

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. 7,237,634 to Severinsky et al.

IPR Case No.: IPR2015-00799

**REPLY TO PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE TO PETITION
FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,237,634**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Authorities iii

Updated List of Exhibits v

I. Introduction..... 1

II. The priority applications fail to establish written description support for the claimed electrical limitations 2

 A. The priority applications lack written description support for the *at least 2.5 ratio* limitation 4

 1. The priority applications offer no teaching of a ratio of voltage to current 4

 2. The claimed *at least 2.5 ratio* is not derivable from the priority applications 5

 B. The priority applications lack written description support for the *at least 500 volts* limitation 7

 1. The priority applications fail to disclose even one representative species of the *at least 500 volts* genus claim 7

 2. The *at least 500 volts* limitation is not derivable from the priority applications 9

 C. The priority applications lack written description support for the *150 amperes* limitation. 10

III. The lack of written description support in the priority applications is not cured by the references to Severinsky ‘970..... 12

 A. Paice fails to prove that the incorporation by reference language incorporates the claimed electrical limitations..... 12

 1. The incorporation language is ambiguous and lacks detailed particularity 12

 2. Paice’s interpretation contradicts the plain meaning 14

 3. Under any reading, the disclosed “differences” preclude incorporation of the claimed electrical limitations 14

 4. The remaining “incorporation” language that Paice relies on is equally deficient 15

 B. If Severinsky ‘970 is incorporated in its entirety, the combination of Severinsky ‘970 and the priority applications would still fail to establish that the inventors possessed the claimed electrical limitations 16

1.	The priority applications and Severinsky '970 taken together lack written description support for the “ <i>at least 2.5 ratio</i> ” limitation	17
2.	The priority applications and Severinsky '970 taken together lack written description support for the “ <i>at least 500 volts</i> ” limitation	19
3.	The priority applications and Severinsky '970 taken together lack written description support for the “ <i>at least 150 amperes</i> ” limitation.....	21
IV.	The '866 CIP Application is the first application that reasonably conveys possession of the claimed electrical limitations	23
V.	Paice does not attempt to meet its burden of going forward with evidence that the priority applications support all limitations of the challenged claims.....	24
VI.	Ground of unpatentability: Claims 81-90, 115-124, 162-171 and 216-225 are obvious over the '455 PCT Publication in view of Severinsky '970	25
VII.	Conclusion	25
	Certificate of Service	27

Table of Authorities

Cases

<i>AbbVie Deutschland GmbH & Co., KG v. Janssen Biotech, Inc.</i> , 759 F.3d 1285 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	7, 10
<i>Amgen, Inc. v. Chugai Pharmaceuticals Co.</i> , 927 F.2d 1200 (Fed. Cir. 1991)	5
<i>Anascape, Ltd. v. Nintendo of Am. Inc.</i> , 601 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	16
<i>Application of Wertheim</i> , 541 F.2d 257 (CCPA 1976).....	11, 21
<i>Ariad Pharm., Inc. v. Eli Lilly & Co.</i> , 598 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	10
<i>Ariad Pharms., Inc. v. Eli Lilly & Co.</i> , 560 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	8, 12
<i>Augustine Med., Inc. v. Gaymar Indus., Inc.</i> , 181 F.3d 129 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	4
<i>Bilstad v. Wakalopulos</i> , 386 F.3d 1116 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	11, 18, 19
<i>Dynamic Drinkware, LLC v. National Graphics, Inc.</i> , 800 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	24
<i>Enzo Biochem, Inc. v. Gen-Probe, Inc.</i> , 323 F.3d 956 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	11
<i>Harari v. Lee</i> , 656 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	14
<i>In re de Seversky</i> , 474 F.2d 671 (CCPA 1973).....	6

Purdue Pharma L.P. v. Faulding, Ins.,
220 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2000)4

Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly & Co.,
119 F.3d 1559 (Fed. Cir. 1997)10

Technology Licensing Corp. v. Videotek, Inc.,
454 F.3d 1316 (Fed. Cir. 2003)24

Zenon Environmental, Inc. v. United States Filter Corp.,
506 F.3d 1370 (Fed. Cir. 2007)13

Statutes

35 U.S.C. §10225

35 U.S.C. §1031

35 U.S.C. §1204

Rules

37 C.F.R. § 1.576

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.