REQUEST FOR REFUND

Reference # *(Patent #, Application #, etc.)*	**Title of Invention or Mark Information**	
9,082,239	INTELLIGENT VEHICLE FOR ASSISTING VEHICLE OCCUPANTS	
Attorney Docket # *(if applicable)*	**Payment Date** *(mm/dd/yyyy)*	**Refund Request Amount**
FPGP0148IPR	12/05/2025	$ 42,225.00

Refund Option *(Select an option for your refund, if approved)*

- ○ Refund to the credit/debit card, electronic funds transfer (EFT), or deposit account associated with the original payment. If the original payment was a U.S. check from a personal or business checking account, I understand the refund will be issued by EFT to the same checking account.
- ◉ Refund to deposit account # 06-510.
- ○ There is no deposit account available to issue the refund and the original payment was a foreign check, cashier's check, money order, or wire transfer; or the original payment account is unavailable (e.g., the account is closed). I understand you will contact me with additional instructions using the contact information entered below if the refund is approved.

Reason for Refund Request *Refund requests must generally be filed within 2 years of payment date (37 CFR 1.26 and 2.209)*

☐ Duplicate Payment ☐ No Fee Due ☐ Office Error ☑ Other: Discretionary Denial

☐ Small Entity Later Established*

*Must be filed within 3 months of payment date (37 CFR 1.28). There is no refund when micro entity is later established.

Rationale *(Supporting documentation may be submitted with this form)*

Upon discretionary review, institution of the Petition for Inter Partes Review was denied on April 1, 2026 (Exhibit A), and the opinion was received on May 13, 2026 (Exhibit B). The receipt for the petition filing fees is attached as Exhibit C.

Requester's Information

Company or Firm Name *(if applicable)*		
Brooks Kushman P.C.		
Address Line 1	**City**	**State/Region**
150 W. Second St., Suite 400N	Royal Oak	MI
Address Line 2 *(if applicable)*	**Country**	**Zip/Postal Code**
	United States	48067-3846

Email Address	**Phone Number**
aturner@brookskushman.com	(248) 358-4400
Requester's Name	**Registration Number** *(if applicable)*
Andrew B. Turner	63,121
Signature	**Date** *(mm/dd/yyyy)*
/Andrew B. Turner/	09/03/2026

Submit online via Patent Center (Patents customers who are registered users only): https://patentcenter.uspto.gov, or
Fax to: 571-273-6500, or
Mail to: Mail Stop 16, Director of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

EXHIBIT A

Trials@uspto.gov
571-272-7822

Paper 8
Date: April 1, 2026

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

NOTICE OF DECISIONS ON INSTITUTION

Before JOHN A. SQUIRES, *Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office*.

NOTICE

Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 314(a), after review of discretionary and non-merits considerations, institution of *inter partes* review or post-grant review is denied in the following proceedings:

IPR2026-00133*	IPR2026-00164	IPR2026-00172*
IPR2026-00134*	IPR2026-00171*	IPR2026-00173*
IPR2026-00135*		

---

* Opinion forthcoming.

Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 314(a), after review of discretionary considerations, the following proceedings will be reviewed for merits and non-discretionary considerations:

IPR2026-00061	IPR2026-00067	IPR2026-00163
IPR2026-00065	IPR2026-00151*	IPR2026-00176
IPR2026-00066	IPR2026-00162	

Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 314(a), after review of the merits, the petitioner has failed to show a reasonable likelihood of prevailing with respect to at least one of the claims challenged in the petition. Accordingly, institution of *inter partes* review or post-grant review is denied in the following proceedings:

IPR2025-01588

Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 314(a) and § 324(a), after review of the merits, the petitioner has shown a reasonable likelihood of prevailing with respect to at least one of the claims challenged in the petition, or that it is more likely than not that at least one of the claims challenged in the petition is unpatentable, as appropriate, and no other non-discretionary considerations warrant denial of institution. Accordingly, institution of *inter partes* review or post-grant review is granted in the following proceedings:

IPR2026-00049	IPR2026-00072	PGR2026-00003*
IPR2026-00071	IPR2026-00094	

* Opinion forthcoming.

EXHIBIT B

Director_Discretionary_Decision@uspto.gov
571-272-7822

Paper 11
Date: May 13, 2026

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

FORD MOTOR COMPANY,
Petitioner,

v.

AUTOCONNECT HOLDINGS LLC,
Patent Owner.

IPR2026-00171 (Patent 9,082,239 B2)
IPR2026-00172 (Patent 9,147,297 B2)
IPR2026-00173 (Patent 9,173,100 B2)

Before JOHN A. SQUIRES, *Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office*.

