

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

HEWLETT PACKARD ENTERPRISE COMPANY,
Petitioner,

v.

CHRIMAR SYSTEMS, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2019-00033
Patent 8,902,760 B2

Before KARL D. EASTHOM, GREGG I. ANDERSON, and
ROBERT J. WEINSCHENK, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

WEINSCHENK, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION
Denying Institution of *Inter Partes* Review
35 U.S.C. § 315(a)(1)

I. INTRODUCTION

Hewlett Packard Enterprise Company (“Petitioner”) filed a Petition (Paper 2, “Pet.”) requesting an *inter partes* review of claims 73, 106, 112, 134, 142, 145, and 146 (“the challenged claims”) of U.S. Patent No. 8,902,760 B2 (Ex. 1004, “the ’760 patent”). Chrimar Systems, Inc. (“Patent Owner”) filed a Preliminary Response (Paper 8, “Prelim. Resp.”) to the Petition. Also, as authorized, Petitioner filed a Reply (Paper 9, “Reply”) to the Preliminary Response, and Patent Owner filed a Sur-reply (Paper 10, “Sur-reply”) to the Reply.

An *inter partes* review “may not be instituted if, before the date on which the petition for such review is filed, the petitioner or real party in interest filed a civil action challenging the validity of a claim of the patent.” 35 U.S.C. § 315(a)(1). The information presented shows that Petitioner filed a civil action challenging the validity of a claim of the ’760 patent before the date on which the Petition was filed. Therefore, the Petition is denied, and no trial is instituted.

A. *Related Proceedings*

The parties indicate that the ’760 patent is the subject of several cases in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, and the United States District Court for the Northern District of California. Pet. 2–6; Paper 5, 1–2. The parties also indicate that the ’760 patent was the subject of Reexamination No. 90/013,802, and the subject of petitions for *inter partes* review in IPR2016-00574, IPR2016-01399, IPR2016-01759, IPR2017-00719, and IPR2018-01511. Pet. 2–3; Paper 5, 2.

B. *The '760 Patent*

The '760 patent relates to a system for managing, tracking, and identifying remotely located electronic equipment. Ex. 1004, 1:27–30. According to the '760 patent, one of the difficulties in managing a computerized office environment is keeping track of a company's electronic assets. *Id.* at 1:32–57. Previous systems for tracking electronic assets suffered from several deficiencies. *Id.* at 1:62–65. For example, previous systems could not determine the connection status or physical location of an asset and could only track assets that were powered-up. *Id.* at 1:65–2:2.

To address these deficiencies, the '760 patent describes a system for tracking an electronic asset. *Id.* at 2:3–6, 3:23–27. In one embodiment described in the '760 patent, the system includes a central module and a remote module. *Id.* at 3:27–30. The remote module attaches to the electronic asset and transmits a low frequency signal. *Id.* A receiver in the central module monitors the signal transmitted by the remote module and determines if the status or location of the electronic asset changes. *Id.* at 3:30–32, 3:34–40.

C. *Illustrative Claim*

Of the challenged claims, claims 73 and 146 are independent. Claim 73, as amended during reexamination, is reproduced below.

73. A BaseT Ethernet system comprising:

Ethernet cabling having at least first and second individual pairs of conductors used to carry BaseT Ethernet communication signals, the at least first and second individual pairs of conductors physically connect between a piece of BaseT Ethernet terminal equipment and a piece of central network equipment,

the piece of central network equipment is a BaseT Ethernet hub;

the piece of central network equipment having at least one DC supply,

the piece of BaseT Ethernet terminal equipment having at least one path to draw different magnitudes of current flow via the at least one DC supply through a loop formed over at least one of the conductors of the first pair of conductors and at least one of the conductors of the second pair of conductors,

the piece of central network equipment to detect at least two different magnitudes of current flow through the loop.

Ex. 1004, 21:37–52; Ex. 1035, 1:23–2:4.

D. *Evidence of Record*

Petitioner submits the following references and declaration (Pet. 13):

Reference or Declaration	Exhibit No.
Declaration of George Zimmerman (“Zimmerman Declaration”)	Ex. 1001
The Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, Inc., IEEE Standard 802.3u-1995 (1995) (“IEEE 802.3-1995”)	Ex. 1021
The Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, Inc., IEEE Standard 802.3-1993 (1993) (“IEEE 802.3-1993”)	Ex. 1022
Bloch et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,173,714 (issued Nov. 6, 1979) (“Bloch”)	Ex. 1025
Nelson, U.S. Patent No. 4,823,070 (issued Apr. 18, 1989) (“Nelson”)	Ex. 1026
Bulan et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,089,927 (issued Feb. 18, 1992) (“Bulan”)	Ex. 1027
Hunter et al., PCT Publication No. WO 96/23377 (published Aug. 1, 1996) (“Hunter”)	Ex. 1033
Peguiro, Swiss Patent No. CH 643 095 A5 (issued May 15, 1984) (“Peguiro”)	Ex. 1034

E. *Asserted Grounds of Unpatentability*

Petitioner asserts that the challenged claims are unpatentable on the following grounds (Pet. 13):

Claim(s)	Basis	References
73, 106, 112, 134, 142, and 145	35 U.S.C. § 103	Hunter and Bulan
146	35 U.S.C. § 103	Hunter, Bulan, and Nelson
146	35 U.S.C. § 103	Bloch, IEEE 802.3-1993, IEEE 802.3-1995, and Peguiron

II. ANALYSIS

An *inter partes* review “may not be instituted if, before the date on which the petition for such review is filed, the petitioner or real party in interest filed a civil action challenging the validity of a claim of the patent.” 35 U.S.C. § 315(a)(1). Petitioner previously filed a civil action challenging the validity of a claim of the ’760 patent. Pet. 8; Prelim. Resp. 1; Ex. 2001 ¶¶ 1, 76–81. Petitioner argues, though, that § 315(a)(1) does not bar institution of an *inter partes* review because Petitioner voluntarily dismissed its previous civil action without prejudice. Pet. 9 (citing *Emerson Elec. Co. v. SIPCO, LLC*, Case IPR2015-01579, slip op. at 2–3 (PTAB Jan. 14, 2016) (Paper 7)).¹

¹ In *Emerson*, a panel of the Board held in a non-precedential decision that the § 315(a)(1) bar does not apply when a petitioner dismissed its previous civil action without prejudice because “[f]ederal courts treat a civil action that is dismissed without prejudice as ‘something that de jure never existed.’” *Emerson*, Case IPR2015-01579, slip op. at 2–3 (Paper 7). Subsequently, in *Click-to-Call Technologies, LP v. Ingenio, Inc.*, 899 F.3d 1321, 1328 n.3 (Fed. Cir. 2018) (en banc), the Federal Circuit held that the § 315(b) time bar applies even when a previous civil action was dismissed voluntarily without prejudice. This Decision addresses the § 315(a)(1) bar in light of the Federal Circuit’s discussion of the § 315(b) time bar.

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.