

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 IPR2015-00785
Patent 7,237,634

**PATENT OWNER'S
RESPONSE TO PETITION**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	THE '634 PATENT	2
A.	Background of the '634 Patent.....	2
B.	Claim Construction	4
1.	“setpoint (SP)”	4
2.	The Challenged Claims Require a Comparison of Road Load to Setpoint and MTO	7
3.	“abnormal and transient conditions”.....	9
III.	ARGUMENT.....	10
A.	Ford’s Conclusory Petition is Deficient Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) ...	10
B.	Ford Will Be Estopped from Maintaining Challenges to Claims 80 and 114.....	12
C.	Grounds 1-5 Should Be Denied—the Prior Art of Record Fails to Disclose Using Road Load to Determine When to Operate the Engine	13
1.	Severinsky Uses Speed to Determine When to Use the Engine 14	
2.	The Passages of Severinsky on Which Ford Relies Are Inapposite—Severinsky Does Not Use Road Load to Determine When to Operate the Engine.....	17
D.	Grounds 1-5 Should Be Denied—the Prior Art of Record Fails to Disclose a Setpoint.....	26
1.	Severinsky’s Sweet Spot Is Not a Setpoint.....	27

2.	Ford's Focus on <i>Output</i> Torque Is Flawed	34
3.	Severinsky Does Not Disclose the "Abnormal and Transient Conditions" Limitations	36
E.	Ford's Reliance on the '634 Patent's Discussion of Severinsky is Flawed and Improper.....	38
F.	Grounds 1 and 4 Should Be Denied—the Prior Art of Record Fails to Disclose Limiting a Rate of Change of Torque Output of the Engine to Achieve Stoichiometry	43
1.	Anderson Does Not Disclose Limiting a Rate of Change of Torque Output of the Engine.....	43
2.	Neither Anderson nor Severinsky Discloses Using the Electric Motor to Supply Additional Torque to Limit a Rate of Change of Engine Torque Output.....	46
3.	Neither Anderson nor Severinsky Discloses the '634 Patent's Stoichiometry Limitations.....	47
4.	Ford Fails to Establish a Rationale to Combine	50
G.	Grounds 2 and 5 Should Be Denied—Lateur's Cruise Control Is Not a Road-Load-Based Control Strategy	53
H.	Grounds 3-5 Should Be Denied—the Prior Art of Record Fails to Disclose Road-Load-Based Hysteresis	54
1.	Neither Severinsky nor Frank Discloses Road-Load-Based Hysteresis	55
2.	Ford Fails to Establish a Rationale to Combine	58
IV.	CONCLUSION.....	60

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>In re Abbott Diabetes Care Inc.</i> , 696 F.3d 1142 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	6
<i>Bettcher Indus., Inc. v. Bunzl USA, Inc.</i> , 661 F.3d 629 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	12
<i>Clearwater Sys. Corp. v. Evapco, Inc.</i> 394 F. App'x 699 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	41
<i>In re Cortright</i> , 165 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	6
<i>In re Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC</i> , 793 F.3d 1268 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	4
<i>Elkay Mfg. Co. v. Ebco Mfg. Co.</i> , 192 F.3d 973 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	41
<i>Ex parte Clapp</i> , 227 U.S.P.Q. 972 (BPAI 1985)	60
<i>Fuji Photo Film Co. v. Int'l Trade Comm'n</i> , 386 F.3d 1095 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	6
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	11, 12
<i>Ex parte Gunasekar, et al.</i> , Appeal 2009-008345, 2011 WL 3872007 (BPAI Aug. 29, 2011)	59, 60
<i>In re Gurley</i> , 27 F.3d 551 (Fed. Cir. 1994)	50
<i>Innogenetics, N.V. v. Abbott Labs.</i> , 512 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	54
<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	57, 59

...

KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.,
550 U.S. 398 (2007).....11, 57, 59

Microsoft Corp. v. Proxyconn, Inc.,
789 F.3d 1292 (Fed. Cir. 2015)4, 6, 9, 14

In re NTP, Inc.,
654 F.3d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2011)6, 9

In re Oelrich,
666 F.2d 578 (CCPA 1981).....12

PharmaStem Therapeutics, Inc. v. Viacell, Inc.,
491 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2007)42

In re Suitco Surface, Inc.,
603 F.3d 1255 (Fed. Cir. 2010)4

In re Vaidyanathan,
381 Fed. Appx. 985 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....6

Whole Space Indus., Ltd. v. Zipshade Indus. (B.V.I.) Corp.,
IPR2015-00488, Paper 14 (PTAB Jul. 24, 2015).....59

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 103.....1, 10, 11, 58

35 U.S.C. § 311.....1

35 U.S.C. § 315.....12

35 U.S.C. § 322.....10

Other Authorities

37 C.F.R. § 42.2210

37 C.F.R. § 42.100.....1, 4, 13

37 C.F.R. § 42.120.....1

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.