

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 IPR2015-00801
Patent 7,237,634

**Patent Owner's Preliminary Response to
Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S.
Patent No. 7,237,634**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND 2

III. THE '634 PATENT 3

 A. Background of the '634 Patent 3

 B. Claim Construction 6

 1. “setpoint (SP)” 7

 2. “abnormal and transient conditions” 13

IV. ARGUMENT 15

 A. The Board Should Exercise its Discretion to Reject Ford’s Seventh Shot at the '634 Patent 16

 1. The Petition is Ford’s Thirteenth Shot at the '634 Patent 19

 2. Estoppel Considerations Support Rejecting Ford’s Petition 24

 B. The Petition is Procedurally Improper 27

 1. The Petition Improperly Incorporates by Reference 28

 2. The Petition Creates an Overly Voluminous Record 31

 C. Grounds 1-8 Are Deficient Because Severinsky, Alone or in Combination with the Other References of Record, Does Not Render Obvious the Challenged Claims 32

 1. Ford’s Proposed Grounds Fail to Provide a Proper Obviousness Analysis Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) 33

2. The Proposed Combinations Based on Severinsky Do Not Disclose A Setpoint36

3. The Proposed Combinations in Grounds 3 and 6 do not Disclose or Render Obvious “wherein the at least one electric motor is sufficiently powerful to provide acceleration of said vehicle sufficient to conform to the Federal urban cycle driving fuel mileage test...”40

4. The Proposed Combination of Severinsky and Frank Fails to Disclose or Render Obvious the Road Load-Based Hysteresis Claim Limitations.....44

V. CONCLUSION.....49

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>In re Abbott Diabetes Care Inc.</i> , 696 F.3d 1142 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	12
<i>Apple, Inc., v. Contentguard Holdings, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00356, Paper 9 (PTAB Jun. 26, 2015)	32
<i>Apple Inc. v. ContentGuard Holdings, LLC</i> , IPR2015-00448, Paper 9 (PTAB Jul. 10, 2015)	30
<i>ASUSTeK Computer Inc. v. Exotablet, Ltd.</i> , IPR2015-00041, Paper 6 (PTAB Apr. 23, 2015)	18
<i>Bettcher Indus., Inc. v. Bunzl USA, Inc.</i> , 661 F.3d 629 (Fed.Cir.2011)	35
<i>Butamax Advanced Biofuels LLC v. Gevo, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00581, Paper 8 (PTAB Oct. 14, 2014)	17, 25
<i>Cisco v. C-Cation Technologies</i> , IPR2014-00454, Paper 12 (PTAB Aug. 29, 2014)	28
<i>Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007)	48
<i>Conopco, Inc. dba Unilever v. Procter & Gamble Company</i> , IPR2014-00628, Paper 23 (PTAB Mar. 20, 2015)	18, 19, 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

...

CustomPlay, LLC v. ClearPlay, Inc.,
IPR2014-00783, Paper 9 (PTAB Nov. 7, 2014).....25

eBay Inc. v. MoneyCat Ltd.,
CBM2015-00008, Paper 9 (PTAB May 1, 2015).....25

Ex parte Clapp, 227 U.S.P.Q. 972, 973 (BPAI 1985)44

Ex parte Gunasekar, et al.,
Appeal 2009-008345, 2011 WL 3872007 (BPAI Aug. 29, 2011)43, 44, 49

Fidelity National v. DataTreasury,
IPR2014-00491, Paper 9 (PTAB Aug. 13, 2014).....28

Fuji Photo Film Co. v. Int'l Trade Comm'n,
386 F.3d 1095 (Fed. Cir. 2004) 11

Graham v. John Deere Co.,
383 U.S. 1 (1966).....34, 35

In re Kahn,
441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006)48

KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.,
550 U.S. 398 (2007).....34

MaxLinear, Inc. v. Cresta Technology Corp.,
IPR2015-00591, Paper 9 (PTAB Jun. 15, 2015)23

Micro Motion, Inc. v. Invensys Systems, Inc.,
IPR2014-0393, Paper 16 (PTAB Aug. 4, 2014).....28

Microsoft Corp. v. Proxyconn, Inc.,
No. 2014-1542, 2015 WL 3747257 (Fed. Cir. Jun. 16, 2015)7, 11, 13

In re NTP, Inc.,
654 F.3d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2011)7, 11

In re Oelrich,
666 F.2d 578 (CCPA 1981).....35

Samsung Elecs. Co. v. Rembrandt Wireless Technologies, LP,
IPR2015-00555, Paper 20 (PTAB Jun. 19, 2015)18, 25

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.