

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.: IPR2015-00801

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW
UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 311 *ET SEQ.* AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.100 *ET SEQ.*
(CLAIMS 80, 111, 114, 144, 241, 264, 266, 267, 278-280, 282-291
OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,237,634)**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXHIBIT LIST..... iii

I. INTRODUCTION..... 1

II. MANDATORY NOTICES UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.8..... 2

 A. Real Party-In-Interest - 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1) 2

 B. Related Matters - 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2) 2

 C. Lead and Back-Up Counsel - 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3) 2

 D. Service Information - 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4) 2

III. REQUIREMENTS UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.104..... 3

 A. Grounds for Standing - 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a)..... 3

 B. Challenged Claims - 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(1)..... 3

 C. Prior Art Relied Upon 3

 D. Grounds of Challenge – 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(2) 3

IV. PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART (POSA) 4

V. OVERVIEW OF THE '634 PATENT..... 4

 A. Purported Improvement in the '634 Patent..... 4

 B. The Challenged Claims Require Only One-Motor 5

VI. STATE AND CONTENT OF THE PRIOR ART..... 5

VII. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION – 37 C.F.R. § 42.104 (B)(3) 6

 A. “*Road load (RL)*” and “*RL*” 7

 B. “*Setpoint (SP)*” and “*SP*” 7

 C. “*Mode I,*” “*low-load operation mode I,*” “*high-way cruising operation mode IV,*” “*acceleration operation mode V*” 8

 D. “*Abnormal and transient conditions*” 9

VIII. UNPATENTABILITY GROUNDS 10

 A. GROUND 1: Claims 267, 278-280, 282, 284, 285, 289 and 290 are Obvious over Severinsky '970 in view of Yamaguchi 10

 1. Independent Claim 267 10

 a. Severinsky '970 discloses limitations [267.2] and [267.3][a] 14

 b. Patentee’s admissions refute its expected arguments 17

 c. Patentee’s contention that Severinsky '970 is “speed-based” rather than “torque-based” is misplaced 19

d.	Severinsky '970's description of motor-engine transition further confirms it uses road load.....	20
e.	Conclusion: Severinsky '970 discloses [267.2] and [267.3]	21
2.	Rationale to Combine.....	24
3.	Dependent Claims 278-280, 282, 284, 285, 289 and 290.....	25
B.	GROUND 2: Claims 283, 286, 287 and 288 are Obvious over Severinsky '970 and Yamaguchi in view of Lateur.....	33
1.	Rationale to Combine – Controls	35
2.	Rationale to Combine – “ <i>Variable-Ratio Transmission</i> ”	39
C.	GROUND 3: Claim 291 is Obvious over Severinsky '970 and Yamaguchi in view of Suga	40
1.	Rationale to Combine.....	42
D.	GROUND 4: Claim 241 is Obvious over Severinsky '970 in view of Vittone	44
1.	Independent Claim 241	44
2.	Rationale to Combine.....	48
E.	GROUND 5: Claim 264 is Obvious over Severinsky '970 and Vittone in view of Yamaguchi	50
1.	Rationale to Combine.....	50
F.	GROUND 6: Claim 266 is Obvious over Severinsky '970 and Vittone in view of Suga.....	50
1.	Rationale to Combine.....	51
G.	GROUND 7: Claims 80 and 114 are Obvious over Severinsky '970 in view Frank.....	51
1.	Independent Claim 80	51
2.	Rationale to Combine.....	55
3.	Independent Claim 114.....	57
H.	GROUND 8: Claims 111 and 144 are Obvious over Severinsky '970 and Frank in view of Yamaguchi	59
1.	Rationale to Combine.....	60
IX.	OBJECTIVE INDICIA OF NONOBVIOUSNESS	60
X.	CONCLUSION.....	60
	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	61

