520 U.S. 651 (1997); and *Freytag v. Comm’r*, 501 U.S. 868 (1991).

Based on my professional judgment, this appeal requires an answer to one or more precedent-setting questions of exceptional importance:

(1) Whether the case should be allowed to proceed on the merits when no party is requesting remand based on *Arthrex, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.*, 941 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2019);

(2) Whether litigants who failed to raise an Appointments Clause challenge before the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (“PTAB” or “Board”) should be permitted to raise such a challenge on appeal when there is no need for timely resolution or remedial action;

(3) If administrative patent judges (“APJs”) are principal officers, what remedy is warranted for this and similarly-situated cases; and

(4) Whether APJs of the PTAB are inferior or principal officers of the United States under the Appointments Clause.

Dated: April 6, 2020

/s/ Garland T. Stephens  
Garland T. Stephens  
Counsel for Intel Corporation

## INTRODUCTION

Intel<sup>1</sup> respectfully requests that this Court grant panel rehearing so that this Court may consider the merits of this appeal without an intervening remand to the PTAB. In particular, these appeals differ significantly from other cases that have been remanded based on *Arthrex* because both Appellant Alacritech and Appellee Intel now *agree* that the case should *not* be remanded to the PTAB.<sup>2</sup> Patent owner/Appellant Alacritech's petition for rehearing seeks to abandon its Appointments Clause challenge unless the *en banc* Federal Circuit holds that the America Invents Act ("AIA") is incurably unconstitutional. D.I. 65. The *en banc* Federal Circuit recently rejected this same extraordinary request to hold the AIA incurably unconstitutional in both *Polaris Innovations Ltd. v. Kingston Tech. Co., Inc.* No. 18-1831, D.I. 106 (Fed. Cir. Mar. 16, 2020) and in *Arthrex, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.*, No. 18-2140, D.I. 115 (Fed. Cir. Mar. 23, 2020), and in any event that request would not lead to a remand. Given that the Federal Circuit has recently rejected the same *en banc* request Alacritech is now making twice, Intel respectfully

---

<sup>1</sup> All Appellees also join Intel in this Petition.

<sup>2</sup> For the concurrently-filed Joint Motion That, In the Event This Court Denies Alacritech's Pending Petition for Rehearing En Banc, This Court Should Retain the Mandate and Proceed on the Merits, the United States does not oppose the other parties' request insofar as they are requesting that the court vacate its prior judgment vacating the Board's decisions in these appeals, hold any Appointments Clause challenge affirmatively waived, and proceed to merits of these cases.

submits that panel rehearing is warranted so that Alacritech's request to abandon its Appointments Clause Challenge can be given effect and the case can proceed on the merits before this Court without an unnecessary remand that neither party is seeking.

### **FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

Alacritech did not raise an Appointments Clause challenge before the Board. Instead, Alacritech argued for the first time in its opening brief to this Court that the Board's decision was invalid because the APJs who rendered it were appointed in violation of the Appointments Clause, U.S. CONST., art. II, § 2, cl.2.

In its October 31, 2019 decision, the *Arthrex* panel found that APJs are "principal officers," severed the application of Title 5's removal restrictions to APJs, rendering them inferior officers, and then remanded the case to a new panel of APJs for a new hearing. *Id.* at 1338-1340. The Federal Circuit recently rejected the *Arthrex* parties' petitions for *en banc* rehearing. *Arthrex*, D.I. 115.

On December 12, 2019, Alacritech submitted a letter pursuant to Federal Circuit Rule 28(i) identifying the *Arthrex* decision as supplemental authority. D.I. 51. In its letter, Alacritech requested that the Federal Circuit proceed with the appeals and "resolve its arguments that the PTAB decision should be reversed or vacated on the merits" and only remand the Board's decisions consistent with this Court's decision in *Arthrex* if the Federal Circuit decided against Alacritech on the merits. *Id.* at 1.



On February 20, 2019, the Court vacated the Board’s decisions and “remanded to the Board for proceedings consistent with *Arthrex*.” D.I. 63 at 3.

