

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

**VALMONT INDUSTRIES, INC.'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO:
LINDSAY CORPORATION'S *INTER PARTES* REVIEW PETITION**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION1

II. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION1

 A. Petitioner fails to construe the proper scope of essential means-plus-function limitations in Claims 1-18 and the prior art cannot be applied to the claims.1

 B. Petitioner impermissibly reads “directly” out of “directly control”5

 C. Petitioner’s proposed construction of “hand-held display” fails as a matter of law.....6

III. Ground 1: Petitioner has not shown a reasonable likelihood that Claims 1, 6-14 and 16-18 are anticipated by Scott.....10

 A. Claims 1, 6-14 and 16-18: Scott does not disclose a “hand-held display,” a “hand held remote user interface” or a “handheld RUI comprising a display”10

 B. Claims 1, 6-14 and 18: Scott does not disclose “software operable on said processor for [performing three specified tasks]” ...11

 C. Claims 1, 6-14 and 16-18: Scott has not been shown to disclose a “wireless telemetry means...”16

 D. Claims 16 and 17: Scott does not disclose direct control of the operation of the irrigation equipment.17

IV. Ground 2: Petitioner has not shown a reasonable likelihood that Claims 1-3, 6-14, and 16-18 are obvious

over Scott in view of Pyotsia and AIMS Telemetry Network.....19

A. Claims 1-3, 6-14 and 18: Scott and Pyotsia do not disclose “software operable on said processor for [performing three specified tasks]”19

B. Claims 1-2 and 10-13: Petitioner has not established that AIMS Telemetry Network is a Prior Art Publication22

C. Claims 1-3, 6-14 and 16-18: Petitioner has not provided evidence establishing a motivation to combine Scott, Pyotsia and AIMS Telemetry Network.....26

D. Claims 16 and 17: Scott does not disclose direct control of the operation of the irrigation equipment.31

V. Ground 3 – Claim 3: Petitioner has not shown a reasonable likelihood that Claim 3 is obvious over Scott in view of Pyotsia and Walker34

VI. Ground 4: Petitioner has not shown a reasonable likelihood that 4, 5, 11, and 15 are obvious over Scott in view of Pyotsia and Abts35

A. Claims 4, 5, 11 and 15: Petitioner has not provided evidence establishing a motivation to combine Scott, Pyotsia and Abts.35

B. Claims 4, 5, 11 and 15: Petitioner’s reliance on its Ground 1 arguments to provide support for the Claim 1 limitations is fatal.38

VII. CONCLUSION.....39

EXHIBIT LIST

Exhibit	Description
VALMONT 2001	<i>eBay Enterprise, Inc. and eBay, Inc. v. Lockwood</i> , No. CBM2014-00026 (PTAB 2014), Institution Decision
VALMONT 2002	<i>Kinetic Technologies, Inc. v. Skyworks, Solutions, Inc.</i> , No. IPR2014-00529 (PTAB 2014), Decision Denying Institution of <i>Inter Partes</i> Review
VALMONT 2003	<i>LG Display Co., Ltd. v. Acacia Research Corp.</i> , No. IPR2014-01094 (PTAB 2014), Decision Denying Institution of <i>Inter Partes</i> Review
VALMONT 2004	Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, Tenth Addition (2001) (excerpts)
VALMONT 2005	Random House Webster's Unabridged Dictionary, Second Edition (2001) (excerpts)

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>In re Arkley</i> , 455 F.2d 586 (Fed. Cir. 1972)	14
<i>Cisco Sys., Inc. v. C-Cation Techs., LLC</i> , No. IPR2014-00454, 2014 WL 4352301 (PTAB Aug. 29, 2014).....	3
<i>Default Proof Credit Card System, Inc. v. Home Depot U.S.A., Inc.</i> <i>(d/b/a The Home Depot)</i> , 412 F.3d 1291 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	2
<i>EBay Enterprise, Inc. and EBay, Inc. v. Lockwood</i> , No. CBM2014-00026, Institution Decision	3
<i>Elec. Frontier Foundation, v. Personal Audio, LLC</i> , No. IPR2014-00070, 2014 WL 1604334 (PTAB Apr. 18, 2014)	24
<i>Exxon Chem. Patents v. Lubrizol Corp.</i> , 64 F.3d 1553 (Fed. Cir. 1995)	6
<i>Fujitsu Ltd. v. Netgear Inc.</i> , 620 F.3d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	6
<i>Genzyme Corp. v. Transkaryotic Therapies, Inc.</i> , 346 F.3d 1094 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	7
<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	28
<i>Karsten Mfg. Corp. v. Cleveland Golf Co.</i> , 242 F.3d 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	9
<i>Kinetic Technologies, Inc. v. Skyworks Solutions, Inc.</i> , No. IPR2014-00529 (PTAB 2014).....	29

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.