

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

**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	iv
I. Introduction.....	1
II. Claim construction.....	2
A. “Setpoint (SP)”	2
B. Paice seeks to amend each independent claim to include “a comparison of the RL to a setpoint (SP) results in a determination that”	3
C. “Abnormal and transient conditions”	4
III. Regarding Paice’s procedural argument, Ford’s Petition is not conclusory.....	6
IV. Issues raised for Grounds 1-8: Paice’s repeated arguments regarding “RL” and “SP,” and Paice’s new argument regarding “abnormal and transient conditions,” are not persuasive.....	6
A. As the Board has previously found, Severinsky ’970 discloses “when” to operate the engine based on “RL”, <i>i.e.</i> , the “torque required to propel the vehicle”	6
B. As the Board has previously found, Severinsky ’970 discloses a “setpoint”	8
C. Severinsky ’970 discloses the additional “abnormal and transient conditions” limitations of claim 290.....	9
D. Paice cannot avoid its ’634 Patent specification admissions	11
V. Issues raised for Grounds 1-3, 5 and 8: Paice’s renewed argument regarding the rationale to combine Severinsky ’970 with Yamaguchi is not persuasive.....	11
A. As the Board has previously found, Severinsky ’970 does not teach away from preheating the engine.....	13
VI. Issues raised for Ground 2: Paice’s new arguments regarding the cruise control limitations of claim 283, and the rationale to combine Severinsky ’970 and Lateur, are not persuasive.....	14
VII. Issues raised for Ground 3: Paice’s new argument regarding the rationale to combine Severinsky ’970 and Yamaguchi in view of Suga is not persuasive.....	15

VIII.	Issues raised for Grounds 4-6: Paice’s repeated arguments regarding “ <i>limiting a rate of change of torque output of the engine</i> ,” and the rationale to combine Severinsky ’970 and Vittone, are not persuasive	18
A.	As the Board has previously found, a POSA would have understood that Vittone’s “steady state management” teaches that the rate of change of torque output of the engine is limited	18
B.	Rationale to combine Severinsky ’970 with Vittone, and with Yamaguchi.....	20
C.	Paice’s narrow interpretation of Severinsky ’970 and Vittone is incorrect.....	21
D.	As the Board has previously found, Vittone does not teach away from preheating the engine	22
IX.	Issues raised for Ground 8: Paice’s repeated arguments regarding the hysteresis limitations, and the rationale to combine Severinsky ’970 and Frank, are not persuasive	23
A.	As the Board has found, the combination of Severinsky ’970 and Frank discloses the hysteresis limitations	23
B.	Rationale to combine Severinsky ’970 with Frank.....	24
X.	Conclusion	25
	Certificate of Service	27

Table of Authorities

Cases

Constant v. Advanced Micro–Devices, Inc.,
848 F.2d 1560 (Fed. Cir. 1988)11

In re Gurley,
27 F.3d 551 (Fed. Cir. 1994)23

Omega Eng’g, Inc. v. Raytek Corp.,
334 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2003)5, 10

PharmaStem Therapeutics, Inc. v. Viacell, Inc.,
491 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2007)11

Updated List of Exhibits

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,	Takaoka

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.