

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

TERREMARK NORTH AMERICA LLC, VERIZON BUSINESS
NETWORK SERVICES INC., VERIZON SERVICES CORP., TIME
WARNER CABLE INC., ICONROL NETWORKS, INC., and
COXCOM, LLC
Petitioner,

v.

JOAO CONTROL & MONITORING SYSTEMS, LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2015-01486
Patent 6,549,130 B1

Before HOWARD B. BLANKENSHIP, STACEY G. WHITE, and
JASON J. CHUNG, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

CHUNG, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

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

I. INTRODUCTION

Petitioner, Terremark North America LLC, Verizon Business Network Services Inc., Verizon Services Corp., Time Warner Cable Inc., iControl Networks, Inc., and Coxcom, LLC, filed a Petition requesting an *inter partes* review of claims 1, 8, 10, 12, 15, 17, 98, 119, 124, 145, and 149 of U.S. Patent No. 6,549,130 B1 (Ex. 1001, “the ’130 patent”). Paper 1 (“Pet.”). In addition, on August 5, 2015, Petitioner filed a Motion to Recognize June 23, 2015, as the filing date. Paper 6 (“Motion”). On August 19, 2015, in response to Petitioner’s Motion, Patent Owner, Joao Control & Monitoring Systems, LLC, filed Patent Owner’s Opposition to Motion to Recognize June 23 as the filing date. Paper 7. Patent Owner filed a Preliminary Response. Paper 9 (“Prelim. Resp.”). We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 314, which provides that an *inter partes* review may not be instituted “unless . . . the information presented in the petition . . . 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.”

For the reasons set forth below, we determine that the Petition was not filed timely within the statutory period of 35 U.S.C. § 315(b). We, thus, deny *inter partes* review of the ’130 patent.

A. Identifying the Petitioner

Petitioner presents various lists of petitioning parties throughout the Petition. The Petition lists Terremark North America LLC, Verizon Business Network Services Inc., Verizon Services Corp., Time Warner Cable Inc., iControl Networks, Inc., and Coxcom, LLC in the caption of the

Petition and in the “[r]eal party-in-interest” section. Pet. 1. Five entities, CoxCom, LLC, Terremark North America LLC, Verizon Communications Inc., Time Warner Cable, Inc., and iControl Networks, Inc. are identified in the Petition as Petitioners in the “[l]ead and back-up counsel” section. Pet. 4–5.

Verizon Communications Inc., Verizon Corporate Resources Group LLC, and Verizon Data Services LLC are identified in the Petition as real parties-in-interest. Pet. 2. Petitioner notes that Verizon Communications Inc. has more than 500 affiliated entities and states that “each of these entities agrees to be estopped under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §§ 315 and/or 325 as a result of any final written decision in the requested IPR to the same extent that the Petitioners are estopped.” On this record, we construe any mismatch between the named Verizon entities to be a typographical error.

Because Petitioner identifies five entities, CoxCom, LLC, Terremark North America LLC, Verizon Communications Inc., Time Warner Cable, Inc., and iControl Networks, Inc. as Petitioners in the “[l]ead and back-up counsel” section (*id.*), and, as stated *supra*, any mismatch between the named Verizon entities (e.g., Verizon Communications Inc., Verizon Business Network Services, and Verizon Services Corp.) is a typographical error, we construe any mismatch between the caption of the Petition, the “[r]eal party-in-interest” section, and the “[l]ead and back-up counsel” section to be a typographical error.

We, thus, identify Petitioner as Terremark North America LLC, Verizon Communications Inc., Verizon Services Corp., Verizon Business

Network Services, Time Warner Cable Inc., iControl Networks, Inc., and Coxcom, LLC.

