

trials@uspto.gov

IPR2016-00123, Paper No. 21
IPR2016-00146, Paper No. 21
IPR2016-00177, Paper No. 21
February 21, 2017

571-272-7822

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

VOLKSWAGEN GROUP OF AMERICA, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

WEST VIEW RESEARCH, LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2016-00123 (Patent 8,719,037 B2)
Case IPR2016-00146 (Patent 8,719,038 B1)
Case IPR2016-00177 (Patent 8,781,839 B1)

Held: February 7, 2017

Before MICHAEL R. ZECHER, KEVIN W. CHERRY, and
JASON J. CHUNG, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

The above-entitled matter came on for hearing on Tuesday,
February 7, 2017, commencing at 1:01 p.m., at the U.S. Patent
and Trademark Office, 600 Dulany Street, Alexandria, Virginia.

Case IPR2016-00123 (Patent 8,719,037 B2)
Case IPR2016-00146 (Patent 8,719,038 B1)
Case IPR2016-00177 (Patent 8,781,839 B1)

APPEARANCES:

ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER:

CLIFFORD A. ULRICH, ESQUIRE
Andrews, Kurth, Kenyon, LLP
One Broadway
New York, New York 10004-1007

and

CHARLES HAWKINS, ESQUIRE
Volkswagen Group of America, Inc.

ON BEHALF OF PATENT OWNER:

(No counsel present.)

Case IPR2016-00123 (Patent 8,719,037 B2)

Case IPR2016-00146 (Patent 8,719,038 B1)

Case IPR2016-00177 (Patent 8,781,839 B1)

1 have copies of our demonstratives that we filed, if I can give you
2 copies if you would like.

3 JUDGE ZECHER: Absolutely.

4 MR. ULRICH: May I?

5 JUDGE ZECHER: Please approach.

6 MR. ULRICH: So the way I would like to proceed is
7 first on IPR2016-00123 which is patent number 8,719,037, then
8 move on to IPR2016-00177 which is patent number 8,781,839,
9 then finally IPR2016-00146 which is U.S. patent number
10 8,719,038.

11 So all three patents belong to the same patent family
12 and claim priority back to June of 1999. The specifications are
13 basically the same. There are some differences in some recent
14 abstracts, some typographical corrections, but by and large they
15 are the same. And all three more or less relate to transportation
16 devices that include functionalities such as network
17 communication, voice recognition and also some display features
18 as well.

19 As described in all of these patents, the hardware
20 features are conventional, the software features are conventional
21 and all the functionality is basically conventional.

22 So our IPRs, petitions, we included a declaration by our
23 expert, Scott Andrews, who is a EE, BS and MS, 35 years
24 experience in automotive technology. The petitions, of course,
25 describe scope and content of the prior art, explain why all of the

Case IPR2016-00123 (Patent 8,719,037 B2)

Case IPR2016-00146 (Patent 8,719,038 B1)

Case IPR2016-00177 (Patent 8,781,839 B1)

1 challenged claims are obvious. And Mr. Andrews also describes
2 the scope and content of that prior art, also explains why the
3 claims are obvious in light of that prior art.

4 Now, in the institution decision the Board sided with
5 Volkswagen Group of America on basically all of the issues
6 except for one claim construction issue. And that's the
7 construction of display device means, the '037 patent. We, in our
8 petition, said that this was a means-plus-function claim. The
9 Board disagreed. But at the end of the day, it's not really an issue
10 that matters.

11 The only claim construction issue were the
12 means-plus-function elements of claim 77 of the '037 patent, and
13 we laid out our structural analysis of those elements in the
14 petitions. For all of the other claim terms, our petition took the
15 position that broadest reasonable interpretation, of course,
16 applies.

17 In response to the institution decisions, West View filed
18 patent owner responses that only contained attorney argument.
19 There was no expert testimony. They didn't depose our witness.
20 So Mr. Andrews' testimony remains unrebutted.

21 The patent owner responses more or less repeat the
22 arguments that West View made, that the patent owner made in
23 its preliminary response, as the Board found all of those
24 arguments to be unpersuasive. And West View's patent owner
25 responses contain no argument that would compel a different

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.