

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

FORD MOTOR COMPANY Petitioner

v.

PAICE LLC & THE ABELL FOUNDATION, INC.

Patent Owner

Case IPR2014-01415

Patent 8,214,097

Patent Owner's Response to Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of

U.S. Patent No. 8,214,097

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Background of the '097 Patent	2
III.	Claim Construction.....	3
	A. The District Courts' Construction.....	4
	B. "Setpoint" is "a definite, but potentially variable value at which a transition between operating modes may occur."	4
	1. "Setpoint" is used to mark a transition between operating modes.....	4
	2. "Setpoint" is not "predetermined" and is not limited to torque values.....	7
IV.	Overview of the References	7
	A. Severinsky	7
	B. Anderson	8
	C. Takaoka	12
V.	Ground 1 is defective because claims 1, 11, and 21 are not obvious over the proposed combination of Severinsky and Anderson.....	12
	A. Severinsky and Anderson do not disclose "wherein the controller controls said engine such that a rate of increase of output torque of said engine is limited . . ."	12
	B. Severinsky and Anderson do not disclose a controller that supplements engine torque with motor torque while the engine's torque output is limited.	15
	C. Severinsky and Anderson do not disclose a "controller . . . such that combustion of fuel within the engine occurs at a substantially stoichiometric ratio"	18

D.	Ground 1 is Defective Because Severinsky in view of Anderson Fails to Disclose the “setpoint”-based Modes of Operation Recited in Claims 1, 11, and 21	21
1.	Ford Misapplies Severinsky to Claims 1, 11, and 21	21
2.	Severinsky and Anderson Fail to Disclose the Modes of Operation Recited in Claims 1, 11, and 21	27
3.	Statements made in the '097 Patent regarding Severinsky do not remedy the above-mentioned deficiencies	32
4.	Severinsky in view of Anderson does not disclose or render obvious a “setpoint”	37
E.	Severinsky and Anderson cannot be combined in the manner asserted by Ford.....	38
F.	Severinsky and Anderson teach away from the claimed invention	43
G.	Ford’s expert should be given little or no weight	47
VI.	Ground 2 is defective because claims 3, 13, and 23 are not obvious over the proposed combination of Severinsky, Anderson, and Yamaguchi	50
VII.	Ground 3 is defective because claims 4, 14, and 24 are not obvious over the proposed combination of Severinsky, Anderson, Yamaguchi, and Takaoka	51
VIII.	Ground 4 is defective because claims 30 and 34 are not obvious over the proposed combination of Severinsky and Takaoka.....	52
A.	Takaoka fails to disclose a “controller” that limits engine output torque to maintain stoichiometry.....	52
1.	Severinsky does not disclose the limiting that rate of change limitations.....	53
2.	Takaoka discloses an underpowered engine	53
3.	Takaoka does not limit the rate of change of engine output torque to achieve stoichiometry	55
4.	Takaoka at best discloses limiting engine output <i>power</i> , not torque.....	56

B.	Severinsky does not disclose or suggest claim 34	58
C.	A POSITA would not have been motivated to combine Severinsky and Takaoka	59
IX.	Conclusion	60

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Bausch & Lomb, Inc. v. Barnes-Hind/Hydrocurve, Inc.,
796 F.2d 443 (Fed. Cir. 1986).....45

Bausch & Lomb, Inc. v. Barnes-Hind/Hydrocurve, Inc.,
796 F.2d 443, 448 (Fed. Cir. 1986)45

Clearwater Sys. Corp. v. Evapco, Inc.,
394 F. App'x 699, 705 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....35

Fluor Tec, Corp. v. Kappos, 499 Fed. Appx. 35 (Fed. Cir. 2012)46

Fuji Photo Film Co. v. Int'l Trade Comm'n,
386 F.3d 1095, 1098 (Fed. Cir. 2004)7

In re Giannelli, 739 F.3d 1375, 1380-81 (Fed. Cir. 2014)14

In re Gurley, 27 F.3d 551 (Fed. Cir. 1994).....43

Innogenetics, N.V. v. Abbott Labs., 512 F.3d 1363, 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2008)59

KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. 398 (2007)46

Microsoft Corporation v. Enfish, LLC, IPR2013-00559,
Paper No. 65 at 29 (PTAB March 3, 2015)59

Outside The Box Innovations, LLC v. Travel Caddy, Inc.,
695 F.3d 1285 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....46

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.