

Filed: August 29, 2023

Filed on behalf of ecobee Technologies ULC

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ECOBEE TECHNOLOGIES ULC,
Petitioner,

v.

ECOFACITOR, INC.,
Patent Owner

Case No. IPR2022-00983
U.S. Patent No. 8,596,550 B2

**PETITIONER'S SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF REGARDING
COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Collateral Estoppel Prevents Relitigating Issues.....	1
III.	This IPR Presents Issues Already Litigated and Adjudged by the Board.....	3
	A. Estoppel Applies to EcoFactor’s “Thermal Gain” Argument.....	3
	B. Estoppel Applies to Whether Ehlers and Wruck Teach a Difference Value	4
	C. Estoppel Applies to EcoFactor’s Arguments Concerning the Claimed Using and Calculating Steps.....	5
IV.	Conclusion	6

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases

<i>Google LLC v. Hammond Development Int’l, Inc.</i> , 54 F.4th 1377 (Fed. Cir. 2022)	3
<i>Mobile Tech, Inc. v. Invue Security Products Inc.</i> , IPR2018-00481 (P.T.A.B. July 16, 2019)	2-3
<i>Ohio Willow Wood Co. v. Alps S., LLC</i> , 735 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	3
<i>Papst Licensing GMBH & Co. v. Samsung Elecs. Am., Inc.</i> , 924 F.3d 1243 (Fed. Cir. 2019)	2
<i>SynQor, Inc. v. Vicor Corp.</i> , 988 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2021)	2, 5
<i>VirnetX Inc. v. Apple, Inc.</i> , 909 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	1-3

Other Authorities

37 C.F.R. § 42.73	1-2, 6
-------------------------	--------

Petitioner (“ecobee”) submits this brief on why collateral estoppel applies against Patent Owner (“EcoFactor”) as to the application of Ehlers and Wruck.

I. Introduction

The Board previously found that the challenged claims of U.S. Patent No. 9,194,597 (“’597 patent”; Ex. 1025), which is a continuation of the ’550 patent, were obvious over the combination of Ehlers and Wruck—a combination at issue in this IPR. *Google LLC and ecobee Technologies ULC v. EcoFactor, Inc.*, IPR2022-00538, Paper 26 (P.T.A.B. August 1, 2023) (“’597 FWD” (Ex. 1026) and, generally, “’597 IPR”). Independent claims 1 and 9 of the ’597 patent recite features substantially identical to features in the claims of the ’550 patent. For instance, the accessing, using, calculating, generating (including with respect to the “difference value”), and detecting steps in claim 1 of each patent are substantially identical. Similarly, the accessing, using, calculating, comparing, detecting, and changing steps in claim 9 of each patent are substantially identical. Both patents share a common specification. *See* Ex. 1001; Ex. 1025. Collateral estoppel and estoppel under 37 C.F.R. § 42.73 apply because this IPR presents issues identical to ones decided in the ’597 IPR.

II. Collateral Estoppel Prevents Relitigating Issues

Collateral estoppel (issue preclusion) prevents relitigating issues. *VirnetX Inc. v. Apple, Inc.*, 909 F.3d 1375, 1377 (Fed. Cir. 2018). Issue preclusion applies

to Board decisions in IPRs. *Papst Licensing GMBH & Co. v. Samsung Elecs. Am., Inc.*, 924 F.3d 1243, 1250-51 (Fed. Cir. 2019). A party is collaterally estopped from relitigating an issue if “(1) a prior action presents an identical issue; (2) the prior action actually litigated and adjudged that issue; (3) the judgment in that prior action necessarily required determination of the identical issue; and (4) the prior action featured full representation of the estopped party.” *VirnetX Inc.*, 909 F.3d at 1377; *see SynQor, Inc. v. Vicor Corp.*, 988 F.3d 1341, 1353 (Fed. Cir. 2021) (“essentially” the same issue); *Mobile Tech, Inc. v. Invue Security Products Inc.*, IPR2018-00481, Paper 29 at 9-10 (P.T.A.B. July 16, 2019). Per the rules, Board decisions have preclusive effect upon issuance. *See* 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.73(a) (“A judgment, except in the case of a termination, disposes of all issues that were, or by motion reasonably could have been, raised and decided”) and 42.73(d) (explaining that “[a] patent owner is precluded from taking action inconsistent with the adverse judgment” of the Board and listing non-limiting examples); *see SynQor*, 988 F.3d at 1351 (“Factual determinations made by the expert agency entrusted by Congress to make those determinations—and to make them finally—need not be endlessly reexamined.”).

Patent claims need not be identical for collateral estoppel to apply. Rather, collateral estoppel requires that the *issues of patentability* that were previously litigated be identical, and applies as long as “the differences between the

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.