

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

Washington, D.C.

In the Matter of

**CERTAIN INFOTAINMENT SYSTEMS,
COMPONENTS THEREOF, AND
AUTOMOBILES CONTAINING THE SAME**

Inv. No. 337-TA-1119

**ORDER NO. 52: GRANTING UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE OF
USPTO DECISIONS INSTITUTING *INTER PARTES* REVIEWS**

(September 23, 2019)

On September 19, 2019, Respondent u-blox AG (“u-blox”) filed a motion for judicial notice of two decisions instituting *inter partes* review proceedings for U.S. Patent No. 8,902,104 (“the ’104 patent”) (Motion Docket No. 1119-053). There is no opposition to the motion from Complainant or any other party.


The motion seeks judicial notice of decisions by the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (“PTAB”) of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (“USPTO”) to institute *inter partes* review proceedings in Cases IPR2019-00737 and IPR2019-00816, which relate to the ’104 patent. Copies of the institution decisions were attached to the motion as Exhibits A and B.

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Evidence 201, judicial notice is appropriate for “a fact that is not subject to reasonable dispute because it (1) is generally known within the trial court’s territorial jurisdiction; or (2) can be accurately and readily determined from sources whose accuracy cannot reasonably be questioned.” Fed. R. Evid. 201 (2011). Judicial notice is appropriate for USPTO decisions related to an asserted patent. *See, e.g., Certain Semiconductor Devices, Semiconductor Device Packages, and Products Containing Same*, Inv. No. 337-TA-1010, Order No. 98 (May 31, 2017) (granting judicial notice for PTAB decisions); *Certain*

Movable Barrier Operator Systems and Components Thereof, Inv. No. 337-TA-1118, Order No. 23 (Apr. 16, 2019) (granting judicial notice for PTAB decisions). These USPTO decisions “are matters of public record and ‘capable of accurate and ready determination by resort to sources whose accuracy could not reasonably be questioned.’” *Zurich Am. Ins. v. Southern-Owners Ins. Co.*, 314 F. Supp. 3d 1284, 1299-300 (M.D. Fla. 2018) (quoting *Horne v. Potter*, 392 Fed. Appx. 800, 802 (11th Cir. 2010)).

Accordingly, Motion Docket No. 1119-053 is hereby GRANTED.

SO ORDERED.



Dee Lord
Administrative Law Judge

PUBLIC CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Lisa R. Barton, hereby certify that the attached **ORDER** has been served by hand upon the following parties as indicated, on **September 23, 2019**.



Lisa R. Barton, Secretary
U.S. International Trade Commission
500 E Street, SW, Room 112
Washington, DC 20436

On Behalf of Complainants Broadcom Corporation:

John M. Caracappa, Esq.
STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP
1330 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036

- Via Hand Delivery
- Via Express Delivery
- Via First Class Mail
- Other: _____

**On Behalf of Respondents Toyota Motor Corporation,
Toyota Motor North America, Inc., Toyota Motor Sales,
U.S.A., Inc., Toyota Motor Engineering & Manufacturing
North America, Inc., Toyota Motor Manufacturing , Indiana,
Inc., Toyota Motor Manufacturing, Kentucky, Inc., Toyota
Motor Manufacturing Mississippi, Inc., Toyota Motor
Manufacturing, Texas, Inc., Panasonic Corporation,
Panasonic Corporation of North America, Denso Ten
Limited, Denso Ten America Limited, Denso Corporation,
Denso International America, Inc., Denso Manufacturing
Tennessee, Inc., Denso Wireless Systems America, Inc., and
Japan Radio Co., Ltd.:**

Paul Steadman, Esq.
DLA PIPER LLP
444 West Lake Street, Suite 900
Chicago, IL 60606

- Via Hand Delivery
- Via Express Delivery
- Via First Class Mail
- Other: _____

**CERTAIN INFOTAINMENT SYSTEMS, COMPONENTS
THEREOF, AND AUTOMOBILES CONTAINING THE
SAME**

Inv. No. 337-TA-1119

Certificate of Service – Page 2

**On Behalf of Respondents Renesas Electronics
Corporation, and Renesas Electronics America, Inc.:**

Daniel P. Muino, Esq.
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
2000 Pennsylvania Ave., NW, Suite 6000
Washington, DC 20006

- Via Hand Delivery
 Via Express Delivery
 Via First Class Mail
 Other: _____

**On Behalf of Respondents Pioneer Corporation and
Pioneer Automotive Technologies:**

Lora A. Brzezyski, Esq.
DRINKER BIDDLE & REATHLLP
1500 K Street, NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005

- Via Hand Delivery
 Via Express Delivery
 Via First Class Mail
 Other: _____

On Behalf of Respondents Socionext, Inc.:

G. Brian Busey, Esq.
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
2000 Pennsylvania Ave., NW, Suite 6000
Washington, DC 20006

- Via Hand Delivery
 Via Express Delivery
 Via First Class Mail
 Other: _____

**On Behalf of Respondents u-blox, u-blox America, Inc.,
and u-blox San Diego, Inc.:**

Smith Brittingham IV, Esq.
**FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT
& DUNNER LLP**
901 New York Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20001

- Via Hand Delivery
 Via Express Delivery
 Via First Class Mail
 Other: _____