

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

KOITO MANUFACTURING CO., LTD.,
Petitioner,

v.

LONGHORN AUTOMOTIVE GROUP LLC,
Patent Owner.

IPR2025-00955
Patent 8,810,803 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

Longhorn Automotive Group LLC (“Patent Owner”) filed a request for discretionary denial (Paper 6, “DD Req.”) in the above-captioned case, and Koito Manufacturing Co. Ltd. (“Petitioner”) filed an opposition (Paper 7, “DD Opp.”).

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

In particular, the projected final written decision due date in the Board proceeding is December 2, 2026. DD Req. 6. Although Patent Owner has not asserted the challenged patent against Petitioner in district court, the challenged patent is part of several district court proceedings involving other parties. Of these parallel proceedings, the earliest district court scheduled trial date is June 1, 2026. *Id.* As such, it is unlikely that a final written decision in this proceeding will issue before a district court trial occurs, resulting in significant duplication of effort, additional expense, and a risk of inconsistent decisions.

Additionally, the challenged patent has been in force for more than eleven years, 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 Solutions 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 strong settled expectations because the challenged patent was not previously commercialized or asserted in the technology space of vehicle headlamps or headlights is unpersuasive. DD Opp. 4–5. Furthermore, Petitioner’s argument that it did not expect a patent claiming a “system for projecting a

pattern of light” to be asserted in the technology space of vehicle headlamps is not persuasive. *See* Ex. 1001, col. 6, ll. 52–65 (claim 1).

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 Petition is denied under 35 U.S.C. § 314(a).

In consideration of the foregoing, it is:

ORDERED that Patent Owner’s request for discretionary denial is *granted*; and

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

IPR2025-00955
Patent 8,810,803 B2

FOR PETITIONER:

William Mandir
John Rabena
Tyler Del Rosario
Derek True
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
wmandir@sughrue.com
jrabena@sughrue.com
tdelrosario@sughrue.com
dtrue@sughrue.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

Vincent Rubino
Peter Lambrianakos
Enrique Iturralde
FABRICANT LLP
vrubino@fabricantllp.com
plambrianakos@fabricantllp.com
eiturralde@fabricantllp.com