

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ECOBEE TECHNOLOGIES, ULC,
Petitioner

v.

ECOFACITOR, INC.,
Patent Owner

IPR2022-00983
Patent No. 8,596,550

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

Table of Contents

I. Introduction.....	1
II. Petitioner’s Asserted Grounds and References.....	2
III. The Petition Fails to Establish a Reasonable Likelihood of Success on the Merits	2
A. Claims 1e and 9e require comparing computer-calculated setpoints with actual setpoints	3
B. Ehlers in view of Wruck does not render obvious comparing computer-calculated setpoints with actual setpoints	4
IV. Institution Should Be Denied Under the <i>Fintiv</i> Factors.....	7
A. Parallel Proceedings.....	8
B. Factor 1 weighs against institution, as there is no stay in the district court now and no evidence exists that a stay may be granted in the future.....	10
C. Factor 2 weighs slightly against institution, as trial in the district court is scheduled to be completed less than one month after the FWD.....	12
D. Factor 3 weighs against institution, as discovery is well underway and claim construction proceedings in the district court case will be almost completed as of the date the institution decision is due.....	14
E. Factor 4 weighs against institution, as there is overlap between this IPR and the district court case.	16
F. Factor 5 weighs against institution, as Petitioner is a Respondent in the parallel district court case.	18
G. Factor 6 weighs in against institution.	18
H. Summary Regarding <i>Fintiv</i> Factors	19
V. Conclusion	20

Table of Authorities

Cases

<i>Apple Inc., v. Fintiv, Inc.</i> , IPR2020-00019, Paper 11 (PTAB Mar. 20, 2020)	passim
<i>Apple Inc., v. Fintiv, Inc.</i> , IPR2020-00019, Paper 15 (PTAB May 13, 2020).....	passim
<i>Cisco Systems, Inc. v. Ramot at Tel Aviv University Ltd.</i> , IPR2020-00123, Paper 14 (PTAB May 15, 2020).....	10
<i>Intel Corp. v. VLSI Tech. LLC</i> , IPR2020-00158, Paper 16 (PTAB May 20, 2020).....	10, 14
<i>NHK Spring Co. v. Intri-Plex Techs., Inc.</i> , IPR2018-00752, Paper 8 (PTAB Sept. 12, 2018).....	7, 12, 17, 20

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 314(a)	2, 7, 20
--------------------------	----------

Exhibits

Exhibit No.	Description
2001	<i>Ecobee, Inc. v. EcoFactor, Inc.</i> , 1-21-cv-00323 (D. Del. March 2, 2012), Dkt. 20 (Ecobee's Motion to Dismiss)
2002	<i>Ecobee, Inc. v. EcoFactor, Inc.</i> , 1-21-cv-00323 (D. Del. March 2, 2012), Dkt. 1 (Complaint)
2003	<i>Ecobee, Inc. v. EcoFactor, Inc.</i> , 1-21-cv-00323 (D. Del. March 2, 2012), Dkt. 18 (ecobee Opposition to Motion to Stay)
2004	Ecobee's Disclosure of Initial Invalidity Contentions, March 17, 2022 in <i>Ecobee, Inc. v. EcoFactor, Inc.</i> , 1-21-cv-00323

I. Introduction

The Petition challenges claims 1-16 of U.S. Patent No. 8,596,550 (Ex. 1001) under two grounds of unpatentability. The Petition fails to establish a reasonable likelihood of success on the merits. The challenged claims require a computer to compare an *automated setpoint* (i.e., a computer-calculated setpoint) with an *actual setpoint*, which allows the patented system to determine if the setpoints that the computer is calculating are acceptable to the user, or if the user is fighting with or opting-out of the automated programming. The Petition fails to show that prior art discloses or renders obvious this limitation.

Moreover, instituting review in this IPR would cause the parties and the Board to incur significant inefficiencies and wasted efforts of the type warned of in *Fintiv* and *NHK Spring*. Over a year ago, on March 2, 2021, Petitioner ecobee Technologies, ULC¹ filed a complaint in U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware against Patent Owner EcoFactor for a declaratory judgement of non-infringement of the '550 patent. Ecofactor filed its counter-claim on May 5, 2021. That district court case has progressed substantially, with discovery having been

¹ ecobee, Inc. was acquired by Generac Holdings Inc. After the acquisition, ecobee, Inc. became ecobee Technologies ULC d/b/a/ ecobee, which is the Petitioner in this proceeding. Ex. 2001, ecobee Motion to Dismiss at fn. 1.

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.