

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY OF COMMERCE
FOR INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AND DIRECTOR OF THE
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

ASSA ABLOY AB, ASSA ABLOY INC.,
ASSA ABLOY RESIDENTIAL GROUP, INC., AUGUST HOME, INC.,
HID GLOBAL CORPORATION, and
ASSA ABLOY GLOBAL SOLUTIONS, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

CPC PATENT TECHNOLOGIES PTY, LTD.,
Patent Owner.

IPR2022-01006 (Patent 9,665,705 B2)
IPR2022-01045 (Patent 9,269,208 B2)
IPR2022-01089 (Patent 9,269,208 B2)¹

Before KATHERINE K. VIDAL, *Under Secretary of Commerce for
Intellectual Property and Director of the United States Patent and
Trademark Office.*

DECISION

Granting Director Review, Vacating the Final Written Decision, and
Remanding to the Patent Trial and Appeal Board Panel
for Further Proceedings

¹ This Decision applies to each of the above captioned proceedings.

IPR2022-01006 (Patent 9,665,705 B2)
IPR2022-01045 (Patent 9,269,208 B2)
IPR2022-01089 (Patent 9,269,208 B2)

I. INTRODUCTION

On May 31, 2022, ASSA ABLOY AB, ASSA ABLOY Inc., ASSA ABLOY Residential Group, Inc., August Home, Inc., HID Global Corporation, and ASSA ABLOY Global Solutions, Inc. (collectively, “Petitioner”) filed a Petition requesting an *inter partes* review of claims 1–17 of U.S. Patent No. 9,665,705 B2 (Ex. 1001, “the ’705 patent”).² IPR2022-01006, Paper 2 (“Pet.”). On June 3, 2022, Petitioner filed two separate Petitions requesting *inter partes* reviews of claims 1–13 of U.S. Patent No. 9,269,208 B2 (“the ’208 patent”).³ IPR2022-01045, Paper 3 (claims 1–9); IPR2022-01089, Paper 3 (claims 10–13). On December 1, 2022, the Board instituted *inter partes* review (Paper 23) of the -1006 IPR and, on January 3, 2023, the Board instituted *inter partes* reviews (IPR2022-01045, Paper 21; IPR2022-01089, Paper 21) of the -1045 and -1089 IPRs.

On November 30, 2023, the Board issued a Final Written Decision (Paper 47, “Final Dec.”) in the -1006 IPR and, on December 20, 2023, the Board issued a single, combined Final Written Decision in the -1045 and -1089 IPRs (IPR2022-01045, Paper 42; IPR2022-01089, Paper 42). The Final Written Decisions determined that Petitioner had not shown by a preponderance of the evidence that any challenged claim of the ’705 patent

² Unless otherwise noted, all citations are to papers and exhibits in IPR2022-01066 (“the -1006 IPR”). Petitioner filed similar papers in IPR2022-01045 (“the -1045 IPR”) and IPR2022-01089 (“the -1089 IPR”) (collectively, “the -1045 and -1089 IPRs”).

³ The ’705 patent and ’208 patent are both continuation applications from U.S. Patent Application No. 10/568,207, now issued as U.S. Patent No. 8,266,442 B2. *Compare* Ex. 1001, code (63), *with* Ex. 1007, code (63).

IPR2022-01006 (Patent 9,665,705 B2)
IPR2022-01045 (Patent 9,269,208 B2)
IPR2022-01089 (Patent 9,269,208 B2)

or the '208 patent was unpatentable.⁴ Final Dec. 86; IPR2022-01045, Paper 42, 92.

On December 22, 2023 and January 18, 2024, Petitioner filed requests for Director Review of the Board's Final Written Decisions. Paper 48, Ex. 3100; IPR2022-01045, Paper 43, Ex. 3100; IPR2022-01089, Paper 43, Ex. 3100 (collectively, "Requests"). Petitioner raises three issues in its Requests: (1) whether the Board's construction of "biometric signal" adds a limitation "[f]or the first time, using language neither side proposed" (Paper 48, 2, 6–7); (2) whether the Board's construction of "biometric signal" is erroneous (*id.* at 2–4, 6–13); and (3) whether the Board inconsistently addressed the claim limitation "receive a series of entries of the biometric signal[] . . ." between the captioned proceedings and IPR2022-00601 and IPR2022-00602 (*id.* at 4–6, 10, 14–15). *See Apple Inc. v. CPC Patent Techs. Pty, Ltd.*, IPR2022-00602, Paper 31 (PTAB Sept. 27, 2023) (challenging the '705 patent); *Apple Inc. v. CPC Patent Techs. Pty, Ltd.*, IPR2022-00601, Paper 31 (PTAB Sept. 27, 2023) (challenging the '208 patent).

