

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

GOOGLE LLC,
Petitioner,

v.

ECOFACOR, INC.,
Patent Owner.

IPR2023-00356
Patent 8,596,550 B2

Before SCOTT B. HOWARD, PAUL J. KORNICZKY, and
BRENT M. DOUGAL, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

KORNICZKY, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION
Granting Institution of *Inter Partes* Review
35 U.S.C. § 314
Granting Motion for Joinder
35 U.S.C. § 315(c); 37 C.F.R. § 42.122

I. INTRODUCTION

Google LLC (“Petitioner”) filed (1) a Petition for *inter partes* review (Paper 1, “Pet.”) of claims 1–16 of U.S. Patent No. 8,596,550 B2 (Ex. 1001, “the ’550 patent”) and (2) a Motion for Joinder (Paper 2, “Mot.”) to *ecobee Technologies ULC v. EcoFactor, Inc.*, IPR2022-00983 (“the ecobee IPR”). We instituted an *inter partes* review in the ecobee IPR on November 15, 2022. Ecobee IPR, Paper 8. EcoFactor, Inc. (“Patent Owner”) did not file a Patent Owner Preliminary Response or an Opposition to Petitioner’s Motion for Joinder in this proceeding.

We have authority to institute an *inter partes* review if “the information presented in the petition . . . and any response . . . shows that there is a reasonable likelihood that the petitioner would prevail with respect to at least 1 of the claims challenged in the petition.” 35 U.S.C. § 314(a) (2018).

After considering the Petition, the Motion for Joinder, and evidence of record, we grant Petitioner’s request to institute an *inter partes* review of claims 1–16 of the ’550 patent and Motion for Joinder to IPR2022-00983.

II. BACKGROUND

A. *Real Parties-in-Interest*

As required by 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1), each party identifies the real party-in-interest. Petitioner identifies itself as the real party-in-interest. Pet. 67. Patent Owner identifies itself as a real party-in-interest. Paper 5, 1.

B. Related Proceedings

As required by 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2), Petitioner and Patent Owner identify the judicial or administrative matters that would affect or be affected by a decision in this proceeding. Petitioner and Patent Owner state the '550 patent is the subject matter of:

(1) *Emerson Electric Co. v. EcoFactor, Inc.*, 1-21-cv-00317 (D. Del. March 1, 2021);

(2) *Google, LLC v. EcoFactor, Inc.*, 3-21-cv-01468 (N.D. Cal. March 1, 2021);

(3) *ecobee, Inc. v. EcoFactor, Inc.*, 1-21-cv-00323 (D. Del. March 2, 2021);

(4) *Carrier Global Corp. v. EcoFactor, Inc.*, 1-21-cv-00328 (D. Del. March 3, 2021);

(5) *EcoFactor, Inc. v. Google, LLC*, 6-22-cv-00350 (W.D. Tex. April 1, 2022);

(6) *Certain Smart Thermostat Systems, Smart HVAC Systems, Smart HVAC Control Systems, And Components Thereof*, Inv. No. 337-TA-1258 (April 4, 2022) (Initial Determination) (“*Certain Smart Thermostat Systems*”);

(7) *ecobee Technologies ULC v. EcoFactor, Inc.*, IPR2022-00969 (involving the '550 patent);

(8) *ecobee Technologies ULC v. EcoFactor, Inc.*, IPR2022-00983 (involving the '550 patent); and

(9) *Google LLC v. EcoFactor, Inc.*, IPR2023-00355 (involving the '550 patent). Pet. 67–68; Paper 5, 1.

C. *Asserted Grounds*

Petitioner relies upon the following evidence:

(1) U.S. Patent Publication 2004/0117330, published June 17, 2004 (Ex. 1004, “Ehlers”);

(2) U.S. Patent Publication 2005/0040250, published February 24, 2005 (Ex. 1005, “Wruck”);

(3) U.S. Patent 7,784,704 B2 (Ex. 1019, “Harter”).

Petitioner challenges the patentability of claims 1–16 of the ’550 patent claims on the following grounds (Pet. 11):

Ground	Claim(s) Challenged	35 U.S.C. § ¹	Reference(s)/Basis
1	1–16	103(a)	Ehlers, Wruck
2	9–16	103(a)	Ehlers, Wruck, Harter

III. INSTITUTION OF *INTER PARTES* REVIEW

The Petition in this proceeding asserts the same grounds of unpatentability as the one on which we instituted review in the *ecobee* IPR. *Compare* Pet. 12–66, *with ecobee* IPR, Paper 8 at 7. Indeed, Petitioner contends that the Petition

introduces the same arguments and the same grounds raised in the existing *ecobee* IPR (i.e., challenges the same claims of the same patent, relies on the same expert declaration, and is based on the same grounds and combinations of prior art submitted in the granted *ecobee* Petition). Although there are minor differences related to the mandatory notices and grounds for

¹ The relevant sections of the Leahy-Smith America Invents Act (“AIA”), Pub. L. No. 112–29, 125 Stat. 284 (Sept. 16, 2011), took effect on March 16, 2013. Because the ’550 patent claims priority to an application filed before this date, our citations to 35 U.S.C. § 103 in this Decision are to its pre-AIA version. Our decision is not impacted, however, by which version of the statute applies.

standing, there are no substantive changes to the facts, citations, evidence, or arguments relied upon to assert unpatentability of the claims relative to the ecobee Petition.

Mot. 7. Exhibit 1023, a redlined comparison of the petitions in this proceeding and the ecobee IPR, confirm that the challenges are substantively identical.

Patent Owner did not file a Preliminary Response.

For the same reasons set forth in our institution decision in the ecobee IPR, we determine that the information presented in the Petition shows a reasonable likelihood that Petitioner would prevail in showing that claims 1–16 of the '550 patent are unpatentable. *See* ecobee IPR, Paper 8, 14–30. Accordingly, we institute an *inter partes* review on all of the challenged claims.

IV. GRANT OF MOTION FOR JOINDER

We instituted trial in the ecobee IPR on November 15, 2022. ecobee IPR, Paper 8. Petitioner filed the Petition and Motion for Joinder on December 15, 2022. Because joinder was requested no later than one month after trial was instituted in the ecobee IPR, Petitioner's Motion for Joinder is timely. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.122(b) (2022).

The statutory provision governing joinder in *inter partes* review proceedings is 35 U.S.C. § 315(c), which reads:

If the Director institutes an *inter partes* review, the Director, in his or her discretion, may join as a party to that *inter partes* review any person who properly files a petition under section 311 that the Director, after receiving a preliminary response under section 313 or the expiration of the time for filing such a response, determines warrants the institution of an *inter partes* review under section 314.

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.