On March 16, 2020, Alacritech filed a petition for *en banc* rehearing asking the Federal Circuit to invalidate the America Invents Act and reverse the Board’s order. D.I. 65 at 8. If the rehearing *en banc* is denied, Alacritech alternatively asks for panel rehearing so that it “can abandon its Appointments Clause argument and the panel can address Alacritech’s remaining arguments rather than remanding” to the PTAB. *Id.* at 9.

On April 6, 2020, Intel and Alacritech submitted the concurrently-filed Joint Motion That, In the Event This Court Denies Alacritech’s Pending Petition for Rehearing En Banc, This Court Should Retain the Mandate and Proceed on the Merits, which requests that the Court vacate its order, allow Alacritech to withdraw its Appointment Clause challenge and proceed on the merits if the Court denies Alacritech’s pending petition for *en banc* rehearing.

### **ARGUMENT**

Both Appellant Alacritech and Appellee Intel now agree that this Court should proceed to the merits of the appeal without a remand to the Board based on a violation of the Appointment Clause. Alacritech now seeks instead to abandon its challenge under the Appointments Clause if the *en banc* Court does not take the extraordinary step of holding the AIA entirely invalid—a request the *en banc* Federal

Circuit has recently rejected twice and that in any event would not lead to a remand. Proceeding on the merits of the appeal without a remand is thus desired by both Alacritech and Intel—who are in full agreement on that critical point—and is the most efficient course of action for the parties, the Board, and the Court. The appeal is fully briefed and merely waiting for an oral argument date. Therefore, Intel respectfully submits that panel rehearing is warranted so that Alacritech’s request to abandon its Appointment Clause challenge can be given effect and the appeal can simply proceed on the merits.

Although Intel wishes the Federal Circuit to decide the consolidated appeals on the merits without a remand, if the panel nonetheless were to deny panel rehearing and order a remand, Intel would respectfully request *en banc* rehearing on whether Alacritech’s request to abandon its Appointment Clause challenge should be given effect, whether APJs are inferior officers, whether Alacritech forfeited its Appointments Clause challenge by not raising it before the Board below, and what remedy is appropriate when the patent owner asks to proceed on the merits before the Federal Circuit even after *Arthrex* held the PTAB trials below violated the Constitution.

**I. Panel Rehearing Is Warranted Because Both Appellant Alacritech and Appellee Intel Agree This Case Should Not Be Remanded and Instead Should Proceed On The Merits Absent *En Banc* Intervention**

This case is unusual because both Appellant Alacritech and Appellee Intel now agree that the case should not be remanded pursuant to *Arthrex*. Alacritech initially raised an Appointments Clause challenge, but has now asked to withdraw that challenge unless its *en banc* request for an extraordinary remedy (to invalidate the AIA) is granted. D.I. 65. The *en banc* Federal Circuit recently denied this same request in *Polaris* and *Arthrex* and nothing suggests that its decision here will be any different.

Proceeding on the merits in this Court is the most efficient course of action and will conserve judicial resources. The PTAB and the parties have invested substantial time in these IPRs and the issues are fully briefed before this Court. All that remains is for the Court to set and hold oral argument. This will also reduce the number of cases impacted by *Arthrex* if all seven of the instant consolidated appeals are allowed to proceed on the merits. Furthermore, it is in the public interest to resolve these disputes expeditiously to provide certainty regarding the scope of Alacritech's patent rights and reduce the demands on the PTAB and this Court. This Court has allowed other patent owners to withdraw their Appointments Clause challenges after the briefing is complete, so that their appeal can proceed on the merits before this Court. See *Koninklijke Philips N.V. v. Microsoft Corp.*, No. 19-

1178, D.I. 77 (Fed. Cir. Nov. 18, 2019); *L’Oreal USA, Inc. v. Liqwd, Inc.*, No. 19-2410, D.I. 24 (Fed. Cir. Mar. 4, 2020). In light of Alacritech’s withdrawal of its request for an *Arthrex* remand, Intel respectfully requests panel rehearing so that this case can be addressed on the merits.

**II. If Panel Rehearing is Denied, *En Banc* Rehearing Is Warranted On Whether The Case Should Be Remanded**

Intel wishes for the Court to grant panel rehearing so that these fully-briefed appeals may proceed on the merits before the Federal Circuit without remand. To the extent that the panel denies that request and orders a remand, Intel submits that *en banc* rehearing of that order would be warranted.

