Trials@uspto.gov 571-272-7822

DOCKET

Paper No. 42 Entered: April 28, 2015

### RECORD OF ORAL HEARING

### UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

\_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_

### BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

- - - - - -

### NISSAN NORTH AMERICA, INC., FORD MOTOR COMPANY, JAGUAR LAND ROVER NORTH AMERICA LLC, SUBARU OF AMERICA INC., TOYOTA MOTOR NORTH AMERICA, INC., and VOLVO CARS OF NORTH AMERICA LLC,

Petitioners,

v.

### CRUISE CONTROL TECHNOLOGIES LLC, Patent Owner.

- - - - - - -

Case IPR2014-00291 U.S. Patent 6,324,463

- - - - - - - -

Oral Hearing Held on Wednesday, March 25, 2015

- - - - - - -

Before: JOSIAH C. COCKS, HYUN J. JUNG, and GEORGE R. HOSKINS (via video link), *Administrative Patent Judges*.

The above-entitled matter came on for hearing on Wednesday, March 25, 2015, at 10:00 a.m., in Hearing Room A, taken at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, 600 Dulany Street, Alexandria, Virginia.

Case IPR2014-00291 U.S. Patent 6,324,463

### APPEARANCES:

### ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER TOYOTA MOTORS:

JOHN F. RABENA, ESQ. WILLIAM H. MANDIR, ESQ. FADI N. KIBLAWI, ESQ. Sughrue Mion, PLLC 2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20037-3213

### ON BEHALF OF THE PATENT OWNER:

JOHN R. KASHA, ESQ. Kasha Law LLC 14532 Defief Mill Road North Potomac, Maryland 20878

TIMOTHY M. SALMON, ESQ. Cruise Control Technologies LLC 14532 Defief Mill Road North Potomac, Maryland 20878

| 1  | PROCEEDINGS  |
|----|--|
| 2  | (10:00 a.m.)   |
| 3  | JUDGE COCKS: Please be seated. Good morning.                     |
| 4  | This is the oral argument for IPR2014-00291. This is the fifth   |
| 5  | of five related proceedings all involving U.S. Patent            |
| 6  | 6,324,463.   |
| 7  | Let's begin with introductions of counsel, starting              |
| 8  | with Petitioner.   |
| 9  | MR. RABENA: Good morning, Your Honor. I'm                        |
| 10 | John Rabena from Sughrue Mion here on behalf of Petitioner,      |
| 11 | Toyota. I am here at counsel table with Fadi Kiblawi and         |
| 12 | William Mandir, also of my firm.                                 |
| 13 | JUDGE COCKS: Thank you, Mr. Rabena. For                          |
| 14 | Patent Owner?  |
| 15 | MR. KASHA: Good morning, Your Honor. I'm                         |
| 16 | John Kasha, lead counsel for Patent Owner. And with me is        |
| 17 | Mr. Timothy Salmon from Cruise Control Technologies. And         |
| 18 | he will be presenting oral argument today.                       |
| 19 | JUDGE COCKS: All right. Thank you, Mr. Kasha                     |
| 20 | and Mr. Salmon.  |
| 21 | As we set forth in our trial hearing order and as is             |
| 22 | fairly well established at this point, each side has 45 minutes. |
| 23 | Petitioner will begin and may reserve rebuttal time.             |
| 24 | Patent Owner will then argue their opposition. And the           |
| 25 | Petitioner will conclude with any time reserved.                 |

3

| 1  | So having that being said, Mr. Rabena, the floor is              |
|----|--|
| 2  | yours. Whenever you are ready.                                   |
| 3  | MR. RABENA: Thank you, Your Honors. This                         |
| 4  | petition was initially filed by the Nissan petitioner, and then  |
| 5  | they settled and we stepped in as the lead petitioner.           |
| 6  | It is based primarily on there are three grounds,                |
| 7  | all based primarily on the Prometheus reference. The             |
| 8  | arguments raised by the Patent Owner are such that they all      |
| 9  | stand and fall on Prometheus.                                    |
| 10 | There are no separate arguments regarding the                    |
| 11 | Narita or Celsior issues or whether it is obvious to combine.    |
| 12 | It is all based on what is disclosed in Prometheus.              |
| 13 | Before I get to the substance of Prometheus, I                   |
| 14 | would like to address an issue that was raised in the Patent     |
| 15 | Owner response, in that they challenged or they objected to      |
| 16 | the authenticity of the Prometheus reference as being prior art. |
| 17 | And our view is that objection was untimely.                     |
| 18 | Under 42.64, they had 10 days from institution to file any       |
| 19 | objections to the prior art we were relying on. And the rule     |
| 20 | specifically states that the reason that they have to do that at |
| 21 | that time is to allow correction in the form of supplemental     |
| 22 | evidence; in other words, discovery on where it was published,   |
| 23 | who had it, who had access to this reference.                    |
| 24 | JUDGE COCKS: What was the rule you just cited?                   |

4

| 1  | MR. RABENA: 42.64. In particular I'm looking at                  |
|----|--|
| 2  | Subsection $(b)(1)$ . And it states that the objection must be   |
| 3  | with sufficient particularity to allow correction in the form of |
| 4  | supplemental evidence. It also states that there is a 10-day     |
| 5  | from institution time line.                                      |
| 6  | There is also a requirement in that same rule that               |
| 7  | the Patent Owner subsequently file a motion to exclude. None     |
| 8  | of that has been done here. This was raised for the first time   |
| 9  | in the Patent Owner response.                                    |
| 10 | And, as a result, we didn't have any opportunity to              |
| 11 | seek additional discovery into the extent of the publication of  |
| 12 | the reference. And since the author, Renault, was in France,     |
| 13 | we would have loved to do that discovery and we didn't have      |
| 14 | that chance.   |
| 15 | In addition, the expert in this case, Mr. McNamara,              |
| 16 | I think, he designed cruise controls and interfaces, in his      |
| 17 | declaration he explains that, since 1995. And he talks about     |
| 18 | this reference and the Prometheus project.                       |
| 19 | And he says in paragraphs 43 to 45 that it was a                 |
| 20 | large scale inter-governmental research project between eight    |
| 21 | or nine different European automotive makers and government      |
| 22 | agencies. There were no, you know, confidentiality. This was     |
| 23 | almost the entire automotive industry involved in this project.  |
| 24 | There were seminars, things like that, that are even cited in    |
| 25 | the exhibit.   |
|    |  |

5

## DOCKET A L A R M



# 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.