I have reviewed Petitioner's Requests, the Board's Final Written Decisions, and the Papers and Exhibits of record in the captioned proceedings. I determine that Director Review of the Board's Final Written Decisions is appropriate. *See Revised Interim Director Review*

⁴ The Board made similar determinations in each captioned proceeding. My reasoning and the determinations made in this Decision apply equally to all captioned proceedings.

IPR2022-01006 (Patent 9,665,705 B2)
IPR2022-01045 (Patent 9,269,208 B2)
IPR2022-01089 (Patent 9,269,208 B2)

*Process*⁵ §§ 4.B, 5.A. For the reasons discussed in further detail below, I vacate the Board’s Final Written Decisions and remand for further proceedings consistent with this Decision.

II. BACKGROUND

Independent claims 1 of the ’705 and ’208 patents recite, in part, “A system for providing secure access to a controlled item, the system comprising: . . . a biometric sensor configured to receive *a biometric signal*.” Ex. 1001, 15:62–16:23 (emphasis added); Ex. 1007, 15:42–16:3.

Prior to institution, neither Petitioner nor CPC Patent Technologies Pty Ltd. (“Patent Owner”) offered a construction for the term “biometric signal,” and the Board stated that it construed the claims according to their “plain and ordinary meaning” in its decisions granting institution. *See* Paper 27 (Corrected Decision), 41.

After institution, Patent Owner argued that “biometric signal” means a “physical attribute of the user (i.e., fingerprint, facial pattern, iris, retina, voice, etc.).”⁶ Paper 31 (“PO Resp.”), 8–19; Paper 41 (“PO Sur-reply”), 7–

⁵ Available at www.uspto.gov/patents/ptab/decisions/revised-interim-director-review-process.

⁶ Patent Owner’s proposed claim construction is the same one offered by petitioner Apple in IPR2022-00601 and IPR2022-00602. *See* IPR2022-00601, Paper 1, 9; IPR2022-00602, Paper 1, 6. In those IPRs, the Board adopted Apple’s unopposed construction in its institution decisions (*see* IPR2022-00601, Paper 11, 13; IPR2022-00602, Paper 11, 13), and the parties did not propose any constructions for the term during trial (*see* IPR2022-00601, Papers 17, 20; IPR2022-00601, Papers 17, 20). The Board did not further address the construction of “biometric signal” in its final written decisions in those cases. *See* IPR2022-00601, Paper 31, 21–22; IPR2022-00602, Paper 31, 17–18.

IPR2022-01006 (Patent 9,665,705 B2)

IPR2022-01045 (Patent 9,269,208 B2)

IPR2022-01089 (Patent 9,269,208 B2)

11. In contrast, Petitioner responded that “biometric signal” means “the input and output of the biometric sensor.” Paper 35 (“Pet. Reply”), 7–11.

In its Final Written Decisions, the Board determined that a dispute existed as to the meaning of “biometric signal” and construed the term to mean “a physical or behavioral biometric attribute that provides secure access to a controlled item.” Final Dec. 54–68, 79 (“We note that our construction of the claim term ‘biometric signal’ . . . is different from the construction proposed by Patent Owner.”).

III. DISCUSSION

“[T]he Board [is] permitted to issue a new construction in the final written decision given that claim construction was a disputed issue during the proceedings.” See *WesternGeco LLC v. ION Geophysical Corp.*, 889 F.3d 1308, 1328 (Fed. Cir. 2018). However, “under the APA, the Board ‘may not change theories midstream’ by adopting a different claim construction in the final written decision than that adopted in the institution decision ‘without giving respondents reasonable notice of the change and the opportunity to present argument under the new theory.’” *Axonics, Inc. v. Medtronic, Inc.*, 75 F.4th 1374, 1381–1382 (Fed. Cir. 2023) (citing and discussing *SAS Inst., Inc. v. ComplementSoft, LLC*, 825 F.3d 1341, 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2016), *rev’d and remanded on other grounds*, *SAS Inst., Inc. v. Iancu*, 138 S. Ct. 1348 (2018)).⁷ Further, the Federal Circuit has found there

⁷ The *WesternGeco* court also observed that where the construction in a final written decision “is *sufficiently similar* to a construction disputed by the parties, the Board need not give the parties prior notice of the exact construction the Board adopts.” *Axonics*, 75 F.4th at 1381 n.7 (emphasis added) (citing *WesternGeco*, 889 F.3d at 1328). The Federal Circuit has not,

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.