

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

FORD MOTOR COMPANY  
Petitioner,

v.

PAICE LLC & ABELL FOUNDATION, INC.  
Patent Owner.

---

U.S. Patent No. 7,104,347 to Severinsky et al.

IPR Case No.: IPR2015-00794

---

**REPLY TO PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE TO PETITION  
FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,104,347**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Updated List of Exhibits .....	iii
I. Introduction.....	1
II. Claim construction.....	2
A. <i>Setpoint</i> .....	2
B. Paice’s “comparison” amendment is improper .....	2
III. Ford is not estopped as Paice alleges .....	2
IV. Grounds 1-2: Ibaraki ’882 renders the challenged claims unpatentable .....	3
A. Ibaraki ’882 discloses operating the engine/motor when the “ <i>road load</i> ” is above/below a “ <i>setpoint</i> ” .....	3
1. Paice’s power argument is not based on the figures nor disclosure of Ibaraki ’882 .....	5
2. Fig. 5 of Ibaraki ’882 discloses mode selection based on <i>road load</i> and <i>setpoint</i> .....	9
3. Even if Ibaraki is power-based, the challenged claims are obvious based on the undisputed mathematical relationship between power and torque .....	11
B. Ibaraki ’882 discloses operating the motor and engine “ <i>when         the torque RL...is more than the MTO</i> ”.....	12
1. Fig. 5 also discloses operating the motor and engine when <i>road load</i> is “ <i>more than the MTO</i> ” .....	17
C. Ibaraki ’882 discloses a <i>setpoint</i> substantially less than MTO .....	19
V. Ground 2: Claim 29 is obvious over Ibaraki ’882 in view of the knowledge of a PHOSITA and known prior art systems .....	20
VI. Ground 3: Claim 39 is obvious over Ibaraki ’882 in view of Vittone, and the knowledge of a PHOSITA .....	20
A. As the Board has previously found, a PHOSITA would have understood that Vittone’s “steady state management” teaches that the rate of change of torque output of the engine is limited .....	20
B. Rationale to combine Ibaraki ’882 with Vittone.....	21
C. Paice’s narrow interpretation of Ibaraki ’882 and Vittone is incorrect.....	22
VII. Ground 4: Claim 40 is obvious over Ibaraki ’882 in view of Yamaguchi and the knowledge of a PHOSITA .....	23

VIII.	Ground 5: Claim 41 is obvious over Ibaraki '882 in view of Ibaraki '626 and the knowledge of a PHOSITA.....	24
IX.	Ground 6: Claim 27 is obvious over Ibaraki '882 in view of Lateur and the knowledge of a PHOSITA .....	24
	A. Lateur discloses the additional cruise control “limitations” .....	24
	B. Rationale to combine Ibaraki '882 with Lateur .....	26
X.	Ground 7: Claims 25 and 26 are obvious over Ibaraki '882 in view of Frank and the knowledge of a PHOSITA.....	27
	A. As the Board has found, Frank discloses the hysteresis limitations .....	27
	B. Rationale to combine Ibaraki '882 with Frank .....	27
XI.	Conclusion .....	28
	Certificate of Service .....	29
	Certificate of Compliance Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.24 .....	30

**Updated List of Exhibits**

<b>Exhibit No.</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Identifier</b>
1401	US Patent 7,104,347	Sept. 12, 2006	'347 Patent
1402	Ford Letter to Paice	Sept. 2014	Ford Letter
1403	US Patent 5,789,882	Aug. 4, 1998	Ibaraki '882
1404	US Patent 5,623,104	Apr. 22, 1997	Suga
1405	US Patent 4,335,429	June 15, 1982	Kawakatsu '429
1406	Automotive Electronics Handbook (Jurgen)		Jurgen
1407	US Patent 5,823,280	Oct. 20, 1998	Lateur
1408	Declaration of Gregory Davis		Davis Dec.
1409	US Application 60-100095	Filed Sept. 11, 1998	'095 Provisional
1410	Excerpt of USPN 7,104,347 File History	n/a	'347 File History
1411	U.S. Patent No. 7,237,634	July 3, 2007	'634 Patent
1412	7,237,634 File History (certified)	n/a	'634 Patent File History
1413	Toyota Litigations	2005	Toyota Litigation
1414	Hyundai Litigation	2013-2014	Hyundai Litigation
1415	PTAB Decisions & Preliminary Response in 2014-00571		Ford IPRs
1416	Bosch Automotive Handbook (1996)	Oct. 1996	Bosch Handbook
1417	US Patent 5,934,395	Aug. 10, 1999	Koide
1418	US Patent 6,116,363	Sept. 12, 2000	Frank
1419	Engineering Fundamentals of the Internal Combustion Engine	1997	Pulkrabek
1420	Fiat Conceptual Approach to Hybrid Cars Design (Vittone)	Dec. 5-7, 1994	Vittone
1421	US Patent 5,865,263	Feb. 2, 1999	Yamaguchi
1422	US Patent 6,003,626	Dec. 21, 1999	Ibaraki '626
1423	Innovations in Design: 1993 Ford Hybrid Electric Vehicle Challenge	Feb. 1994	

<b>Exhibit No.</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Identifier</b>
1424	1996 & 1997 Future Car Challenge	Feb. 1997 & Feb. 1998	
1425	Introduction to Automotive Powertrain (Davis)		Davis Textbook
1426	History of Hybrid Electric Vehicle (Wakefield-1998)	1998	Wakefield
1427	SAE 760121 (Unnewehr-1976)	Feb. 1, 1976	Unnewehr
1428	SAE 920447 (Burke-1992)	Feb. 1, 1992	Burke 1992
1429	Vehicle Tester for HEV (Duoba-1997)	Aug. 1, 1997	Duoba 1997
1430	DOE Report to Congress (1994)	April 1995	1994 Report to Congress
1431	SAE SP-1331 (1998)	Feb. 1998	SAE SP-1331
1432	SAE SP-1156 (1996)	Feb. 1996	SAE SP-1156
1433	Microprocessor Design for HEV (Bumby-1988)	Sept. 1, 1988	Bumby/Masding 1988
1434	DOE HEV Assessment (1979)	Sept. 30, 1979	HEV Assessment 1979
1435	EPA HEV Final Study (1971)	June 1, 1971	EPA HEV Final Study
1436	Propulsion System for Design for EV (Ehsani-1996)	June 18, 2005	IEEE Ehsani 1996
1437	Propulsion System Design for HEV (Ehsani-1997)	Feb. 1997	IEEE Ehsani 1997
1438	Critical Issues in Quantifying HEV Emissions (An 1998)	Aug. 11, 1998	An 1998
1439	WO 9323263A1 (Field)	Nov. 25, 1998	9323263
1440	Toyota Prius (Yamaguchi-1998)	Jan. 1998	Toyota Prius Yamaguchi 1998
1441	US Patent 6,209,672	April 3, 2001	'672 Patent
1442	SAE SP-1089 (Anderson-1995)	Feb. 1995	SAE SP-1089
1443	1973 Development of the Federal Urban Driving Schedule (SAE 730553)	1973	SAE 1973
1444	Gregory Davis Resume		
1445	Gregory Davis Data		
1446	U.S. Patent No. 4,407,132	Oct. 4, 1983	Kawakatsu '132

# 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.