

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

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

v.

CRUISE CONTROL TECHNOLOGIES LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2014-00281
Patent 6,324,463

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

HOSKINS, *Administrative Patent Judge.*

DECISION
Motion for Joinder
37 C.F.R. § 42.122

On April 10, 2014, following a conference call, we authorized Patent Owner to file a motion to join this proceeding with four other related *inter partes* review proceedings. *See* Paper 14. The five related proceedings are IPR2014-00279, IPR2014-00280, IPR2014-00281, IPR2014-00289, and IPR2014-00291 (“the five subject proceedings”). *See id.* Patent Owner accordingly filed a Motion for Joinder (Paper 15, “Motion” or “Mot.”) on April 24, 2014. Petitioner filed an Opposition to the Motion for Joinder (Paper 16, “Opposition” or “Opp.”) on May 8, 2014.

As an initial matter, we note that under our Rules, “[a] motion will not be entered without Board authorization.” 37 C.F.R. § 42.20(b) (2013). Our April 10, 2014 Order authorized Patent Owner only to file a motion to join the five subject proceedings. *See* Paper 14, 5. While the Motion accordingly requests such a joinder, it also requests “an order requiring Petitioner to identify a single lead counsel authorized to speak on its behalf and a backup counsel designated to speak for Petitioner and lead counsel.” Mot. 1. The Motion further requests, if joinder is opposed by Petitioner or if we deny the Motion, that we deny each Petition in the five subject proceedings for Petitioner’s alleged failure to comply with 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(a) and alleged violation of what Patent Owner describes as a “one petitioner, one voice rule.” *Id.* We deny these requests pursuant to Rule 42.20(b) as an unauthorized motion, and turn to the authorized portion of the Motion request joinder of the five subject proceedings.

Board’s Authority to Join the Five Subject Proceedings

The parties dispute whether we have the authority to join the five subject proceedings into one proceeding *before* deciding whether to institute

a trial in any of the five subject proceedings. Patent Owner contends 37 C.F.R. § 42.122 (2013) gives us such authority. *See* Mot. 14. Petitioner contends 35 U.S.C. § 315(c) and 37 C.F.R. § 122(b) explicitly prohibit pre-institution joinder of *inter partes* review proceedings. *See* Opp. 7–9. We need not resolve this dispute because, even if we do have the authority to join multiple *inter partes* review proceedings prior to instituting any trials, we are not persuaded by the Motion to do so in this case.

Whether to Join the Five Subject Proceedings

As Patent Owner contends, the five subject proceedings have many similarities. They each concern the same patent, U.S. Patent No. 6,324,463 (“the ’463 patent”). *See* Mot. 2–3 (¶¶ 1–5). The Petitioner in each case is the same group of parties, as identified above in the caption of this decision. *See id.* Each subject proceeding was filed on either December 20, 2013 or December 23, 2013. *See id.* There is a significant amount of overlap among the ’463 patent claims being challenged in each of the five subject proceedings, and the five Petitions identify the same constructions for the same four claim terms. *See id.* at 2–3 (¶¶ 1–7). There is also some overlap in the prior art being cited in the five subject proceedings.¹ Substantially the same group of people is identified as lead and back-up counsel among the five subject proceedings, although a different person is identified as lead

¹ Specifically, alleged Admitted Prior Art is raised in two proceedings (*see* IPR2014-00281, Paper 1, 36–37; IPR2014-00289, Paper 3, 48–60), a Toyota Celsior Owner’s Manual is raised in two proceedings (*see* IPR2014-00280, Ex. 1010; IPR2014-00291, Ex. 1009), Nagashima is raised in two proceedings (*see* IPR2014-00281, Ex. 1009; IPR2014-00289, Ex. 1010), and Narita is raised in two proceedings (*see* IPR2014-00281, Ex. 1004; IPR2014-00291, Ex. 1006).

counsel for Petitioner in each proceeding. *See id.* at 3–5 (¶¶ 9–13). The Petitions in three of the five subject proceedings (IPR2014-00279, IPR2014-00289, and IPR2014-00291) include a Declaration executed by the same person, David A. McNamara, in support of the Petition. *See id.* at 3 (¶ 8).

The Motion asserts that having to defend against each of the five subject proceedings separately will prejudice Patent Owner, which allegedly would be alleviated by joinder. *See Mot.* 11–13. Patent Owner contends five separate proceedings “means five of everything at five times the cost — five separate filings, five separate expert declarations, five separate oral hearings . . . , [and] at least five depositions of Petitioner’s declarants” *Mot.* 12. Patent Owner also asserts that, with five separate proceedings, Patent Owner will have to coordinate with five separate counsel to schedule depositions. *See id.* (citing IPR2013-00250, Paper 25, p. 4 (Sept. 3, 2013) as “explaining that ‘joinder of the proceedings will allow for a single deposition, rather than multiple depositions, of the same witnesses’”). Petitioner by contrast contends that maintaining five separate proceedings would not unduly prejudice Patent Owner, because Patent Owner started the present dispute by filing fifteen separate lawsuits against various automotive companies, including each of the parties identified as a petitioner in the five subject proceedings. *See Opp.* 10–11. Petitioner further contends joinder is not appropriate because of many differences among the five subject proceedings, including different primary prior art references being cited, different declarants, and different claims being challenged. *See Opp.* 11–12.

As the moving party, Patent Owner has the burden of proof to establish that it is entitled to joinder of the five subject proceedings. 37 C.F.R. § 42.20(c) (2013). We are not persuaded by the Motion that joining

the five subject proceedings would reduce, in any material manner, the burden(s) placed upon Patent Owner in defending the validity of the '463 patent before the Board. Regardless of whether the five subject proceedings are joined or not joined, Patent Owner will still have to defend against the same number of parties (regardless of whether they are identified as one Petitioner or multiple co-Petitioners), and prepare brief(s) addressing the same ground(s) upon which we institute review, if any. Patent Owner presents no credible evidence or argument in support of its statement that five separate proceedings “means five of everything at five times the cost” versus one joined proceeding which would involve the same substantive issues as the five separate proceedings. The alleged discovery burden(s) imposed by five separate proceedings can be alleviated substantially by entering the same schedule in each case, in conjunction with cooperation between the parties and motion practice in the event of disputes — which is no different than what would happen in one joined proceeding. *See, e.g.,* Opp. 9–10. Moreover, we agree with Petitioner that Patent Owner invited a multi-front battle concerning the validity of the '463 patent when it filed ten separate infringement lawsuits on December 21, 2012, with another five lawsuits following on January 15, 2013. *See* Paper 1, 4; Paper 12, 2–4.

The Motion also contends joinder of the five subject proceedings before institution of any trial(s) in response to the Petitions would benefit the Board. *See* Mot. 13. Joinder is said to “put[] the Board in a better position to assess inter-petition redundancy of the more than 180 separate alleged grounds of unpatentability and address any inconsistent statements.” *Id.* We are not persuaded that joinder in the present case, whether before or after institution of trial(s), materially would benefit the Board. The Board has

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.