

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ZHONGSHAN BROAD OCEAN MOTOR CO., LTD.,
BROAD OCEAN MOTOR LLC, and
BROAD OCEAN TECHNOLOGIES, LLC,
Petitioners,

v.

NIDEC MOTOR CORPORATION,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2014-01121 (Patent 7,626,349 B2)
Case IPR2014-01122 (Patent 7,208,895 B2)
Case IPR2014-01123 (Patent 7,312,970 B2)¹

Before BENJAMIN D. M. WOOD, JAMES A. TARTAL, and
PATRICK M. BOUCHER, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

BOUCHER, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION
Denying Requests for Rehearing
37 C.F.R. § 42.71

¹ We exercise our discretion to issue a single decision for the three proceedings. The parties are not authorized to use this style of caption.

IPR2014-01121 (Patent 7,626,349 B2)
IPR2014-01122 (Patent 7,208,895 B2)
IPR2014-01123 (Patent 7,312,970 B2)

On January 21, 2015, we instituted *inter partes* review in IPR2014-01121 and IPR2014-01122, and denied institution of *inter partes* review in IPR2014-01123. Paper 20 in each of the proceedings. In all three proceedings, we denied institution on certain grounds advanced by Petitioners because those grounds relied on references that we determined were defective under 37 C.F.R. § 42.63(b). Dec. 7.² Specifically, each of those grounds relied on at least one Japanese reference; Petitioners filed an English translation of the reference, but failed to file an attesting affidavit with the translation as required by the rule.

On February 4, 2015, Petitioners filed a Request for Rehearing in each of the three proceedings that advance arguments involving (1) regulations for making and responding to evidentiary objections under 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b); (2) regulations for correction of clerical or typographical mistakes under 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(c); and (3) our discretion under 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.5(b) and (c)(3). Req. Reh'g 1.

I. REHEARING STANDARD

When rehearing a decision, the Board reviews the decision for an abuse of discretion. 37 C.F.R. § 42.71(c). “An abuse of discretion occurs where the decision (1) is clearly unreasonable, arbitrary, or fanciful; (2) is

² Petitioners make substantially the same arguments in each proceeding. For convenience, we subsequently provide citations herein to our Institution Decision (Paper 20, “Dec.”) and to Petitioner’s Request for Rehearing (Paper 21, “Req. Reh’g”) in IPR2014-01123.

IPR2014-01121 (Patent 7,626,349 B2)
IPR2014-01122 (Patent 7,208,895 B2)
IPR2014-01123 (Patent 7,312,970 B2)

based on an erroneous conclusion of law; (3) rests on clearly erroneous fact findings; or (4) involves a record that contains no evidence on which the Board could rationally base its decision.” *Stevens v. Tamai*, 366 F.3d 1325, 1330 (Fed. Cir. 2004) (citing *Eli Lilly & Co. v. Bd. of Regents of the Univ. of Wash.*, 334 F.3d 1264, 1266–67 (Fed. Cir. 2003)). The burden of showing that the decision should be modified lies with Petitioners, the parties challenging the decision. See 37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d). In addition, “[t]he request must specifically identify all matters the party believes the Board misapprehended or overlooked, and the place where each matter was previously addressed.” *Id.*

II. REGULATIONS FOR MAKING AND RESPONDING TO EVIDENTIARY OBJECTIONS

Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b), an opportunity is afforded to parties to submit supplemental evidence in response to objections to evidence submitted during a preliminary proceeding. The procedure contemplates service of the objection “within ten business days of the institution of the trial” (37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(1)) and service of the supplemental evidence “within ten business days of service of the objection” (37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(2)).

Petitioners correctly contend that their defective exhibits, namely the Japanese references with unattested translations, are “evidence submitted during a preliminary proceeding.” Req. Reh’g 5. Petitioners also correctly

IPR2014-01121 (Patent 7,626,349 B2)
IPR2014-01122 (Patent 7,208,895 B2)
IPR2014-01123 (Patent 7,312,970 B2)

contend that “supplemental evidence” includes the attesting affidavits later obtained by Petitioners. *Id.* Thus, we agree with Petitioners that the procedure allows service of its later-obtained attesting affidavits.

Nevertheless, such a procedure ultimately fails to have the curative effect Petitioners desire. Specifically, 37 C.F.R. § 42.63(b) requires that “an affidavit attesting to the accuracy of the translation *must* be filed *with* the document” (emphases added). Consequently, the original Petitions are incomplete with respect to the grounds advanced by Petitioners that rely on the Japanese references. Later submission of the Japanese references with translations and attesting affidavits would require assignment of a new filing date. 37 C.F.R. § 42.106. The patents at issue in each of the proceedings are also the subject of *Nidec Motor Corporation v. Broad Ocean Motor LLC et al.*, Civil Action No. 4:13-CV-01895-JCH (E.D. Mo., Sept. 25, 2013). Dec. 3. Petitioners’ original email message to the Board requesting guidance on filing the later-obtained attesting affidavits is dated October 29, 2014 (Req. Reh’g, Ex. A), more than a year after service of the complaint in that civil action. Thus, following the procedure requested by Petitioners would result in a filing date that bars institution of *inter partes* reviews under 35 U.S.C. § 315(b).

Petitioners direct our attention to the Board’s grant of authorization to file supplemental evidence in *Toyota Motor Corp. v. American Vehicular Sciences LLC*, Case No. IPR2013-00415 (PTAB Dec. 5, 2013) (Paper 14). Req. Reh’g 6–8. We disagree with Petitioners’ assertion that the

IPR2014-01121 (Patent 7,626,349 B2)
IPR2014-01122 (Patent 7,208,895 B2)
IPR2014-01123 (Patent 7,312,970 B2)

circumstances presented in that proceeding are “closely analogous” to those in these proceedings. *See id.* at 6. In *Toyota*, a Japanese reference was filed with an English translation and a certification of the translation that included certain defects. *Id.* The distinction between correction of an already filed, but defective, attesting affidavit and an attempt to file a new later-obtained attesting affidavit is fundamental. The rule, 37 C.F.R. § 42.63(b), is unequivocal and requires in this case that a certification of the translation “must be filed with” the Petition. A certification acquired for the first time after the Petition is filed does not comply with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 42.63(b).

III. REGULATIONS FOR CORRECTION OF CLERICAL OR TYPOGRAPHICAL MISTAKES

As Petitioners note, during the conference call held on November 3, 2014, we guided the parties to the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(c), which allow correction of “a clerical or typographical mistake in the petition” without changing the filing date of the Petition, and authorized briefing by the parties. Req. Reh’g 3. After consideration of the parties’ respective positions, we determined that Petitioners had not established that the facts supported a finding that the failure to include attesting affidavits resulted from a “clerical mistake.” Dec. 3–7.

Petitioners now contend that the curative provisions of § 42.104(c) should extend to a “mistake of fact,” and that the facts support a finding that

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.