

## HYBRID VEHICLES

Inventors: Alex J. Severinsky  
Theodore N. Louckes

### Cross-Reference to Related Applications

5 This application is a continuation-in-part of Ser. No. 09/264,817, filed March 9, 1999, now U. S. patent 6,209,672, issued April 3, 2001, which in turn claims priority from provisional application Ser. No. 60/100,095, filed September 14, 1998, and is also a continuation-in-part of Ser. No. 09/392,743, filed September 9, 1999, which in turn claims priority from provisional application  
10 Ser. No. 60/122,296, filed March 1, 1999.

### Field of the Invention

15 This application relates to improvements in hybrid vehicles, that is, vehicles in which both an internal combustion engine and one or more electric motors are provided to supply torque to the driving wheels of the vehicle. More particularly, this invention relates to a hybrid electric vehicle that is fully competitive with presently conventional vehicles as regards performance, operating convenience, and cost, while achieving substantially improved fuel  
20 economy and reduced pollutant emissions.

### Discussion of the Prior Art

25 For many years great attention has been given to the problem of reduction of fuel consumption of automobiles and other highway vehicles. Concomitantly very substantial attention has been paid to reduction of pollutants emitted by automobiles and other vehicles. To a degree, efforts to solve these problems conflict with one another. For example, increased thermodynamic efficiency and thus reduced fuel consumption can be realized if an engine is  
30 operated at higher temperatures. Thus there has been substantial interest in engines built of ceramic materials withstanding higher

combustion temperatures than those now in use. However, higher combustion temperatures in gasoline-fueled engines lead to increase in certain undesirable pollutants, typically NO<sub>x</sub>.

Another possibility for reducing emissions is to burn mixtures of gasoline and ethanol ("gasohol"), or straight ethanol. However, to date ethanol has not become economically competitive with gasoline, and consumers have not accepted ethanol to any great degree. Moreover, to make an alternate fuel such as ethanol available to the extent necessary to achieve appreciable improvements in nationwide air quality and fuel conservation would require immense costs for infrastructure improvements; not only the entire nation's motor fuel production and delivery system, but also the vehicle manufacture, distribution, and repair system, would have to be extensively revised or substantially duplicated.

One proposal for reducing pollution in cities is to limit the use of vehicles powered by internal combustion engines and instead employ electric vehicles powered by rechargeable batteries. To date, all such "straight electric" cars have had very limited range, typically no more than 150 miles, have insufficient power for acceleration and hill climbing except when the batteries are substantially fully charged, and require substantial time for battery recharging. Thus, while there are many circumstances in which the limited range and extended recharging time of the batteries would not be an inconvenience, such cars are not suitable for all the travel requirements of most individuals. Accordingly, an electric car would have to be an additional vehicle for most users, posing a substantial economic deterrent. Moreover, it will be appreciated that in the United States most electricity is generated in coal-fired power plants, so that using electric vehicles merely moves the source of the pollution, but does not eliminate it. Furthermore, comparing the respective net costs per mile of driving, electric vehicles are not competitive with ethanol-fueled vehicles, much less with conventional gasoline-fueled vehicles. See, generally, Simanaitis, "Electric Vehicles",

Road & Track, May 1992, pp. 126-136; Reynolds, "AC Propulsion CRX", Road & Track, October 1992, pp. 126-129.

Brooks et al U.S. patent 5,492,192 shows such an electric vehicle; the invention appears to be directed to incorporation of antilock braking and traction control technologies into an otherwise conventional electric vehicle.

0 Much attention has also been paid over the years to development of electric vehicles including internal combustion engines powering generators, thus eliminating the defect of limited range exhibited by simple electric vehicles. The simplest such vehicles operate on the same general principle as diesel-electric locomotives used by most railroads. In such systems, an internal combustion engine drives a generator providing electric power to traction motors connected directly to the wheels of the vehicle. This system has the advantage that no variable gear ratio transmission is required between the engine and the wheels of the vehicle.

