

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

GARMIN INTERNATIONAL, INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

BLACKBIRD TECH, LLC d/b/a BLACKBIRD TECHNOLOGIES,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2017-01058  
Patent 6,434,212

---

Before DEBRA K. STEPHENS, THOMAS L. GIANNETTI, and  
CHRISTA P. ZADO, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

STEPHENS, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION  
Institution of *Inter Partes* Review  
37 C.F.R. § 42.108

## I. INTRODUCTION

Garmin International, Inc. (“Petitioner”) filed a Petition requesting an *inter partes* review of claims 1–3 and 5–8 of U.S. Patent No. 6,434,212 B2 (Ex. 1001, “the ’212 patent”) (Paper 1 (“Pet.”)). Blackbird Tech LLC (“Patent Owner”) filed a Preliminary Response (Paper 4 (“Prelim. Resp.”)).

We have authority to determine whether to institute an *inter partes* review under 35 U.S.C. § 314, which provides that an *inter partes* review may not be instituted unless the information presented in the petition “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 set forth below, we institute an *inter partes* review of claims 1–3 and 5–8 of the ’212 patent.

## II. BACKGROUND

### A. *Related Matters*

The parties advise us that the ’212 patent is at issue in the following:

*Blackbird Tech LLC d/b/a Blackbird Technologies v. Garmin International, Inc.*, Case No. 16-CV-689 (D. Del.),

*Blackbird Tech LLC d/b/a Blackbird Technologies v. Fitbit, Inc.*, Case No. 16-CV-683 (D. Del.),

*Blackbird Tech LLC d/b/a Blackbird Technologies v. Aliphcom d/b/a Jawbone*, Case No. 16-CV-684 (D. Del.),

*Blackbird Tech LLC d/b/a Blackbird Technologies v. Sony Corp. et al.*, Case No. 16-CV-685 (D. Del.),

*Blackbird Tech LLC d/b/a Blackbird Technologies v. Timex Group USA, Inc.*, Case No. 16-CV-686 (D. Del.),

*Blackbird Tech LLC d/b/a Blackbird Technologies v. TomTom, Inc.*, Case No. 16-CV-687 (D. Del.), and

*Blackbird Tech LLC d/b/a Blackbird Technologies v. Wahoo Fitness, Inc.*, Case No. 16-CV-688 (D. Del.)

(Pet. 60–61; Paper 4, 2).

B. *The '212 Patent (Ex. 1001)*

The '212 patent, entitled “Pedometer,” relates to a “pedometer having improved accuracy by calculating actual stride lengths of a user based on relative stride rates” (Ex. 1001, Abstract). More particularly, the patent relates to “pedometers having a waist mounted stride-counting device and transmitter, and a wrist-mounted receiver and display” (*id.* at 1:9–11). The device calculates a distance walked or run based on converting a base stride length and a base stride rate to an actual stride length and using that to calculate distance traveled (*id.* at 1:12–17).

Specifically, a step counter which is an inertia device, counts the number of steps a user takes (*id.* at 3:7–8). A data processor includes a data archive that stores historic data on stride length and pace and closed loop or fuzzy logic programming that continually or periodically replaces the base stride rate and length with recently calculated stride rates and lengths (*id.* at 3:39–47).

The pedometer of the '212 patent may optionally require the user to operate a “sampling mode” (*id.* at 3:56–57). In this mode, a user walks or

runs a predetermined distance with the distance then divided by the number of strides counted (*id.* at 3:58–62). The result is the average stride length, which is stored in the data archive as the “Base Stride Length” (*id.* at 3:62–64). The data processor further divides the number of strides by the time of the run or walk to calculate a “Base Stride Rate” (*id.* at 3:65–67). According to the ’212 patent, using a fixed average stride length does not account for changes in the user’s pace or improved performance (*id.* at 4:19–29). To correct for this, a “Use Mode” is activated that causes the data processor to calculate an “Actual Stride Rate” (*id.* at 4:30–33). The “Actual Stride Rate” is calculated periodically, based on data from the stride counter and the clock (*id.* at 4:30–36). An “Actual Stride Length” is calculated by determining a percentage change between the Actual Stride Rate and the Base Stride Rate (*id.* at 4:36–38). More specifically, the Actual Stride Length is calculated by:

$$\text{Actual Stride Length} = \text{Base Stride Length} + \text{Base Stride Length} * (((\text{Actual Stride Rate} - \text{Base Stride Rate})N) / \text{Base Stride Rate})$$

Where: N=1 When Actual Stride Rate is less than or equal to Base Stride Rate multiplied by 1.02, and N=3 When Actual Stride Rate is greater than Base Stride Rate multiplied by 1.02, although other N values in the range of one to three can be used (*id.* at 4:50–58). To further improve accuracy, an N value is derived for the user by using a number of samples to establish Stride Length and N (*id.* at 5:1–6:9).

Once the actual stride length is calculated for a given period of time, the value can be multiplied by the number of strides in that period to obtain a total distance for that period to be stored in a data archive file for that particular walk or run and added to other

actual stride lengths or distances for other periods in which stride length was calculated  
(*id.* at 6:34–38).

C. *Illustrative Claim*

The '212 patent has four independent claims, claims 1, 2, 5, and 6, and dependent claims 3, 4, 7, and 8 which depend from claims 2 and 6, respectively (Ex. 1001, Claims). Claim 1, reproduced below, is illustrative of the claims.

1. An exercise monitoring device comprising:  
a strap for releasably securing the exercise monitoring device to a user;  
a step counter joined to the strap;  
a heart rate monitor joined to the strap; and  
a data processor programmed to calculate a distance traveled by multiplying a number of steps counted by the step counter by a stride length that varies according to a rate at which steps are counted.

III. ANALYSIS

A. *Prior Art Relied Upon*

Petitioner relies upon the following references (Pet. 7–8):

References	Patent Number	Exhibit
Levi, et. al., (hereinafter, “Levi”)	US 5,583,776	1005
Johnson, et. al., (hereinafter, “Johnson”)	WO 87/05229	1006

# 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.