

blacr@foster.com

Registration No.: 40514

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ABB, INC.

Petitioner

v.

ROY-G-BIV CORPORATION

Patent Owner

Trial No.: IPR2013-00062

U.S. Patent No. 6,516,236B1

MOTION CONTROL SYSTEMS

PATENT OWNER ROY-G-BIV CORPORATION'S

PRELIMINARY RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR § 42.107

Table of Contents

- I. Introduction.....1
- II. Summary of Patent Owner’s Argument1
- III. Background.....5
 - A. The Patent Owner.....5
 - B. Technology Background5
 - C. The ‘236 Patent Invention8
 - D. The ‘236 Patent’s History of Litigation and Reexamination12
- IV. The Petition’s “Broadest Reasonable Interpretation” Is Unreasonable13
 - A. “Primitive Operations”14
 - B. “Core Driver Functions”16
- V. The Petition Does Not Demonstrate a Reasonable Likelihood of Prevailing on the Proposed Anticipation or Obviousness Theories17
 - A. Legal Standards17
 - B. Gertz Fails To Anticipate The ‘236 Claims (P. Gr. 1).....19
 - 1. A Summary of Gertz.....19
 - 2. Gertz Does Not Teach “Primitive Operations”21
 - 3. Gertz Also Fails to Disclose The Claimed Core Driver Functions24
 - 4. Gertz Is Largely Cumulative to Art Considered By the Patent Office26
 - C. WOSA/XFS Fails To Anticipate (P. Gr. 2).....28

1.	A Summary of WOSA/XFS.....	28
2.	None of the WOSA/XFS Operations Relied Upon by the Petition Is a “Primitive Operation”	31
3.	WOSA/XFS Does Not Teach “Core Driver Functions”.....	38
4.	WOSA/XFS is Largely Cumulative of WOSA and GDI Previously Considered	38
D.	THE SECONDARY REFERENCES LACK THE SAME LIMITATIONS	40
1.	GERTZ, STEWART & MORROW (P.Gr. 3)	42
2.	GERTZ or WOSA/XFS & DDAG (P.Gr. 4 & 6)	43
3.	GERTZ or WOSA/XFS, DDAG & HALL (P.Gr. 5 & 7)	47
4.	GERTZ, WOSA/XFS, & WRIGHT (P.Gr. 8)	48
VI.	CONCLUSION.....	49

I. Introduction

Patent Owner ROY-G-BIV Corporation (hereafter “Patent Owner”) hereby respectfully submits this Preliminary Response to the Petition seeking *Inter Partes* review in this matter. This filing is timely under 35 U.S.C. § 313 and 37 C.F.R. § 42.107, as it is being filed within three months of the November 27, 2012 mailing date of the Notice granting the Petition a filing date.

A trial should not be instituted in this matter as none of the references relied upon in the Petition, whether considered alone or in combination, gives rise to a reasonable likelihood of Petitioner prevailing with respect to any claim of U.S. Patent No. 6,516,236 (the ‘236 patent).

II. Summary of Patent Owner’s Argument

“The Director may not authorize an inter partes review to be instituted unless the Director determines that the information presented in the petition filed under section 311 . . . shows that there is a reasonable likelihood that the petitioner would prevail with respect to at least 1 of the claims challenged” 35 U.S.C. § 314(a). As discussed below, each proposed anticipation rejection is deficient for failing to set forth each and every feature arranged as recited by the respective claims of the ‘236 Patent. The secondary references do not teach the missing features, and thus fail to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Further, the

plethora of cursory obviousness rejections proposed in the Petition fail to identify specific portions of the evidence that support the obviousness challenges and lack articulated reasoning with a rational underpinning to support a legal conclusion of obviousness. Thus, they fail to comply with Patent Office Rules and Supreme Court precedent. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(5); *KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S. 398, 418 (2007) (quoting *In re Kahn*, 441 F.3d 977, 988 (Fed. Cir. 2006)).

Each ‘236 Patent claim recites directly or by dependency two limitations that are not taught by the primary or secondary references in the Petition: (1) “a primitive operation the implementation of which is required to operate motion control devices and cannot be simulated using other motion control operations”; and (2) “a core set of core driver functions, where each core driver function is associated with one of the primitive operations.” The ‘236 Patent provides an express definition for “primitive operations”: “Primitive operations are operations that are necessary for motion control and cannot be simulated using a combination of other motion control operations.” ‘236 Patent at 7:28-31. The broadest reasonable interpretation of these terms is dictated by Patent Owner’s lexicography.

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.