
BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SCHRADER-BRIDGEPORT INTERNATIONAL, INC.
and SCHRADER ELECTRONICS, INC.
Petitioner

v.

Patent of CONTINENTAL AUTOMOTIVE SYSTEMS US, INC.
Patent Owner

Case IPR2013-00014
Patent U.S. 6,998,973
Filed February 5, 2004
Issued February 14, 2006
Title: DATA TRANSMISSION METHOD FOR A
TIRE-PRESSURE MONITORING SYSTEM OF A VEHICLE

Attorney Docket No. 8747-102772
Customer No: 22242

Filed electronically via the Patent Review Processing System (PRPS) on
January 10, 2013

Before the Honorable Sally C. Medley, *Patent Administration Judge*

PRELIMINARY RESPONSE OF PATENT OWNER

Mail Stop PATENT BOARD
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
A. The Invention Of The '973 Patent.....	1
B. Schrader's Proposed Rejections Fail To Present <i>Prima Facie</i> Showings Of Anticipation And Obviousness	3
II. THE LAW FOR DENYING A PETITION.....	8
III. THE REFERENCES.....	10
A. U.S. Patent No. 6,271,748 ("Derbyshire").....	10
B. U.S. Patent No. 6,486,773 ("Bailie").....	13
C. U.S. Patent No. 6,404,246 ("Estakhri").....	14
D. U.S. Patent No. 5,883,582 ("Bowers").....	15
IV. INTER PARTES REVIEW SHOULD NOT BE INITIATED BECAUSE SCHRADER HAS NOT MADE A <i>PRIMA FACIE</i> SHOWING AS TO THE UNPATENTABILITY OF ANY CLAIM OF THE '973 PATENT.....	16
A. Claims 1-2, 4-5, 7, 9 and 11 Are Not Anticipated By Derbyshire (PGR 1)	16
1. Schrader offers insufficient evidence to establish a <i>prima facie</i> case as to the anticipation of these claims and relies instead upon inadmissible attorney speculation.....	16
2. Derbyshire does not teach or suggest a natural time lag between internal clocks.....	18
B. Claims 3, 7, 8, 10, and 11 are not obvious in view of Derbyshire (PGR 2)	23

C.	Claims 1-5 and 7-11 are not Obvious over Derbyshire in View of Estakhri (PGR 3)	24
1.	Schrader’s proposed rejection is so unclear that it must be denied	24
2.	The Derbyshire/Estakhri combination lacks certain claim elements	26
3.	Derbyshire and Estakhri cannot be properly combined.....	27
4.	Schrader gives no meaningful reason as to why Derbyshire and Estakhri should be combined or modified.....	30
D.	Claims 1-5 and 7-11 are not Obvious over Derbyshire in View of Bowers (PGR 4)	31
1.	Schrader’s proposed rejection is so unclear that it should and must be denied.....	31
2.	Derbyshire and Bowers are from non-analogous art fields.....	32
3.	Derbyshire teaches against the proposed combination	37
4.	A skilled person would have no reason to combine Bowers with Derbyshire	38
E.	Claims 1-5 and 7-11 are not Obvious over Derbyshire in View of Bailie (PGR 5)	39
1.	There is no reason to modify Derbyshire with Bailie.....	39
2.	There is every reason <i>not</i> to modify Derbyshire with Bailie.....	40
F.	Bailie does not anticipate claims 1, 4-5, 7, 9, and 9-11 (PGR 6)	42
1.	Schrader admits that Bailie is missing an element recited in the claims and therefore Bailie cannot anticipate the claims	42
2.	IPR should not be granted for PGR 6 because it is not clear whether PGR 6 is an anticipation rejection or an obviousness rejection.....	43

3.	Bailie does not teach or suggest “a natural time lag between various internal clocks” as claimed.....	45
4.	Bailie does not teach or suggest that “a natural time lag between various internal clocks...is used to prevent collisions between transmissions from the various wheel units”	48
G.	Claims 1-5, and 7, and 9-11 are not obvious over Bailie in view of Estakhri (PGR 7)	50
1.	Schrader’s proposed rejection is so unclear that it should and must be denied.....	50
2.	The proposed Bailie/Estakhri combination has missing claim elements.....	51
3.	Schrader gives no meaningful reason as to why Bailie and Estakhri should be combined	52
H.	Claims 1-5, and 7-11 are not obvious over Bailie in view of Bowers (PGR 8).....	53
1.	Bailie and Bowers cannot be combined because they are from non-analogous art fields.....	53
2.	There is no reason to combine Bailie and Bowers	53
I.	Claims 1-5, and 7-11 are not obvious over Derbyshire, Bailie, and Bowers (PGR 9)	55
V.	CONCLUSION.....	56

Table of Authorities

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 312.....	55, 56
35 U.S.C. § 314.....	9

Cases

<i>Bettcher Industries Inc. v. Bunzl USA Inc.</i> , 661 F.3d 629 (Fed. Cir. 2010).	21
<i>Ex parte Alexander</i> , 86 U.S.P.Q.2d 1120, 1123 (BPAI 2007).....	30
<i>Ex parte Whalen</i> , 89 U.S.P.Q.2d 1078 (BPAI 2008).....	30, 52
<i>In re Fulton</i> , 391 F.3d 1195, 1201 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	28, 37
<i>In re Gordon</i> , 733 F.2d 900 (Fed. Cir. 1984).....	41
<i>In re Gurley</i> , 27 F.3d 551, 553 (Fed. Cir. 1994).....	27
<i>In re Huang</i> , 100 F.3d 135, 139-140 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....	17
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	39
<i>Motorola Inc. v. Interdigital Technology Corp.</i> , 121 F3d 1461 (Fed Cir. 1997).....	23
<i>Therasense Inc. v. Becton, Dickinson and Co.</i> , 593 F3d 1325, 1332.....	22
<i>Transclean Corp. v. Bridgewood Servs., Inc.</i> , 290 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	22

Rules

Changes to Implement IPR Proceedings, Final Rule, 77 Fed. Reg. 48,680, 48,728 (Aug. 14, 2012) (to be codified at 37 C.F.R. § 42.107).....	9, 55
Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48,756, 48,764 (Aug. 14, 2012).....	9

Other Authorities

MPEP § 2112(IV).....	22
MPEP § 2143.01.....	41
MPEP § 2143.03(VI).....	28, 29, 37
MPEP § 2614.....	44
MPEP § 2616.....	44
MPEP § 2617.....	44, 45
Message from Chief Judge James Donald Smith, Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences: USPTO Discusses Key Aspects of New Administrative Patent Trials, http://www.uspto.gov/aia_implementation/smith-blog-extravaganza.jsp (last visited 12/18/2012).....	9

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.