

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

NISSAN NORTH AMERICA, INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

JOAO CONTROL & MONITORING SYSTEMS, LLC,  
Patent Owner.

---

VOLKSWAGEN GROUP OF AMERICA, INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

JOAO CONTROL & MONITORING SYSTEMS, LLC,  
Patent Owner.

---

COXCOM, LLC,  
Petitioner,

v.

JOAO CONTROL & MONITORING SYSTEMS, LLC,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2015-01509 Case IPR2015-01611 Case IPR2015-01760<sup>1</sup>  
Patent 6,549,130 B1

---

<sup>1</sup> This Decision addresses the same issues in the above-identified cases. Therefore, we exercise our discretion to issue one Decision to be entered in each of the identified cases. The parties are not authorized to use this style of case caption.

Case IPR2015-01509 Case IPR2015-01611 Case IPR2015-01760  
Patent 6,549,130 B1

---

Before DAVID C. MCKONE, STACEY G. WHITE, and BETH Z. SHAW,  
*Administrative Patent Judges.*

WHITE, *Administrative Patent Judge.*

ORDER

*Lifting Stay of Ex Parte Reexamination No. 90/013,301*  
*35 U.S.C. § 315(d) and 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.3, 42.122(a)*

The panel stayed *Ex Parte* Reexamination No. 90/013, 301 (“301 Reexam”), the co-pending *ex parte* reexamination of U.S. Patent No. 6,549,130 B1 (“the ’130 patent”), the patent challenged in IPR2015-01509, IPR2015-01611, and IPR2015-01760. IPR2015-01509 Paper 23, IPR2015-01611 Paper 16, IPR2015-01760 Paper 15. Final Written Decisions have been issued holding that Nissan North America, Inc., has shown claims 26, 29, 30, 33, 42, 43, 48, 60, and 68 of the ’130 patent to be unpatentable (IPR2015-01509 Paper 29, 65); Volkswagen Group of America, Inc., has shown claims 26, 31, 38, 42, 43, 48, 60, 63, 64, 73, 74, 85, 138, 139, and 143, 119, 120, and 205 of the ’130 patent to be unpatentable (IPR2015-01611 Paper 21, 21); and Coxcom LLC has shown claims 1, 8, 10, 12, 17, 98, 119, 124, 145, and 149 of the ’130 patent to be unpatentable (IPR2015-01760 Paper 25, 30).

Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d)(2), a party dissatisfied with a final decision of the Board must file its request for rehearing within 30 days. The 30-day deadline for filing a request for rehearing has passed in IPR2015-01509 and IPR2015-01760 without the filing of any such a request. In IPR2015-01611, Petitioner filed a Request for Rehearing (Paper 22) and a decision has been issued denying that Request (Paper 23). In addition, no party has filed a notice appeal as required by 35 U.S.C. § 142 and 37 C.F.R. §§ 90.2(a) and 90.3. Accordingly, it is now appropriate to lift the stay of Reexamination Control No. 90/013,301

#### ORDER

Accordingly, it is  
ORDERED that the stay of Reexamination 90/013,301, is hereby lifted; and  
FURTHER ORDERED that all time periods in Reexamination 90/013,301  
are hereby restarted.

Case IPR2015-01509 Case IPR2015-01611 Case IPR2015-01760  
Patent 6,549,130 B1

PETITIONER

Michael J. Lennon  
Clifford A. Ulrich  
KENYON & KENYON LLP  
[mlennon@kenyon.com](mailto:mlennon@kenyon.com)  
[culrich@kenyon.com](mailto:culrich@kenyon.com)

PATENT OWNER

Raymond Joao  
[rayjoao@optonline.net](mailto:rayjoao@optonline.net)

René A. Vazquez  
HENINGER GARRISON DAVIS, LLC  
[rvazquez@hgdlawfirm.com](mailto:rvazquez@hgdlawfirm.com)  
[PG\\_JCMS@hgdlawfirm.com](mailto:PG_JCMS@hgdlawfirm.com)

Steven W. Ritcheson  
[switcheson@insightplc.com](mailto:switcheson@insightplc.com)