As an initial matter, if the panel denies Intel’s request and orders a remand, Intel respectfully submits that the *en banc* court should allow Alacritech to abandon its Appointment Clause Challenge so the case can proceed on the merits for the reasons discussed above.

In addition, while Intel recognizes that existing circuit precedent is to the contrary, Intel respectfully submits that APJs are inferior officers because of significant direction and supervision that the Director has as a “superior” over the APJs and the fact that the Supreme Court has held that similar direction and supervision renders officers “inferior officers.” *See, e.g., Freytag*, 501 U.S. at 881-82. Indeed, the Director’s ability to both remove APJs and control the APJs’

decisions places the APJs well within the scope of inferior officers under controlling Supreme Court precedent.

Even if the proceedings below violated the Constitution's Appointments Clause (which Intel disputes), Intel respectfully submits that the question of whether a party can forfeit its challenge and proceed on the merits warrants *en banc* review. The justification in the *Arthrex* decision for ignoring Arthrex's forfeiture does not provide a sufficient basis to entertain Alacritech's belated challenge given that the need for timely resolution and remedial action no longer exists.

Further, as explained by Judge Dyk in his dissent from the denial of rehearing *en banc* in *Arthrex*, when the judiciary construed the statute to permit severance, its effect should have been both retrospective and prospective. As Judge Dyk explained, "the statute here must be read as though the APJs had always been constitutionally appointed." *Arthrex*, D.I. 115 at 36. In other words, APJs should be treated as removable at will prior to the issuance of the *Arthrex* decision. This fix should apply retrospectively, so that a remand is not required. *Arthrex*, D.I. 115 at 34 ("If the ruling were retroactive, the actions of APJs in the past would have been compliant with the constitution and the statute.").

Finally, Intel respectfully submits that the equities do not require remanding this case and certainly not to a new set of APJs, particularly when Alacritech was

willing to proceed on the merits before this Court even after the appointment of APJs was held unconstitutional.

For all these reasons, Intel respectfully submits that *en banc* review is warranted if panel review is denied.

### CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Intel respectfully requests that the Court grant panel rehearing and allow Alacritech to drop its Appointments Clause challenge, but if the panel does not do so, then *en banc* review is warranted for the reasons set forth above.

Dated: April 6, 2020

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Garland T. Stephens

Garland T. Stephens  
Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP  
700 Louisiana St., Suite 1700  
Houston, TX 77002  
713-546-5011  
garland.stephens@weil.com

Melissa L. Hotze  
Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP  
700 Louisiana St., Suite 1700  
Houston, TX 77002  
713-546-5033  
melissa.hotze@weil.com

Richard D. Eiszner  
Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP  
700 Louisiana St., Suite 1700  
Houston, TX 77002

713-546-5249  
richard.eiszner@weil.com

Anne M. Cappella  
Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP  
201 Redwood Shores Parkway  
Redwood Shores, CA 94065  
650-802-3141  
anne.cappella@weil.com

Amanda Branch  
Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP  
201 Redwood Shores Parkway  
Redwood Shores, CA 94065  
650-802-3138  
amanda.branch@weil.com

Gregory Silbert  
Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP  
767 Fifth Avenue  
New York, NY 10153  
212-310-8846  
gregory.silbert@weil.com

*Counsel for Intel Corporation*

/s/ Karineh Khachatourian  
Karineh Khachatourian  
Rimon, P.C.  
2479 E. Bayshore Road, Suite 210  
Palo Alto, CA 94303  
650-461-4433  
karinehk@rimonlaw.com

Nikolaus A. Woloszczuk  
Rimon, P.C.  
2479 E. Bayshore Road, Suite 210  
Palo Alto, CA 94303  
650-461-4433

nikolaus.woloszczuk@rimonlaw.com

*Counsel for Cavium, LLC*

/s/ Kirk T. Bradley

Kirk T. Bradley  
ALSTON & BIRD LLP  
Bank of America Plaza  
101 S. Tryon St., Suite 4000  
Charlotte, NC 28280  
704-444-1000  
kirk.bradley@alston.com

Brady Cox  
ALSTON & BIRD LLP  
Chase Tower  
2200 Ross Ave., Suite 2300  
Dallas, TX 75201  
214-922-3400  
brady.cox@alston.com

Emily Chambers Welch  
ALSTON & BIRD LLP  
1201 West Peachtree St.  
Atlanta, GA 30309  
404-881-7000  
emily.welch@alston.com

*Counsel for Dell Inc.*



# **ADDENDUM**

NOTE: This order is nonprecedential.