B. Related Matters

Petitioner indicates that the '130 patent has been asserted in the following proceedings: (1) *Joao v. LifeShield, Inc.*, No. 2-15-cv-02772 (E.D. Pa.); (2) *Joao v. Slomin's Inc.*, No. 2-14-cv-02598 (E.D.N.Y.); (3) *Joao v. Cox Communications, Inc.*, No. 1-14-cv-00520 (D. Del.); (4) *Joao v. Volkswagen Group of America, Inc.*, No. 1-14-cv-00517 (D. Del.); (5) *Joao v. DISH Network Corp.*, No. 1-14-cv-00522 (D. Del.); (6) *Joao v. Cablevision Systems Corp.*, No. 1-14-cv-00518 (D. Del.); (7) *Joao v. Consolidated Edison, Inc.*, No. 1-14-cv-00519 (D. Del.); (8) *Joao v. Verizon Communications, Inc.*, No. 1-14-cv-00525 (D. Del.); (9) *Joao v. Time Warner Cable, Inc.*, No. 1-14-cv-00524 (D. Del.); (10) *Joao v. DirecTV*, No. 1-14-cv-00521 (D. Del.); (11) *Joao v. Nissan North America, Inc.*, No. 1-14-cv-00523 (D. Del.); (12) *Alarm.com Inc. v. Joao*, No. 1-14-cv-00284 (D. Del.); (13) *Joao v. Protect America, Inc.*, No. 1-14-cv-00134 (W.D. Tex.); (14) *Joao v. FrontPoint Security Solutions LLC*, No. 1-13-cv-01760 (D. Del.); (15) *Joao v. Chrysler Corp.*, No. 4-13-cv-13957 (E.D. Mich.); (16) *Joao v. Ford Motor Co.*, No. 4-13-cv-13615 (E.D. Mich.); (17) *Joao v. Mazda Motor of America Inc.*, No. 1-13-cv-00728 (D. Del.); (18) *Joao v. Mitsubishi Motors North America Inc.*, No. 1-13-cv-00614 (D. Del.); (19) *Joao v. Lowe's Cos., Inc.*, No. 5-13-cv-00056 (W.D.N.C.); (20) *Joao v. Jaguar Land Rover North America LLC*, No. 1-13-cv-00507 (D. Del.); (21) *Joao v. Vivint Inc.*, No. 1-13-cv-00508 (D. Del.); (22) *Joao v.*

IPR2015-01486
Patent 6,549,130 B1

Chrysler Corp., No. 1-13-cv-00053 (S.D.N.Y.); (23) *Joao v. Ford Motor Co.*, No. 1-12-cv-01479 (D. Del.); (24) *Joao v. City of Yonkers*, No. 1-12-cv-07734 (S.D.N.Y.); (25) *Joao v. Ford Motor Co.*, No. 4-12-cv-14004 (E.D. Mich.); (26) *Joao v. Hyundai Motor America*, No. 8-12-cv-00007 (C.D. Cal.); (27) *Joao v. Ford Motor Co.*, No. 2-12-cv-00033 (C.D. Cal.); (28) *Joao of California, LLC v. Sling Media, Inc.*, No. 3-11-cv-06277 (C.D. Cal.); (29) *Xanboo Inc. v. Joao of California*, No. 8-11-cv-00604 (C.D. Cal.); (30) *Joao of California, LLC v. ACTI Corp.*, No. 8-10-cv-01909 (C.D. Cal.); and (31) *Joao v. Cenuco, Inc.*, No. 7-05-cv-01037 (S.D.N.Y.). Pet. 2–4; Paper 5.

According to Patent Owner, the '130 patent also is the subject of four *ex parte* reexaminations, Reexamination Control Nos.: (1) 90/013,303; (2) 90/013,301; (3) 90/013,302; and (4) 90/013,300. Paper 5, 5. Petitioner concurrently filed petitions requesting an *inter partes* review of the following U.S. Patent Nos.: (1) 6,549,130 (Case IPR2015-01509); (2) 6,542,077 B2 (Case IPR2015-01466); (3) 6,587,046 (Case IPR2015-01477); (4) 7,277,010 (Case IPR2015-01484); (5) 6,542,076 (Case IPR2015-01478); (6) 7,397,363 (Case IPR2015-01482); (7) 7,397,363 (Case IPR2015-01485); and (8) 6,542,076 (Case IPR2015-01508). *Id.* at 4–5.

II. ANALYSIS

Because at least one of the petitioning parties was served with a complaint on June 23, 2014 (Exs. 2002–2005), the statutory bar date for IPR2015-01486 is June 23, 2015. 35 U.S.C. § 315(b); 37 C.F.R. § 42.101(b). Petitioner, however, was accorded a filing date of June 24,

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.