

Filed on behalf of  
Lindsay Corporation

IPR2015-01039

By: Scott R. Brown  
Matthew B. Walters  
HOVEY WILLIAMS LLP  
10801 Mastin Blvd., Suite 1000  
Overland Park, Kansas 66210  
Tel: (913) 647-9050  
Fax: (913) 647-9057

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

LINDSAY CORPORATION  
Petitioner

v.

VALMONT INDUSTRIES, INC.  
Patent Owner

---

Case No. IPR2015-01039  
U.S. Patent No. 7,003,357

---

**PETITIONER'S REPLY**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	iv
I. ARGUMENT.....	2
A. VALMONT’S LIMITED CONSTRUCTION OF “HAND-HELD” IS NOT THE BROADEST REASONABLE INTERPRETATION AND IGNORES FEDERAL CIRCUIT PRECEDENT. ....	2
B. VALMONT ADMITS THE PRESENCE OF EACH ELEMENT OF INDEPENDENT CLAIMS 1, 17, AND 18 IN THE ASSERTED PRIOR ART. ....	4
C. VALMONT’S EXPERT ADMITTED ALL HARDWARE AND SOFTWARE NECESSARY TO PRACTICE THE CLAIMED INVENTION WAS BACKGROUND INFORMATION TO ONE OF ORDINARY SKILL.....	8
D. VALMONT MISAPPLIES THE LAW OF OBVIOUSNESS AND IGNORES <i>KSR</i> ’S FLEXIBLE STANDARD TO ARGUE THAT ONE OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART WOULD NOT BODILY COMBINE SCOTT, PYOTSIA, AND AIMS TO ARRIVE AT THE CLAIMED INVENTION.....	9
E. THE RECORD EVIDENCE TEACHES ONE OF ORDINARY SKILL HOW TO ARRIVE AT THE CLAIMED INVENTION WITH THE TEACHINGS OF THE PRIOR ART.....	11
F. DR. ROSENBERG DID NOT OPINE ONE WOULD BODILY COMBINE SCOTT WITH PYOTSIA.....	14
G. THE MONITORING AND CONTROL OF SCOTT COULD BE CARRIED OUT ON A PDA.....	17
H. DEPENDENT CLAIM 3’S DIGITAL TELEPHONE LIMITATION IS OBVIOUS.....	21

I. DEPENDENT CLAIM 6’S SOFTWARE OPERATIVE ON SAID  
PROCESSOR LIMITATION IS OBVIOUS. ....22

J. DEPENDENT CLAIM 11 IS OBVIOUS.....23

K. INDEPENDENT CLAIM 17 IS OBVIOUS. ....24

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE .....26

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Cases**

*Belden Inc. v. Berk-Tek LLC*  
805 F.3d 1064 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....12

*In re Etter*  
756 F.2d 852 (Fed. Cir. 1985)..... 9, 10, 17

*In re Icon Health and Fitness, Inc.*  
496 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....10

*In re Mouttet*  
686 F.3d 1322 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....10

*In re Sneed*  
710 F.2d 1544 (Fed. Cir. 1983).....10

*KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*  
550 U.S. 398 (2007).....11

*Luminara Worldwide, LLC v. Liown Elecs. Co., Ltd.*  
814 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....4

*Thorner v. Sony Computer Ent. Am. LLC*  
669 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....4

*Wyers v. Master Lock Co.*  
616 F.3d 1231 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....12

This review presents an inordinately simple case of obviousness.

Valmont's independent claims recite a remote user interface having software on a processor that uses wireless communications to communicate with irrigation equipment. A display shows the status of the irrigation equipment with GUI elements and a user can control the irrigation equipment by interacting with GUI elements on the display. Valmont responds that its non-obvious advancement is providing the claimed structure and functionality in a *hand-held* unit. But it relies on the discredited and irrelevant argument that one could not bodily incorporate the structure of one reference into another, ignoring black letter law criticizing arguments based on the inability to bodily combine prior art references.

The evidence in this matter makes clear that Valmont's claimed invention is obvious because it claims well-known concepts combined in a desired manner to provide portability to achieve routine, expected results. Indeed, Valmont did not invent computer hardware or displays like those found in PDAs, cell phones, laptops, or hand held computers. Valmont did not invent computer processors, wireless communications hardware, or wireless communications protocols. Nor did Valmont invent the software required to operate GUIs on remote controls or the concept of using a computer with a graphical user interface ("GUI") to remotely control irrigation equipment. Indeed, as admitted by Valmont's expert, the

# 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.