

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

**LIBERTY MUTUAL INSURANCE CO.**

Petitioner

v.

**PROGRESSIVE CASUALTY INSURANCE CO.**

Patent Owner

---

Case CBM2013-00009

Patent 8,140,358

---

Before the Honorable JAMESON LEE, JONI Y. CHANG, and MICHAEL R. ZECHER, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

**PETITIONER LIBERTY MUTUAL INSURANCE CO.'S OPPOSITION TO  
PATENT OWNER'S REQUEST FOR REHEARING PURSUANT TO 37  
C.F.R. § 42.71**

Pursuant to the Board's March 26, 2014 Order (Paper 75), Petitioner respectfully opposes Patent Owner's Request for Rehearing ("Req.", Paper 71), which should be denied because it is improper, untimely, and substantively incorrect.

Progressive's Request is improper because it relies on facts and "new evidence" (including unauthorized Exhibit 2036, Req. at 4-5) from *after* the Board's Final Written Decision, which the Board could not have considered in making its decision. Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d), a party "must specifically identify all matters the party believes the Board misapprehended or overlooked, and the place where each matter was previously addressed in a motion, an opposition, or a reply." While Progressive's Request for Rehearing is ostensibly a request for the Board to reconsider one of its Final Written Decisions, Progressive's Request rests on the time Final Written Decisions were uploaded to PRPS *by a paralegal after* the Board completed the Final Written Decisions and could not be something *the Board* misapprehended or overlooked in issuing those decisions. Because Progressive is attempting to rely on evidence from after the decisions, its Request for Rehearing is improper.

Indeed, Progressive's Request itself reveals itself to be an untimely request to rehear the Board's decision in its February 20, 2014 Order that "the two final written decisions [in CBM2012-00003 and CBM2013-00009] were entered at the same time." Paper 69 at 2. To begin, that determination was correct, regardless of the actual time of day each paper was uploaded by the Board's administrative staff. Moreover, to the extent Progressive takes issue with that determination in the February 20 Order, *e.g.*,

Req. at 3-4 (quoting the February 20 Order and then immediately stating that “the Board has misapprehended or overlooked that its decisions are entered at the times they are posted to the PRPS”), any rehearing request directed to the substance of that Order was required to be filed by March 6, 2014. 37 U.S.C. § 42.71(d)(1). Because the Request was filed on March 12, 2014, it was untimely and should be denied for this additional reason.

Finally, even if Progressive’s timing argument were preserved and correct, Progressive’s Request should still be denied. Progressive’s whole argument is premised on 35 U.S.C. § 325(e), which states in relevant part that “petitioner . . . may not request or maintain a proceeding before the Office with respect to a claim on any ground that the petitioner raised or reasonably could have raised during that post-grant review.” But Progressive effectively reads the “petitioner” qualification entirely out of this provision, while misconstruing what it means to “maintain a proceeding.” To begin, any prohibition against maintaining a proceeding *falls only on a petitioner*, it does not preclude the Board from completing a proceeding by issuing a Final Written Decision. The record of this proceeding closed on October 15, 2013 at the end of the combined oral hearing for this Case and Case CBM2013-00003. Thereafter, Petitioner did nothing to maintain this proceeding, and certainly did nothing to maintain it during any time elapsing between the moment the CBM2012-00003 Final Written Decision was posted by a Board paralegal to PRPS and the moment the Final Written Decision in this proceeding was posted by a Board paralegal to PRPS.

Section 325(e) restricts only the ability *of a petitioner to maintain a proceeding*, and imposes no limits on the Board, whether in issuing a Final Written Decision or otherwise. The Request thus rests on a fundamentally flawed reading of the America Invents Act (“AIA”) and should be denied.

Indeed, Congress has made clear that the Board has the discretion to complete CBM reviews through Final Written Decisions, and to defend those decisions on appeal, even when *no* petitioner remains. For example, 35 U.S.C. § 327(a) confirms the Board “may proceed to a final written decision” *without any challenging party*. Contrary to Progressive’s misreading (Req. at 13), this confirmation of authority imposes no *limits* on the Board’s power to proceed to a Final Written Decision, or defend it thereafter. *See, e.g.*, 35 U.S.C. §143 (“The Director shall have the right to intervene in an appeal from a decision entered by the Patent Trial and Appeal Board in a . . . post-grant review”). There is a clear public interest in having the validity of patent claims finally determined after being fully and fairly litigated before the Board over an eighteen month period, and that should not be derailed by settlement or otherwise. The Board’s ability to continue without the Petitioner makes this entirely *unlike* district court proceedings or *inter partes* reexamination, and Progressive’s attempt to argue Petitioner is “maintaining” this proceeding by analogy to those inapposite contexts fails. Req. at 10-11 (discussing *Smallwood v. Gallardo* and *Function Media, L.L.C. v. Kappos*); *id.* at 7 (citing inapplicable Rule of Civil Procedure). Progressive’s Request for Rehearing should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

**ROPES & GRAY LLP**

March 28, 2014

By /J. Steven Baughman/

J. Steven Baughman, Lead Counsel  
James R. Myers (pro hac vice), Back-up Counsel  
Nicole M. Jantzi

**ROPES & GRAY LLP**

700 12<sup>th</sup> St. NW, Suite 900

Washington, DC 20005

Steven.baughman@ropesgray.com

James.myers@ropesgray.com

Nicole.jantzi@ropesgray.com

*Attorneys for Petitioner Liberty Mutual Insurance Co.*

Mailing address for all PTAB correspondence:

**ROPES & GRAY LLP**

IPRM – Floor 43

Prudential Tower

800 Boylston Street

Boston, Massachusetts 02199-3600

# 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.