

RECORD OF ORAL HEARING
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

WEBASTO ROOF SYSTEMS, INC.,

Petitioner

vs.

UUSI, LLC.,

Patent Owner

Case IPR2014-00648 (Patent 8,217,612 B2)
Case IPR2014-00649 (Patent 7,548,037 B2)
Case IPR2014-00650 (Patent 7,579,802 B2)¹

Oral Hearing Held: June 29, 2015

Before: GLENN J. PERRY, HYUN J. JUNG, and JASON J.
CHUNG, *Administrative Patent Judges*

The above-entitled matter came on for hearing on Monday, June 29,
2015 at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, 600 Dulany Street,
Alexandria, Virginia in Courtroom B at 9:10 a.m.

Case IPR2014-00648 (Patent 8,217,612 B2)
Case IPR2014-00649 (Patent 7,548,037 B2)
Case IPR2014-00650 (Patent 7,579,802 B2)¹

APPEARANCES:

ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER:

CHARLES H. SANDERS, ESQ.
Goodwin Procter LLP
Exchange Place
Boston, MA 02109
617-570-1000
csanders@goodwinprocter.com

TIMOTHY J. ROUSSEAU, ESQ.
Goodwin Procter LLP
The New York Times Building
620 Eighth Avenue
New York, New York 10018-1405
trousseau@goodwinprocter.com

PHONG DINH, ESQ.
Goodwin Procter LLP
901 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001
202-346-4000
pdinh@goodwinprocter.com

ON BEHALF OF THE PATENT OWNER:

MONTE L. FALCOFF, ESQ.
Harness, Dickey & Pierce, P.L.C.
5445 Corporate Drive, Suite 200
Troy, MI 48098
248-641-1600
mlfalcoff@hdp.com

1 Goodwin Procter and Silvester Kuhar, who is head of the IP
2 department at Webasto.

3 JUDGE PERRY: Welcome, everyone.

4 MR. SANDERS: Your Honors, of course have
5 heard argument regarding the '612 and '802 patents, so my
6 intention today is to start with the '037 patent.

7 There are three claims at issue. They are all
8 independent claims. And in this presentation you will see the
9 independent claims underlined in the summary slide.

10 At this point the disputes are really about Bernard.
11 Chikaraishi, was included for obviousness as to independent
12 claim 1, because independent claim 1 requires a regulator.
13 There is no dispute that Chikaraishi discloses a regulator.
14 There is no dispute, genuine dispute, at least, that it would
15 have been obvious to combine Bernard and Chikaraishi, so at
16 this point what we're really focused on is Bernard.

17 There are four claim terms that are in dispute at
18 this point. And I will be addressing those claim terms as they
19 appear in the claims. I will start with claims 1 and 7 taken
20 together, because they recite the same claim term, power
21 system, that is in dispute.

22 And the system equation limitation that is also
23 highlighted that is in dispute, it was argued in the briefing as
24 to claims 1 and claim 7 with respect to the different parameter

1 values claim term. It also appears in claim 13, I see from
2 Patent Owner's presentation that is now being argued with
3 respect to claim 13, but I will be discussing it just with
4 respect to claims 1 and 7 here because that's the way it was
5 done in the briefing.

6 First, the term "power system." I am now on slide
7 6. What Patent Owner proposes is to read in two things, the
8 modularized or preassembled power unit, which do not appear
9 anywhere in this specification, and a frame, a closure, and a
10 drive motor, which appear elsewhere in claims 1 and 7 and,
11 therefore, it is unnecessary to read them into the power
12 system limitation.

13 Petitioner proposes to construe the power system
14 simply as a motor driven system.

15 I am now on slide 7, which shows support for
16 construing the claim term "power system" as a motor driven
17 system. The first quotation on this slide, the one at the top,
18 appears in the field of the invention in the patent disclosure.
19 And it states that the present invention concerns motor-driven
20 actuator control systems and methods, which supports
21 construing power system as a motor driven system.

22 Later on in the specification, this is in the
23 background, discusses National Highway Traffic Safety
24 Administration standard that relates to power-operated

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.