DECISION
Denying Institution of *Inter Partes* Review

AutoConnect Holdings LLC ("Patent Owner") filed a request for discretionary denial (Paper 6, "DD Req.") in each of the above-captioned cases, and Ford Motor Company ("Petitioner") filed an opposition (Paper 7, "DD Opp.").[1] On April 1, 2026, after considering the parties' arguments and the record, and in view of all relevant considerations, I issued a Notice indicating that the Petitions are denied in the above-captioned cases. Paper 8.

Patent Owner argues that Petitioner proposes claim construction positions in the district court that are inconsistent with those presented in the Petition and fails to sufficiently explain why the different positions are warranted. DD Req. 14–15 (citing *Revvo Techs., Inc. v. Cerebrum Sensor Techs., Inc.*, IPR2025-00632, Paper 20 (Director Nov. 3, 2025) (precedential) ("*Revvo*")). Specifically, Patent Owner argues that Petitioner "maintains that every independent claim contains seven terms that are indefinite." *Id.* at 14 (citing Ex. 2026, 1–3) (emphasis omitted).

In the Petition, Petitioner applies the plain and ordinary meaning of the challenged claims, except for the term "and/or," recited in independent claims 1, 8, and 15. Pet. 8–9. Petitioner explains that it challenges "the above listed claims as indefinite in district court because the '239 Patent defines 'and/or' as both disjunctive and conjunctive, which is an impossibility." *Id.* at 8 (emphasis omitted). In the Petition, Petitioner adopts Patent Owner's "disjunctive construction," but further explains "how the prior art discloses more than one feature for certain claims." DD Opp. 17;

[1] Citations are to papers in IPR2026-00171. The parties filed similar papers in IPR2026-00172 and IPR2026-00173.

see Pet. 8–9; *see also* DD Opp. 15–18. Accordingly, Petitioner provides an explanation for its conflicting claim constructions of "and/or." DD Opp. 15–18.

But Petitioner does not address the other terms that it argues are indefinite in the district court. *See* Ex. 2026, 1–3. Instead, Petitioner "stipulates to withdraw all indefiniteness arguments . . . from the Related Litigation if the PTAB institutes this IPR." DD Opp. 18. As I previously explained in similar circumstances, Petitioner's stipulation to continue to pursue different constructions and abandon the inconsistent construction in district court only if the IPR is instituted is inadequate. *See Tiktok, Inc. v. Shopsee, Inc.*, IPR2025-01485, Paper 13, 2–3 (Director Jan. 16, 2025). Petitioner's claim construction stipulation does not increase efficiency and minimize the potential for inconsistent outcomes, unlike a stipulation that it will not pursue in the parallel litigation the grounds it raised or could have reasonably raised in the Petition. *See id.* at 3. At best, it replaces one argument in district court for another argument at the Board. *Id.* Accordingly, the Petitions are denied under 35 U.S.C. § 314(a).

While certain arguments are highlighted above, the determination to exercise discretion to deny institution is based on the complete record and a holistic assessment of all of the evidence in light of the arguments presented.

In consideration of the foregoing, it is:

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

FOR PETITIONER:

Andrew Turner
John LeRoy
Christopher Smith
Abdulai Rashid
BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.
aturner@brookskushman.com
jleroy@brookskushman.com
csmith@brookskushman.com
arashid@brookskushman.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

Eric Zelepugas
Robert Conley
AVANTECH LAW, LLP
zelepugas@avantechlaw.com
conley@avantechlaw.com

United States Patent and Trademark Office

USPTO
P.O.Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Fee payments receipt

AIA REVIEW NUMBER
IPR2026-00171

AIA REVIEW TYPE
Inter Partes Review

PATENT OWNER/RESPONDENT'S PATENT NUMBER
9082239

RECEIPT DATE
12/05/2025 16:50:59 ET

PAYMENT STATUS
CLEARED

TOTAL PAYMENT
$73,025.00

Payment Summary

Transaction Date	Payment Method	Description	Fee Code	Quantity	Fee Amount	Fee Total
12/05/2025 16:50:59	DA	INTER PARTES REVIEW REQUEST FEE - UP TO 20 CLAIMS	1406	1	$23,750.00	$23,750.00
12/05/2025 16:50:59	DA	INTER PARTES REVIEW POST-INSTITUTION FEE - UP TO 20 CLAIMS	1414	1	$28,125.00	$28,125.00
12/05/2025 16:50:59	DA	INTER PARTES REVIEW REQUEST OF EACH CLAIM IN EXCESS OF 20	1407	15	$470.00	$7,050.00
12/05/2025 16:50:59	DA	INTER PARTES POST-INSTITUTION REQUEST OF EACH CLAIM IN EXCESS OF 20	1415	15	$940.00	$14,100.00
					Total Fees	**$73,025.00**