

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

TOYOTA MOTOR CORP.,
Petitioner,

v.

AUTOCONNECT HOLDINGS LLC,
Patent Owner.

IPR2025-00890 (Patent 8,793,034 B2)
IPR2025-00891 (Patent 9,147,296 B2)

Before COKE MORGAN STEWART, *Acting Under Secretary of
Commerce for Intellectual Property and Acting Director of the United States
Patent and Trademark Office.*

DECISION
Denying Institution of *Inter Partes* Review

IPR2025-00890 (Patent 8,793,034 B2)

IPR2025-00891 (Patent 9,147,296 B2)

AutoConnect Holdings LLC (“Patent Owner”) filed a request for discretionary denial (Paper 6, “DD Req.”) in the above-captioned cases, and Toyota Motor Corp. (“Petitioner”) filed an opposition (Paper 7, “DD Opp.”).¹ With authorization, Patent Owner filed a Reply (Paper 8).

After considering the parties’ arguments and the record, and in view of all relevant considerations, discretionary denial of institution is appropriate in these proceedings. This determination is based on the totality of the evidence and arguments the parties have presented.

Although the parties are engaged in a parallel proceeding involving the challenged patent, it is unclear whether a final written decision in these proceedings will issue after the district court trial occurs. The projected final written decision due date in these Board proceedings is November 29, 2026. DD Req. 6. The district court’s scheduled trial date is July 20, 2026, and the parties offer different time-to-trial statistics that suggest trial could begin between July 2026 and early December 2026. *Id.*; DD Opp. 13–14. As such, these considerations neither favor nor counsel against discretionary denial.

Some considerations, however, favor discretionary denial. In particular, the challenged patents have been in force for approximately eleven and ten years, respectively, creating strong settled expectations for Patent Owner, and Petitioner does not provide persuasive reasoning why an *inter partes* review is an appropriate use of Board resources. *Dabico Airport Sols. Inc. v. AXA Power ApS*, IPR2025-00408, Paper 21 at 2–3 (Director June 18, 2025). Petitioner’s argument that Patent Owner does not have

¹ Citations are to papers in IPR2025-00890. The parties filed similar papers in IPR2025-00891.

IPR2025-00890 (Patent 8,793,034 B2)

IPR2025-00891 (Patent 9,147,296 B2)

strong settled expectations because “Patent Owner has not commercialized its purported inventions, nor has it done anything to improve the United States economy or public interest with its purported inventions,” without more, does not defeat Patent Owner’s strong settled expectations. DD Opp. 8. Additionally, Patent Owner provides evidence that it brought the challenged patents to Petitioner’s attention in 2023, which further supports discretionary denial. DD Req. 22; *see Geotab Inc., v. Fractus, S.A.*, IPR2025-00928, Paper 11, 2–3 (Director Sept. 12, 2025).

Although certain arguments are highlighted above, the determination to exercise discretion to deny institution is based on a holistic assessment of all of the evidence and arguments presented. Accordingly, the Petitions are denied under 35 U.S.C. § 314(a).

In consideration of the foregoing, it is:

ORDERED that Patent Owner’s requests for discretionary denial are *granted*; and

FURTHER ORDERED that the Petitions are *denied*, and no trial is instituted.

IPR2025-00890 (Patent 8,793,034 B2)

IPR2025-00891 (Patent 9,147,296 B2)

FOR PETITIONER:

Joshua Goldberg

James Barney

Aidan Skoyles

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER, LLP

joshua.goldberg@finnegan.com

james.barney@finnegan.com

aidan.skoyles@finnegan.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

Eric Zelepugas

Robert Conley

AVANTECH LAW, LLP

zelepugas@avantechlaw.com

conley@avantechlaw.com