

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 IPR2015-00795  
Patent 7,104,347

---

**Patent Owner's Preliminary Response to  
Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S.  
Patent No. 7,104,347**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. INTRODUCTION ..... 1

II. PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND ..... 2

III. THE ’347 PATENT ..... 3

    A. Background of the ’347 Patent ..... 3

    B. Claim Construction ..... 6

        1. “setpoint (SP)” ..... 7

        2. “monitor patterns of vehicle operation over time” ..... 12

IV. ARGUMENT ..... 16

    A. The Board Should Exercise its Discretion to Reject Ford’s Fifth Bite at the Apple ..... 17

        1. The Petition is Ford’s Fifth Bite at the Apple ..... 20

        2. Estoppel Considerations Support Rejecting Ford’s Petition .... 26

    B. The Petition is Procedurally Improper ..... 29

        1. The Petition Improperly Incorporates by Reference ..... 29

        2. The Petition Creates an Overly Voluminous Record ..... 33

    C. Ground 1 is Deficient ..... 34

        1. Ford’s Proposed Grounds Fail to Present a Proper Obviousness Analysis Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) ..... 35

        2. Independent Claim 1 ..... 39

        3. Dependent Claims 2 and 5 ..... 44

**PUBLIC - REDACTED VERSION**

Patent No. 7,104,347  
Patent Owner's Preliminary Response

Case IPR2015-00795  
Attorney Docket No: 36351-0011IP5

D. Ground 2 is Deficient .....45

E. Ground 3 is Deficient .....47

F. Ground 4 is Deficient .....49

G. Ground 5 is Deficient .....51

H. Ground 6 is Deficient .....52

I. Ground 7 is Deficient .....53

V. CONCLUSION.....54

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>In re Abbott Diabetes Care Inc.</i> , 696 F.3d 1142 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	11
<i>Apple, Inc., v. ContentGuard Holdings, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00356, Paper 9 (PTAB Jun. 26, 2015) .....	34
<i>Apple Inc. v. ContentGuard Holdings, LLC</i> , IPR2015-00448, Paper 9 (PTAB July 10, 2015) .....	39
<i>ASUSTeK Computer Inc. v. Exotablet, Ltd.</i> , IPR2015-00041, Paper 6 (PTAB Apr. 23, 2015) .....	19
<i>Boston Scientific Scimed, Inc. v. Cordis Corp.</i> , 554 F.3d 982 (Fed. Cir. 2009) .....	36, 43
<i>Butamax Advanced Biofuels LLC v. Gevo, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00581, Paper 8 (PTAB Oct. 14, 2014) .....	18, 20, 21, 27
<i>Cisco v. C-Cation Technologies</i> , IPR2014-00454, Paper 12 (PTAB Aug. 29, 2014) .....	30
<i>Continental Automotive Sys., Inc. v. Wasica Finance GMBH</i> , IPR2014-01454, Paper 14 (PTAB Feb. 13, 2015) .....	25
<i>In re Cortright</i> , 165 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 1999) .....	7, 11
<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) .....	6
<i>CustomPlay, LLC v. ClearPlay, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00783, Paper 9 (PTAB Nov. 7, 2014) .....	27

...

<i>eBay Inc. v. MoneyCat Ltd.</i> , CBM2015-00008, Paper 9 (PTAB May 1, 2015).....	27
<i>Fidelity National v. DataTreasury</i> , IPR2014-00491, Paper 9 (PTAB Aug. 13, 2014).....	30
<i>Fuji Photo Film Co. v. Int'l Trade Comm'n</i> , 386 F.3d 1095 (Fed. Cir. 2004) .....	11
<i>In re Giannelli</i> , 739 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2014) .....	40
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	35, 53
<i>Innogenetics, N.V. v. Abbott Labs.</i> , 512 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....	47, 49, 51, 54
<i>Ex Parte James R. Bosserdet Jr.</i> , Appeal 2012-001420, 2014 WL 5590704 (PTAB Oct. 9, 2014) .....	42
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	35, 38, 53
<i>MasterImage 3D, Inc. v. Reald Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00033, Paper 12 (PTAB Apr. 22, 2015) .....	50
<i>MaxLinear, Inc. v. Cresta Technology Corp.</i> , IPR2015-00591, Paper 9 (PTAB Jun. 15, 2015) .....	24
<i>Micro Motion, Inc. v. Invensys Systems, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-0393, Paper 16 (PTAB Aug. 4, 2014).....	30
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Proxyconn, Inc.</i> , No. 2014-1542, 2015 WL 3747257 (Fed. Cir. Jun. 16, 2015) .....	6, 7, 11
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Enfish, LLC</i> , IPR2013-00559, Paper 65 (PTAB Mar. 3, 2015).....	48
<i>In re Nilssen</i> , 837 F.2d 1098 (Fed. Cir. 1987) .....	52

# 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.