EXHIBIT LIST

Exhibit No.	Description	Identifier
1851	U.S. Patent No. 7,237,634 issued to Severinsky <i>et al.</i> (July 3, 2007)	'634 Patent
1852	Declaration of Jeffery L. Stein, Ph.D.	Stein
1853	Paice LLC v. Ford Motor Company, Case No. 1:14-cv-00492, District of MD, Baltimore Div., Complaint (Feb. 19, 2014) (Ex. 1853 at 2-51.) Service (Feb. 25, 2014) (Ex. 1853 at 1.) Letter from Ford to Paice (Sept. 22, 2014) (Ex. 1853 at 52.)	Ford Litigation
1854	U.S. Patent No. 5,343,970 issued to Severinsky (Sept. 6, 1994)	Severinsky '970
1855	U.S. Patent No. 5,865,263 issued to Yamaguchi <i>et al.</i> (Feb. 2, 1999)	Yamaguchi
1856	U.S. Patent No. 5,823,280 issued to Lateur (Oct. 20, 1998)	Lateur
1857	U.S. Patent No. 5,623,104 issued to Suga (Apr. 22, 1997)	Suga
1858	Oreste Vittone et al., FIAT Research Centre, <i>Fiat Conceptual Approach to Hybrid Car Design</i> , 12th International Electric Vehicle Symposium, Volume 2 (1994), (available at https://www.worldcat.org/title/symposium-proceedings-12th-international-electric-vehicle-symposium-december-5-7-1994-disneyland-hotel-and-convention-center-anaheim-california/oclc/32209857&referer=brief_results .)	Vittone
1859	U.S. Patent No. 5,842,534 issued to Frank (Dec. 1, 1998)	Frank
1860	USPN 7,237,634 File History	'634 File History
1861	Toshifumi Takaoka et al., <i>A High-Expansion Ratio Gasoline Engine for the Toyota Hybrid System</i> , published as part of Toyota Technical Review, <i>Prevention of Global</i>	Takaoka

Exhibit No.	Description	Identifier
	<p><i>Warming</i>, Vol. 47, No. 2 (Toyota Motor Corporation, April 1998) (Ex. 1861 at 1-8.) (available at: https://www.worldcat.org/title/a-high-expansion-ratio-gasoline-engine-for-the-toyota-hybrid-system/oclc/205516653&referer=brief_results.)</p> <p>Declaration of Walt Johnson and Exhibit A (Dec. 23, 2014) (Ex. 1861 at 9-19.)</p>	
1862	USPN 7,104,347 File History Excerpts	'347 File History
1863	<p>Paice LLC v. Toyota Motor Corp. et al., Case No. 2:04-cv-211, E.D. Texas, Paice Opening Claim Construction Brief (Mar. 8, 2005) (Ex. 1863 at 1-40.)</p> <p>Paice Claim Construction Reply Brief (Mar. 29, 2005) (Ex. 1863 at 41-79.)</p> <p>Claim Construction Order (Sept. 28, 2005) (Ex. 1863 at 80-130.)</p> <p>Paice LLC v. Toyota Motor Corp. et al., Case No. 2:07-cv-180 (Paice Opening Claim Construction Brief (June 25, 2008) (Ex. 1863 at 131-165.)</p> <p>Paice Claim Construction Reply Brief (Aug. 1, 2008) (Ex. 1863 at 166-191.)</p> <p>Claim Construction Order (Dec. 5, 2008) (Ex. 1863 at 192-220.)</p>	Toyota Litigation
1864	<p>Paice LLC v. Hyundai Motor Corp. et al., Case No. 1:12-cv-0499, District of MD, Baltimore Div., Paice Opening Claim Construction Brief (Nov. 14, 2013) (Ex. 1864 at 1-37.)</p> <p>Paice Responsive Brief on Claim Construction (Dec. 16, 2013) (Ex. 1864 at 38-81.)</p> <p>Claim Construction Order (Ex. 1864 at 82-122.)</p>	Hyundai Litigation

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.