

Filed on behalf of Nidec Motor Corporation

IPR2015-00762

By: Scott R. Brown
Matthew B. Walters
HOVEY WILLIAMS LLP
10801 Mastin Blvd., Suite 1000
Overland Park, Kansas 66210
Tel: (913) 647-9050
Fax: (913) 647-9057

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 No. IPR2015-00762
U.S. Patent No. 7,626,349

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. THE BOARD SHOULD DENY BROAD OCEAN’S SECOND PETITION BECAUSE IT IS TIME BARRED.....	3
A. Broad Ocean Filed its Second Petition More Than One Year After Being Served With a Complaint Asserting the ’349 Patent.....	3
B. Broad Ocean Cannot Join Itself as a Party.....	3
1. The Second Petition Attempts to Cure Broad Ocean’s Error in IPR2014-01121, but No Binding Precedent Permits Broad Ocean’s Joinder.....	4
2. Broad Ocean’s Motion Should Be Denied Because 35 U.S.C. § 315(c) Does Not Authorize a Party Joining Itself in Another IPR.	4
i. The Plain Language of 35 U.S.C. § 315(c) Only Permits Joinder of a <i>New Party</i> to an IPR.....	4
ii. Legislative History Supports Limiting 315(c) to the Joinder of Nonparties.	7
C. If the Board Has Authority to Grant Joinder, It Should Nonetheless Deny Broad Ocean’s Motion.	10
1. The Board has Broad Discretion to Deny Broad Ocean’s Motion For Joinder.	10
2. The Board Has Reserved Joinder of the Same Party Under 315(c) for Instances in Which Joinder Provides an Equitable Remedy.....	11
3. The Board Consistently Denies Joinder in Cases Like This, Where an Absence of Strong Equitable Considerations Favoring Joinder	13
4. Broad Ocean Now Seeks its Third Bite at the Apple.	16
III. LEGAL STANDARDS FOR INSTITUTION OF <i>INTER PARTES</i> REVIEW	18

IV. GROUND 1 FAILS TO DEMONSTRATE A REASONABLE
LIKELIHOOD OF PREVAILING WITH RESPECT TO ANY CLAIM.19

A. NMC Adopts the Board’s Claim Constructions in Related *Inter Partes*
Review IPR2014-01121.....19

B. Hideji Fails to Disclose Using Sine Wave Commutation Using
Independent Values of Q and d Axis Currents.20

V. CONCLUSION25

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>ABB Inc. v. Roy-G-Biv Corp.</i> IPR2013-00286 (PTAB Aug. 19, 2013).....	13
<i>Ariosa Diagnostics v. Isis Innovation Ltd.</i> IPR2012-00022 (PTAB Sept. 2, 2014)	13
<i>Dell Inc. v. Network-1 Security Solutions, Inc.</i> IPR2013-00385 (PTAB July 29, 2013).....	7, 9
<i>Garcia v. United States</i> 469 U.S. 70 (1984)	8
<i>Killip v. Office of Pers. Mgmt.</i> 991 F.2d 1564 (Fed. Cir. 1993).....	6
<i>Ling v. Payne</i> 476 U.S. 926 (1986)	6
<i>Medtronic v. Endotach</i> IPR2014-00695 (PTAB Sept. 25, 2014)	5, 14, 15
<i>Micro Motion v. Invensys Systems</i> IPR2014-01409 (PTAB Feb. 18, 2015).....	10, 11, 13, 15
<i>Net Moneyin, Inc. v. Verisign, Inc.</i> 545 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	25
<i>Reloaded Games v. Parallel Networks</i> IPR2014-0095 (PTAB Oct. 22, 2014).....	16
<i>Samsung v. Virginia Innovation</i> IPR2014-00557 (PTAB June 13, 2014)	12
<i>Skyhawk Technologies v. L&H Concepts</i> IPR2014-01485 (PTAB March 20, 2015).....	5
<i>Sony Corp. v. Yissum Research Dev. Co. of the Hebrew Univ. of Jerusalem,</i> IPR2013-00327 (PTAB Sept. 24, 2013)	13

...

<i>Standard Innovation v. Lelo</i> IPR2014-00907 (PTAB Dec. 1, 2014)	15
<i>Target v. Destination Maternity Corporation</i> IPR2014-00508 (PTAB Feb. 12, 2015).....	5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12
<i>ZTE Corp. and ZTE (USA) Inc. v. ContentGuard Holdings Inc.</i> IPR2013-00454 (PTAB Sept. 25, 2013)	9

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 102(b)	20
35 U.S.C. § 311(a)	6
35 U.S.C. § 314(a)	18
35 U.S.C. § 315(b)	1, 3, 4, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 18
35 U.S.C. § 315(c)	4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 13, 14, 16, 18
35 U.S.C. § 325	8
35 U.S.C. § 325(c)	7

Other Authorities

37 CFR § 1.104(c).....	17, 18
37 CFR § 42.104(c).....	17
37 CFR § 42.108	18
37 CFR § 42.123	16
37 CFR § 42.64(b)(2).....	16
Changes to Implement <i>Inter Partes</i> Review Proceedings, Post-Grant Review Proceedings, and Transitional Program for Covered Business Method Patents, 77 FR 48680-01	17

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.