**United States Court of Appeals  
for the Federal Circuit**

---

**INTEL CORPORATION, CAVIUM, LLC, DELL, INC.,**  
*Appellants*

v.

**ALACRITECH, INC.,**  
*Cross-Appellant*

**UNITED STATES,**  
*Intervenor*

---

2019-1443, -1447, -1449, -1450

---

Appeals from the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Patent Trial and Appeal Board in Nos. IPR2017-01405, IPR2017-01735, and IPR2018-00336.

-----

**ALACRITECH, INC.,**  
*Appellant*

v.

**INTEL CORPORATION, CAVIUM, LLC, DELL, INC.,  
WISTRON CORPORATION,**  
*Appellees*

**UNITED STATES,**  
*Intervenor*

---

2019-1444, -1445, -1466

---

Appeals from the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Patent Trial and Appeal Board in Nos. IPR2017-01391, IPR2017-01392, IPR2017-01406, IPR2017-01707, IPR2018-00329, and IPR2018-00375.

-----

**ALACRITECH, INC.,**  
*Appellant*

v.

**INTEL CORPORATION, CAVIUM, LLC, DELL INC.,**  
*Appellees*

**UNITED STATES,**  
*Intervenor*

---

2019-1464

---

Appeal from the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Patent Trial and Appeal Board in Nos. IPR2017-01393, IPR2017-01714, and IPR2018-00374.

-----

**ALACRITECH, INC.,**  
*Appellant*

v.

INTEL CORPORATION v. ALACRITECH, INC.

3

**INTEL CORPORATION, CAVIUM, LLC, DELL, INC.,**  
*Appellees*

**UNITED STATES,**  
*Intervenor*

---

2019-1467, -1468

---

Appeals from the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Patent Trial and Appeal Board in Nos. IPR2017-01409, IPR2017-01410, IPR2017-01736, IPR2017-01737, IPR2018-00338, and IPR2018-00339.

---

PER CURIAM.

### **O R D E R**

In its opening briefs in each of the above appeals and cross-appeals, Alacritech, Inc. argues that the final written decisions at issue in these appeals exceed the scope of the Patent Trial and Appeal Board's authority and violate the Constitution's Appointments Clause. In light of *Arthrex, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.*, 941 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2019), the court now vacates the Board decisions and remands for proceedings consistent with this court's decision in *Arthrex*. On remand, the Board may also wish to consider *Samsung Electronics America, Inc. v. Prisia Engineering Corp.*, 948 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2020).

Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED THAT:

(1) The Patent Trial and Appeal Board's decisions are vacated, and the cases are remanded to the Board for proceedings consistent with *Arthrex* and this order.

(2) Each side shall bear its own costs.

FOR THE COURT

February 20, 2020  
Date

/s/ Peter R. Marksteiner  
Peter R. Marksteiner  
Clerk of Court

## CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

1. This brief complies with the type-volume limitation of Federal Rule of Federal Circuit Rule 32(a) or Federal Rule of Federal Circuit Rule 28.1. This brief contains 1941 words, excluding the parts of the brief exempted by Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 32(f).

2. This brief complies with the typeface requirements of Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 32(a)(5) or Federal Rule of Federal Circuit Rule 28.1 and the type style requirements of Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 32(a)(6). This brief has been prepared in a proportionally spaced typeface using Microsoft Word 2016 in Times New Roman 14 point font.

Dated: April 6, 2020

*/s/Garland T. Stephens*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Garland T. Stephens

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on April 6, 2020, I filed or caused to be filed a copy of the foregoing with the Clerk of the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit via the CM/ECF system and served or caused to be served a copy on all counsel of record by the CM/ECF system.

Dated: April 6, 2020

/s/ Garland T. Stephens

Garland T. Stephens  
Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP  
700 Louisiana St., Suite 1700  
Houston, TX 77002  
713-546-5011  
garland.stephens@weil.com

*Counsel for Intel Corporation*