

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

WEBASTO ROOF SYSTEMS, INC.
Petitioner,

v.

UUSI, LLC
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2014-00648
Patent 8,217,612

PETITIONER'S REPLY TO PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

Attorney Docket: 130163.231151

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
I. RESPONSE TO PATENT OWNER’S INTRODUCTORY REMARKS	1
II. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	2
A. “identifying a collision” and “sensing of a collision” (Claim 1)	2
B. “deactivate said motor in response to a sensing said window or panel has stopped moving” (Claim 6)	5
III. THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE INVALID	6
A. Ground 1: Anticipation by Bernard (Claims 6-8)	6
B. Ground 3: Obviousness over Lamm, Itoh, and Bernard	7
(a) Independent Claim 1 and Dependent Claim 2	9
(b) Dependent Claim 5	11
(c) Independent Claim 6 and Dependent Claims 7-8	12
C. Ground 4: Obviousness over Duhome and Kinzl	13
(a) Independent Claim 1 and Dependent Claim 2	14
(b) Independent Claim 6 and Dependent Claims 7-8	15
IV. CONCLUSION	15

Table of Authorities

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Amgen Inc. v. Hoechst Marion Roussel, Inc.</i> , 314 F.3d 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	7, 9, 14
<i>In re Antor Media</i> , 689 F.3d 1282 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	7
<i>Broadcom Corp. v. Emulex Corp.</i> , 732 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	4
<i>In re Clay</i> , 966 F.2d 656 (Fed. Cir. 1992)	13
<i>In re Huang</i> , 100 F.3d 135 (Fed. Cir. 1996)	11
<i>Impax Labs. v. Aventis Pharms.</i> , 468 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	7, 9, 14
<i>Johnson Worldwide Associates, Inc. v. Zebco Corp.</i> , 175 F.3d 985 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	5
<i>KSR Intern. Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	8, 9, 12, 14
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc)	3
Other Authorities	
37 CFR § 42.6(a)(3)	13

The prior art discloses or suggests all elements of claims 1-2 and 5-8 construed according to their plain and ordinary meaning, as proposed in the Petition and reflected in the institution Decision. Patent Owner reads unsupported limitations into the claims to try to preserve their validity. Patent Owner argues that “identifying a collision” in independent claim 1 requires a distinct algorithm from “sensing of a collision,” even though this “identifying” step is part of “sensing a collision” in claim 1. To narrow independent claim 6, Patent Owner asserts that “to deactivate said motor in response to a sensing said window or panel has stopped moving” requires deactivation to occur *instantaneously* in response to an *abrupt* stoppage. These incorrect claim constructions should be rejected.

Patent Owner also disputes enablement of the cited references, relying on irrelevant arguments about how well they would work. There is no genuine dispute that a person of ordinary skill in the art would have been able to implement them. Patent Owner also argues that references cannot be combined because one cannot merge references wholesale, without modification. However, this is neither how a person of ordinary skill in the art would combine teachings nor how Petitioner has proposed to combine them.

I. RESPONSE TO PATENT OWNER’S INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

Patent Owner dedicates the first 18 pages of its Response to assertions having little to do with the merits that appear intended to sway the Board to credit

Patent Owner over Petitioner. Given the page limit, Petitioner will only respond briefly. Patent Owner's allegations regarding its background and contributions are unsupported. For example, there is no evidence that the patent was implemented or would perform acceptably "in real world automobile scenarios" (Paper 20 at 3). Ex. 1022 at 28:24-29:22, 116:5-12, 116:24-117:3, 118:17-119:3.

Patent Owner also criticizes that Dr. Toliyat was not familiar with the details of "production vehicles" such as "the typical revolutions per minute of an automotive window lift motor when it was operating at its fastest closing speed in early 1990s." Paper 20 at 6, 12. However, such details are irrelevant to the issues here. As Dr. Ehsani admitted, experience in designing automotive sunroof or window lift system is not needed to understand the '612 patent. Ex. 1023 at 282:8-22. Dr. Ehsani could not answer the same questions posed to Dr. Toliyat about these production details, and criticized the questions as irrelevant. *Id.* at 287:6-288:2, 293:14-21, 297:7-298:13. Dr. Toliyat is well-qualified to address the issues in this proceeding. He is an expert in control systems, such as those used in automotive vehicles. *See* Ex. 1004. He is a distinguished lecturer for the IEEE Vehicular Technology Society and has authored numerous journal papers, received many grants, and spoken at several seminars in this field. Ex. 1021, ¶¶ 8-9.

II. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION

A. "identifying a collision" and "sensing of a collision" (Claim 1)

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.