

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MAZDA MOTOR OF AMERICA, INC., SUBARU OF AMERICA, INC.,
and VOLVO CAR USA, LLC,
Petitioner,

v.

STRATOSAUDIO, INC.,
Patent Owner.

IPR2022-00205
Patent 8,903,307 B2

Before JUSTIN T. ARBES, HYUN J. JUNG, and KEVIN C. TROCK,
Administrative Patent Judges.

ARBES, *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

A. *Background and Summary*

Mazda Motor of America, Inc., Subaru of America, Inc., and Volvo
Car USA, LLC (collectively, “Petitioner”) filed a Petition (Paper 1, “Pet.”)

requesting *inter partes* review of claims 11 and 15–18 of U.S. Patent No. 8,903,307 B2 (Ex. 1001, “the ’307 patent”) pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 311(a). Concurrently, Petitioner filed a Motion for Joinder pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 315(c) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.122(b), seeking to be joined as a party to *Volkswagen Group of America, Inc. v. StratosAudio, Inc.*, Case IPR2021-00712 (“the Volkswagen IPR”), which also involves claims 11 and 15–18 of the ’307 patent. Paper 5 (“Mot.”). Patent Owner did not file an opposition to the Motion for Joinder and waived the filing of a preliminary response pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.107(b). Paper 9.

Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 314(a), the Director may not authorize an *inter partes* review unless the information in the petition and preliminary 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.” For the reasons that follow, we determine that institution of *inter partes* review is warranted on the same grounds instituted in the Volkswagen IPR and grant Petitioner’s Motion for Joinder.

B. Related Matters

The parties indicate that the ’307 patent is the subject of the following district court cases: *StratosAudio, Inc. v. Volkswagen Group of America, Inc.*, Case No. 6:20-cv-1131 (W.D. Tex.), *StratosAudio, Inc. v. Hyundai Motor America*, Case No. 6:20-cv-1125 (W.D. Tex.), *StratosAudio, Inc. v. Mazda Motor of America, Inc.*, Case No. 6:20-cv-1126 (W.D. Tex.), *StratosAudio, Inc. v. Subaru of America, Inc.*, Case No. 6:20-cv-1128 (W.D. Tex.), and *StratosAudio, Inc. v. Volvo Cars of North America, LLC*, Case No. 6:20-cv-1129 (W.D. Tex.) (collectively, “the district court cases”). See Pet. 2; Paper 6, 1.

Petitioner filed a petition challenging claims of a patent related to the '307 patent and motion for joinder in Case IPR2022-00204. Other proceedings involving patents asserted in the district court cases are the Volkswagen IPR (instituted) and Cases IPR2021-00716 (instituted), IPR2021-00717 (denied), IPR2021-00718 (denied), IPR2021-00719 (denied), IPR2021-00720 (instituted), IPR2021-00721 (instituted), IPR2021-01267 (instituted), IPR2021-01303 (instituted), IPR2021-01305 (instituted), IPR2021-01371 (instituted), IPR2022-00203 (pending), and IPR2022-00224 (pending).

C. Illustrative Claim

Challenged claim 11 of the '307 patent is independent. Claims 15–18 each depend directly from claim 11. Claim 11 recites:

11. A system for correlating media content identifying data with at least one broadcast segment received by a communication device, the system comprising:

a receiver configured to receive a broadcast stream comprising the at least one broadcast segment and associated media content, the receiver further configured to receive a data stream associated with the broadcast stream, the data stream comprising, at a minimum, the media content identifying data, wherein the media content identifying data comprises at least one element;

at least one computer processor configured to extract the media content identifying data from the data stream, associating each media content identifying data element with at least one of a plurality of media content;

an electronic memory of the communication device configured to store, at a minimum, media content identifying data elements into identifying data aggregates, each identifying data aggregate associated with at least one of the plurality of media content and the at least one broadcast segment, wherein

the at least one broadcast segment is corollary to the at least one of the plurality of media content; and

an output configured to present at least a portion of the data elements stored in the electronic memory of the communication device to provide selective outputting using an interface of at least one of the following: the media content identifying data, the media content, the corollary broadcast segment, a temporal position of the corollary broadcast segment of the broadcast stream.

D. Evidence

Petitioner relies on the following prior art:

U.S. Patent No. 6,317,784 B1, filed Sept. 29, 1998, issued Nov. 13, 2001 (Ex. 1005, “Mackintosh”); and

U.S. Patent No. 5,579,537, issued Nov. 26, 1996 (Ex. 1004, “Takahisa”).

E. Prior Art and Asserted Grounds

Petitioner asserts that claims 11 and 15–18 of the ’307 patent are unpatentable on the following grounds:

Claim(s) Challenged	35 U.S.C. §	Reference/Basis
11, 15, 16, 18	102(b) ¹	Takahisa
17	103(a)	Takahisa
11, 15–18	103(a)	Mackintosh

¹ The Leahy-Smith America Invents Act, Pub. L. No. 112-29, 125 Stat. 284 (2011) (“AIA”), amended 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103. Because the challenged claims of the ’307 patent have an effective filing date before the effective date of the applicable AIA amendments, we refer to the pre-AIA versions of 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103. *See* Pet. 4.

II. ANALYSIS

Joinder for purposes of an *inter partes* review is governed by 35 U.S.C. § 315(c), which states:

JOINDER.—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.

“To join a party to an instituted [*inter partes* review (IPR)], the plain language of § 315(c) requires two different decisions.” *Facebook, Inc. v. Windy City Innovations, LLC*, 973 F.3d 1321, 1332 (Fed. Cir. 2020). “First, the statute requires that the Director (or the Board acting through a delegation of authority) . . . determine whether the joinder applicant’s petition for IPR ‘warrants’ institution under § 314.” *Id.* “Second, to effect joinder, § 315(c) requires the Director to exercise his discretion to decide whether to ‘join as a party’ the joinder applicant.” *Id.*

A. *Whether the Petition Warrants Institution*

Petitioner states that its Petition and accompanying declaration of Vijay Madiseti, Ph.D. (Exhibit 1003), are “substantively identical” to those filed by Volkswagen Group of America, Inc. (“Volkswagen”) in the Volkswagen IPR, with the only differences being the identification of Petitioner and mandatory notice information. *See* Pet. 1–2; Mot. 1–2. We previously instituted an *inter partes* review in the Volkswagen IPR. *See* IPR2021-00712, Paper 16 (“Dec. on Inst.”).

We incorporate our previous analysis regarding the asserted grounds of unpatentability, and conclude that Petitioner has demonstrated a

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.