

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

TOYOTA MOTOR NORTH AMERICA, INC., SUBARU OF AMERICA, INC.,  
AMERICAN HONDA MOTOR CO., INC., NISSAN NORTH AMERICA, INC.,  
FORD MOTOR COMPANY, JAGUAR LAND ROVER NORTH AMERICA,  
LLC, and VOLVO CARS OF NORTH AMERICA, LLC,  
Petitioner,

v.

CRUISE CONTROL TECHNOLOGIES LLC,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2014-00280  
Patent 6,324,463

---

Before JOSIAH C. COCKS, HYUN J. JUNG, and GEORGE R. HOSKINS,  
*Administrative Patent Judges.*

COCKS, *Administrative Patent Judge.*

DECISION

Joint Motion to Terminate the *Inter Partes* Review  
with Respect to American Honda Motor Co., Inc.  
*35 U.S.C. § 317 and 37 C.F.R. § 42.72*

### 1. Introduction

On November 14, 2014, Cruise Control Technologies LLC (“Patent Owner”) and American Honda Motor Co., Inc. (“Honda”) (collectively referred to as “the Parties”) filed a Joint Motion to Terminate this *inter partes* review proceeding with respect to Honda. Paper 27 (“Joint Motion to Terminate”)<sup>1</sup>. Along with the Joint Motion to Terminate, the Parties filed a true copy of the written settlement agreement (Ex. 2000), as well as a joint request (Paper 28) to have the settlement agreement treated as business confidential information under 35 U.S.C. § 317(b) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.74(c).

### 2. Discussion

Under 35 U.S.C. § 317(a), “[a]n *inter partes* review instituted under this chapter shall be terminated with respect to any petitioner upon the joint request of the petitioner and the patent owner, unless the Office has decided the merits of the proceeding before the request for termination is filed.” The Parties also state the following in the Joint Motion to Terminate:

Patent Owner and Honda respectfully submit that termination is appropriate because they have reached an agreement resolving the dispute involving the patent at issue in the above-captioned *Inter Partes* Review, it is prior to full briefing on the issues raised in the above-captioned *Inter Partes* Review, and the Board has not issued a final written decision. Further, Honda represents that it will no longer participate even if the Board does not terminate its participation in the above-captioned *Inter Partes* Review. That means Honda will file no further papers. It also will not be conducting any further cross examination of Patent Owner’s witnesses and will not be participating in any oral argument.

---

<sup>1</sup> The motion was authorized in a conference call on November 12, 2014. Paper 29.

Joint Motion to Terminate 1.

Upon consideration of the circumstances of this proceeding, the panel has determined to terminate the *inter partes* review (IPR2014-00280) as to Honda.

3. *Order*

It is

ORDERED that, as was requested timely by the Parties (Paper 28), the settlement agreement (Exhibit 2000) will be treated as business confidential information under 35 U.S.C. § 317(b) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.74(c); and

FURTHER ORDERED that the Joint Motion to Terminate the involvement of Honda in IPR2014-00280 is *granted*.

Case IPR2014-00280  
Patent 6,324,463

PETITIONER:

William H. Mandir  
John F. Rabena  
SUGHRUE MION PLLC  
[wmandir@sughrue.com](mailto:wmandir@sughrue.com)  
[jrabena@sughrue.com](mailto:jrabena@sughrue.com)  
[Toyota-CCT-IPR@sughrue.com](mailto:Toyota-CCT-IPR@sughrue.com)

Matthew D. Satchwell  
DLA PIPER LLP (US)  
[matthew.satchwell@dlapiper.com](mailto:matthew.satchwell@dlapiper.com)

John M. Caracappa  
STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP  
[jcaracap@steptoe.com](mailto:jcaracap@steptoe.com)

Wab Kadaba  
KILPATRICK TOWNSEND & STOCKTON LLP  
[wkadaba@kilpatricktownsend.com](mailto:wkadaba@kilpatricktownsend.com)

Matthew J. Moore  
LATHAM & WATKINS LLP  
[matthew.moore@lw.com](mailto:matthew.moore@lw.com)

FOR PATENT OWNER:

John R. Kasha  
Kelly L. Kasha  
KASHA LAW LLC  
[john.kasha@kashalaw.com](mailto:john.kasha@kashalaw.com)  
[kelly.kasha@kashalaw.com](mailto:kelly.kasha@kashalaw.com)