

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 IPR2015-00792
Patent 8,214,097

**Patent Owner's Preliminary Response to
Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S.
Patent No. 8,214,097**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND	4
	A. Ford's First Petition.....	4
	B. Ford's Second Petition	5
	C. The Instant Petition	6
III.	THE '097 PATENT.....	7
	A. Background of the '097 Patent.....	7
	B. Claim Construction	10
	1. "setpoint (SP)"	12
	2. "abnormal and transient conditions".....	17
IV.	ARGUMENT.....	19
	A. The Board Should Exercise its Discretion to Reject Ford's Third Bite at the Apple	20
	1. The Instant Petition is Ford's Third Bite at the Apple.....	23
	2. Ford Advances the Exact Same Prior Art and Substantially the Same Arguments	29
	3. Estoppel Considerations Support Rejecting Ford's Petition	33
	B. The Petition is Procedurally Improper	37
	1. The Petition Improperly Incorporates by Reference	37
	2. The Petition Creates an Overly Voluminous Record	41

C. Ground 1 is Deficient—The Proposed Combination of Severinsky and Takaoka Does Not Render Claims 1, 7, 9, 11, 17, 19, 21, 27, 28, 30, 37, or 38 Obvious42

1. The Proposed Combination of Severinsky and Takaoka Does Not Disclose A Setpoint.....43

2. The Proposed Combination of Severinsky and Takaoka Fails to Render Dependent Claims 7, 9, 17, 19, 27, 28, 37, or 38 Obvious47

3. The Petition Fails to Address Adequately a Reason to Combine Severinsky with Takaoka49

D. Ground 2 is Deficient—The Proposed Combination of Severinsky, Takaoka, and Yamaguchi Does Not Render Claims 3, 4, 13, 14, 23, 24, 32, or 33 Obvious50

V. CONCLUSION.....51

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>In re Abbott Diabetes Care Inc.</i> , 696 F.3d 1142 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	16
<i>Apple, Inc., v. ContentGuard Holdings, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00356, Paper 9 (PTAB Jun. 26, 2015)	42
<i>Apple Inc. v. ContentGuard Holdings, LLC</i> , IPR2015-00448, Paper 9 (PTAB Jul. 10, 2015)	40
<i>ASUSTeK Computer Inc. v. Exotablet, Ltd.</i> , IPR2015-00041, Paper 6 (PTAB Apr. 23, 2015)	22
<i>Butamax Advanced Biofuels LLC v. Gevo, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00581, Paper 8 (PTAB Oct. 14, 2014)	21
<i>Cisco v. C-Cation Technologies</i> , IPR2014-00454, Paper 12 (PTAB Aug. 29, 2014)	38
<i>Conopco, Inc. dba Unilever v. Procter & Gamble Company</i> , IPR2014-00628, Paper 23 (PTAB March 20, 2015)	22, 23
<i>In re Cortright</i> , 165 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	11, 15
<i>In re Cuozzo Speed Tech., LLC</i> , 778 F.3d 1271 (Fed. Cir. 2015), <i>reh'g denied</i> , __ F.3d __ (Fed. Cir. Jul. 8, 2015)	11
<i>CustomPlay, LLC v. ClearPlay, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00783, Paper 9 (PTAB Nov. 7, 2014)	34
<i>eBay Inc. v. MoneyCat Ltd.</i> , CBM2015-00008, Paper 9 (PTAB May 1, 2015)	34
<i>Fidelity National v. DataTreasury</i> , IPR2014-00491, Paper 9 (PTAB Aug. 13, 2014)	37

...

<i>Ford Motor Company v. Paice LLC & The Abell Foundation, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00570, Paper 10 (PTAB Sept. 30, 2014).....	5
<i>Ford Motor Company v. Paice LLC & The Abell Foundation, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-01415, Paper 10 (PTAB Mar. 12, 2015).....	5
<i>Ford Motor Company v. Paice LLC & The Abell Foundation, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00767, Paper 2 (PTAB Feb. 19, 2015).....	24
<i>Fuji Photo Film Co. v. Int'l Trade Comm'n</i> , 386 F.3d 1095 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	15
<i>Innogenetics, N.V. v. Abbott Labs.</i> , 512 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	49
<i>MaxLinear, Inc. v. Cresta Technology Corp.</i> , IPR2015-00591, Paper 9 (PTAB Jun. 15, 2015).....	27
<i>Micro Motion, Inc. v. Invensys Systems, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-0393, Paper 16 (PTAB Aug. 4, 2014).....	38
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Proxyconn, Inc.</i> No. 2014-1542, 2015 WL 3747257 (Fed. Cir. June 16, 2015).....	11, 15, 18
<i>Microsoft Corporation v. Enfish, LLC</i> , IPR2013-00559, Paper 65 (PTAB Mar. 3, 2015).....	49
<i>In re NTP, Inc.</i> , 654 F.3d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	11, 15
<i>Salesforce.com, Inc. v. VirtualAgility, Inc.</i> , CBM201300024, Paper 16 (PTAB Nov. 19, 2013)	50
<i>Samsung Elecs. Co. v. Rembrandt Wireless Technologies, LP</i> , IPR2015-00555, Paper 20 (PTAB Jun. 19, 2015).....	22
<i>Shaw Industries Group, Inc. v. Automated Creel Sys., Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00584, Paper 16 (PTAB Dec. 21, 2013).....	38
<i>In re Suitco Surface, Inc.</i> , 603 F.3d 1255 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	11, 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.