15 More particularly, an internal combustion engine produces zero torque at zero engine speed (RPM) and reaches its torque peak somewhere in the middle of its operating range. Accordingly, all vehicles driven directly by an internal combustion engine (other than certain single-speed vehicles using friction or centrifugal clutches, and not useful for normal driving) require a variable-ratio transmission between the engine and the wheels, so that the engine's torque can be matched to the road speeds and loads encountered. Further, some sort of clutch must be provided so that the engine can be mechanically decoupled from the wheels, allowing the vehicle to stop while the engine is still running, and to allow some slippage of the engine with respect to the drive train while starting from a stop. It would not be practical to provide a diesel locomotive, for example, with a multiple speed transmission, or a clutch. Accordingly, the additional complexity of the generator and electric traction motors is accepted. Electric traction motors produce full torque at zero RPM and thus can be

connected directly to the wheels; when it is desired that the train should accelerate, the diesel engine is simply throttled to increase the generator output and the train begins to move.

The same drive system may be employed in a smaller vehicle such as an automobile or truck, but has several distinct disadvantages in this application. In particular, and as discussed in detail below in connection with Figs. 1 and 2, it is well known that a gasoline or other internal combustion engine is most efficient when producing near its maximum output torque. Typically, the number of diesel locomotives on a train is selected in accordance with the total tonnage to be moved and the grades to be overcome, so that all the locomotives can be operated at nearly full torque production. Moreover, such locomotives tend to be run at steady speeds for long periods of time. Reasonably efficient fuel use is thus achieved. However, such a direct drive vehicle would not achieve good fuel efficiency in typical automotive use, involving many short trips, frequent stops in traffic, extended low-speed operation and the like.

So-called "series hybrid" electric vehicles have been proposed for automotive use, wherein batteries are used as energy storage devices, so that an internal combustion engine provided to power a generator can be operated in its most fuel-efficient output power range while still allowing the electric traction motor(s) powering the vehicle to be operated as required. Thus the engine may be loaded by supplying torque to a generator charging the batteries while supplying electrical power to the traction motor(s) as required, so as to operate efficiently. This system overcomes the limitations of electric vehicles noted above with respect to limited range and long recharge times. Thus, as compared to a conventional vehicle, wherein the internal combustion engine delivers torque directly to the wheels, in a series hybrid electric vehicle, torque is delivered from the engine to the wheels via a serially connected generator used as a battery charger, the battery, and the traction motor. However, energy transfer between

those components consumes at least approximately 25% of engine power. Further, such components add substantially to the cost and weight of the vehicle; in particular, an electric motor capable of providing sufficient torque to meet all expected demand, e.g., to allow reasonable performance under acceleration, during hill-climbing and the like, is rather heavy and expensive. Thus, series hybrid vehicles have not been immediately successful.

A more promising "parallel hybrid" approach is shown in U.S. Patent Nos. 3,566,717 and 3,732,751 to Berman et al. In Berman et al an internal combustion engine and an electric motor are matched through a complex gear train so that both can provide torque directly to the wheels, the vehicle being operated in several different modes. Where the output of the internal combustion engine is more than necessary to drive the vehicle ("first mode operation") the engine is run at constant speed and excess power is converted by a first motor/generator ("speeder") to electrical energy for storage in a battery. In "second mode operation", the internal combustion engine drives the wheels directly, and is throttled. When more power is needed than the engine can provide, a second motor/generator or "torquer" provides additional torque as needed.

Berman et al thus show two separate electric motor/generators separately powered by the internal combustion engine; the "speeder" charges the batteries, while the "torquer" propels the vehicle forward in traffic. This arrangement is a source of additional complexity, cost and difficulty, as two separate modes of engine control are required. Moreover, the operator must control the transition between the several modes of operation. Such a complex vehicle is unsuited for the automotive market. Automobiles intended for mass production can be no more complicated to operate than conventional vehicles, and must be essentially "foolproof", that is, resistant to damage that might be caused by operator error. Further, the gear train shown by Berman et al appears to be quite complex and difficult to manufacture economically. Berman et

# 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.