

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

HYUNDAI MOTOR COMPANY,
Petitioner,

v.

AMERICAN VEHICULAR SCIENCES LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2014-01543
Patent 6,738,697 B2

Before JAMESON LEE, BARBARA A. PARVIS, and
GREGG I. ANDERSON, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

LEE, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION
Institution of *Inter Partes* Review
37 C.F.R. § 42.108

I. INTRODUCTION

On April 15, 2014, Hyundai Motor Company (“Hyundai”) filed a Petition (Paper 1, “Pet.”) requesting an *inter partes* review of claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 10, 17–22, 26, 27, 32, 40, and 61 of U.S. Patent No. 6,738,697 B2 (Ex. 1001, “the ’697 patent”). American Vehicular Sciences LLC (“AVS”) waived the filing of a Preliminary Response on October 17, 2014. Paper 8. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 314.

The standard for instituting an *inter partes* review is set forth in 35 U.S.C. § 314(a) which provides as follows:

THRESHOLD.—The Director may not authorize an *inter partes* review to be instituted unless the Director determines that the information presented in the petition filed under section 311 and any response filed under section 313 shows that there is a reasonable likelihood that the petitioner would prevail with respect to at least 1 of the claims challenged in the petition.

Upon consideration of Hyundai’s Petition, we determine that Hyundai has established a reasonable likelihood that it would prevail in showing the unpatentability of each of claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 10, 17–22, 26, 27, 32, 40, and 61 of the ’697 patent. Accordingly, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 314, we institute an *inter partes* review as to claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 10, 17–22, 26, 27, 32, 40, and 61 of the ’697 patent.

A. *Related Proceedings*

Hyundai indicates that the ’697 patent has been asserted by AVS in district court cases including: (1) *American Vehicular Sciences LLC v. Toyota Motor Corp. et al.*, No. 6:13-cv-00405 (E.D. Tex.); (2) *American Vehicular Sciences LLC v. American Honda Motor Co., Inc. et. al.*, No. 6:13-cv-13251 (E.D. Tex.); (3) *American Vehicular Sciences LLC v.*

Hyundai Motor Company et al., No. 2:14-cv-13247 (E.D. Tex.); and (4) *American Vehicular Sciences LLC v. Kia Motors Inc. et al.*, No. 2:14-cv-13249 (E.D. Tex.). The '697 patent also is the involved patent in these *inter partes* review proceedings before the Board: IPR2013-00412; IPR2013-00413; IPR2014-00634; and IPR2014-00645.

B. The '697 Patent Disclosure

The disclosed invention of the '697 patent is directed to a vehicle diagnostic system that diagnoses the state of a vehicle or the state of a component of the vehicle, and generates an output indicative or representative of that diagnosed state. Ex. 1001, Abstract. A communications device transmits that output to a remote location, possibly via a satellite or the Internet. Ex. 1001, Abstract. In that regard, the Specification further states:

Transmission of the output to a remote location may entail arranging a communications device comprising a cellular telephone system including an antenna on the vehicle. The output may be to a satellite for transmission from the satellite to the remote location. The output could also be transmitted via the Internet to a web site or host computer associated with the remote location.

Ex. 1001, 14:20–26.

The Field of the Invention portion of the disclosure states that the invention relates to methods and apparatus for diagnosing components in a vehicle and transmitting data relating to the diagnosis, and other information relating to the operating conditions of the vehicle, to one or more remote locations via a telematics link. Ex. 1001, 1:37–42. The Objects of the Invention portion of the disclosure states that it is an object of the invention to provide a new and improved method and system for diagnosing

components in a vehicle and the operating status of the vehicle, and for alerting the vehicle's dealer, or another repair facility, via a telematics link, that a component of the vehicle is functioning abnormally and may be in danger of failing. Ex. 1001, 11:26–31.

C. Exemplary Claims

Of the challenged claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 10, 17–22, 26, 27, 32, 40, and 61, only claims 1 and 21 are independent claims. Claims 2, 5, 6, 10, and 17–20 each depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 1, and claims 26, 27, 32, 40, and 61 each depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 21. Claims 1 and 21 are reproduced below:

1. A vehicle, comprising:

a diagnostic system arranged on the vehicle to diagnose the state of the vehicle or the state of a component of the vehicle and generate an output indicative or representative thereof; and

a communication device coupled to said diagnostic system and arranged to automatically establish a communications channel between the vehicle and a remote facility without manual intervention and wirelessly transmit the output of said diagnostic system to the remote facility.

21. A method for monitoring a vehicle, comprising the steps of:

diagnosing the state of the vehicle or the state of a component of the vehicle by means of a diagnostic system arranged on the vehicle;

generating an output indicative or representative of the diagnosed state of the vehicle or the diagnosed state of the component of the vehicle; and

transmitting the output indicative or representative of the diagnosed state of the vehicle or the diagnosed state of the component of the vehicle from the vehicle to a remote location.

Ex. 1001, 85:16–26, 86:52–63.

D. Prior Art Relied Upon

Name	Reference	Date	Ex. No.
Ishihara	Japanese Published Application H01-197145	Dec. 17, 1993	Exhibit 1003
	English Translation of Ishihara		Exhibit 1004
Schricker	U.S. Patent No. 5,561,610	Oct. 1, 1996	Exhibit 1005
Mansell	U.S. Patent No. 5,223,844	June 29, 1993	Exhibit 1006
DiLullo	U.S. Patent No. 4,897,642	Jan. 30, 1990	Exhibit 1007

E. Alleged Grounds of Unpatentability

Claims	Ground	Reference(s)
Claims 1, 2, 10, 17, 18, 21, 26, 27, 32, and 61	§ 102(b)	Ishihara
Claims 5, 6, 18, 22, 26, and 27	§ 103(a)	Ishihara and Schricker
Claims 6, 19, 20, 22, and 40	§ 103(a)	Ishihara and Mansell
Claims 1, 2, 5, 10, 17, 18, 19, 21, 26, 27, 32, 40, and 61	§ 102(b)	DiLullo

In support of the grounds above, Hyundai also presents a declaration by Christopher Wilson (Ex. 1008).

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.