

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

FORD MOTOR COMPANY
Petitioner

v.

PAICE LLC & THE ABELL FOUNDATION
Patent Owner

Case IPR2014-00904
Patent 7,237,634

**PATENT OWNER'S
RESPONSE TO PETITION**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION..... 1

II. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION 6

 A. The District Courts’ Construction 6

 B. The Board should revise its construction of “setpoint (SP)” 7

 1. “Setpoint” is used to mark a transition between operating modes 8

 2. “Setpoint” is not “predetermined” and is not limited to torque values
 12

III. DEFECTS IN THE INSTITUTED SINGLE
GROUND OF UNPATENTABILITY 12

 A. Ground 1 is Defective Because Ford Misapplies Severinsky
 to the Challenged Claims..... 13

 B. Ground 1 is Defective Because Ford Has Failed to Demonstrate
 that Severinsky in view of Field and SAE 1996 Discloses or
 Renders Obvious the Features Recited in the Challenged Claims 26

 1. Ground 1 is Defective Because Ford Has Failed to Demonstrate
 that Severinsky in view of Field and SAE 1996 Discloses or
 Renders Obvious the Features Recited in Claim 16 26

 (a) Severinsky in view of Field and SAE 1996 does not
 disclose or render obvious “a highway cruising mode IV,
 wherein, when the SP<the RL<the MTO, the engine is
 operable to provide torque to propel the hybrid vehicle,
 and wherein the controller is operable to start the engine
 if the engine is not running to enter the highway cruising
 mode IV” 28

 i. Severinsky operates the engine to propel the
 vehicle based on speed, not road load (RL) 29

 ii. Severinsky does not compare the road load
 to a setpoint (SP) 39

 iii. Statements made in the ’634 Patent regarding
 Severinsky do not remedy the above-mentioned
 deficiencies 44

(b)	Severinsky in view of Field and SAE 1996 does not disclose or render obvious “a low-load mode I, wherein, when the RL<the SP, the second electric motor is operable to provide torque to propel the hybrid vehicle”	50
(c)	Severinsky in view of Field and SAE 1996 does not disclose or render obvious a “setpoint”	53
2.	Ground 1 is Defective Because Ford Has Failed to Demonstrate that Severinsky in view of Field and SAE 1996 Discloses or Renders Obvious the Features Recited in Claim 1	55
(a)	Severinsky in view of Field and SAE 1996 does not disclose or render obvious “wherein the controller is operable to operate the engine when torque required from the engine to propel the hybrid vehicle and/or to drive one or more of the first or the second motors to charge the battery is at least equal to a setpoint (SP) above which the torque produced by the engine is efficiently produced”	55
(b)	Severinsky in view of Field and SAE 1996 does not render obvious a “setpoint” as required by claim 1	58
3.	Severinsky in view of Field and SAE 1996 does not render obvious claim 18	58
IV.	CONCLUSION	60

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Clearwater Sys. Corp. v. Evapco, Inc.</i> , 394 F. App'x 699, 705 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	47, 48
<i>In re Abbott Diabetes Care Inc.</i> , 696 F.3d 1142 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	7
<i>Fuji Photo Film Co. v. Int'l Trade Comm'n</i> , 386 F.3d 1095 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	11
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	49
<i>Paice LLC v. Hyundai Motor Co.</i> , No. CIV. WDQ-12-0499, 2014 WL 3725652 (D. Md. July 24, 2014)	7
<i>Paice LLC v. Toyota Motor Corp., et al.</i> , No. 2:04-CV-211-DF, Dkt. No. 91 (E.D. Tex. Sep. 28, 2005)	7
<i>Paice LLC v. Toyota Motor Corp., et al.</i> , No. 2:07-CV-180-DF, Dkt. No. 63 (E.D. Tex. Dec. 5, 2008).....	7
<i>PharmaStem Therapeutics, Inc. v. Viacell, Inc.</i> , 491 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	49
<i>In re Vaidyanathan</i> , 381 Fed. Appx. 985 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (unpublished)	8

...

EXHIBITS

Patent Owner Exhibit Number	Exhibit Description
PAICE Ex. 2001	Arbitration Agreement between Paice LLC and Ford Motor Company
PAICE Ex. 2002	Memorandum Opinion, U.S. District Court for the District of Maryland, U.S. District Judge William D. Quarles, Jr.
PAICE Ex. 2003	Declaration in support of pro hac vice motion
PAICE Ex. 2004	Declaration of Neil Hannemann
PAICE Ex. 2005	Dr. Gregory W. Davis Deposition Transcript (Jan. 13, 2015)
PAICE Ex. 2006	Excerpt from File History for U.S. Patent 8,214,097
PAICE Ex. 2007	“Integrated Microprocessor Control of a Hybrid i.c. Engine/Battery-Electric Automotive Power Train,” P.W. Masding, J.R. Bumby, Jan. 1990
PAICE Ex. 2008	Masding, Philip Wilson (1988) “Some drive train control problems in hybrid i.c engine/battery electric vehicles,” Durham theses, Durham University
PAICE Ex. 2009	Excerpt from McGraw-Hill Dictionary of Scientific and Technical Terms, Sixth Ed., 2003.
PAICE Ex. 2010	Neil Hannemann CV
PAICE Ex. 2011	Paice v. Ford, C.A. No. 1:14-cv-00492-WDQ, Complaint (Feb. 19, 2014)
PAICE Ex. 2012	Griffith Hack Report
PAICE Ex. 2013	Nov. 24, 2014 Letter to Wahls from Cordell
PAICE Ex. 2014	Dr. Gregory W. Davis Deposition Transcript (Feb. 25, 2015)

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.