

By: David Magee
Pepper Hamilton LLP
125 High Street
19th Floor, High Street Tower
Boston, MA 02110
(617) 204-5100 (telephone)
(617) 204-5150 (facsimile)

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ROBERT BOSCH LLC and DAIMLER AG,
Petitioners,

v.

ORBITAL AUSTRALIA PTY LTD,
Patent Owner

Case No. IPR2015-01258
U.S. Patent 5,655,365

**PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO PETITION
PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.107**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iii
TABLE OF EXHIBITS	v
I. INTRODUCTION	1
A. Grounds in Petition.....	1
II. THE ‘365 PATENT	3
A. Overview	3
III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION AND ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	8
A. Person Having Ordinary Skill In The Art	9
B. Claim Construction	9
1. “the timing of introduction of fuel into the at least one cylinder being maintained at before top dead centre (BTDC)”	10
2. “up to about 30° ATDC” (claim 5).....	18
3. “fuel is introduced at between 60° to 80° BTDC” (claim 9)	20
IV. THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE NOT ANTICIPATED OR RENDERED OBVIOUS BY BERNHARDT	21
A. Summary Of Bernhardt	21
B. Bernhardt Does Not Disclose “While Said Ignition Is So Retarded, Increasing The Fuelling Rate Of Said At Least One Cylinder”	26
C. The Petition Fails To Establish Bernhardt As Prior Art	29
D. Petitioner’s Reliance On Onishi And Griese Does Not Cure The Deficiencies Of Bernhardt.....	32
V. THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE NOT OBVIOUS OVER EICHLER ‘791 IN VIEW OF BERNHARDT	33
A. Summary Of Eichler ‘791	33
B. Eichler ‘791 And Bernhardt Do Not Disclose “While Said Ignition Is So Retarded, Increasing The Fuelling Rate Of Said At Least One Cylinder”	36
C. Petitioner’s Reliance On Onishi Does Not Cure The Deficiencies Of Eichler ‘791 And Bernhardt.....	39

VI.	THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE NOT ANTICIPATED OR RENDERED OBVIOUS BY ONISHI	40
A.	Summary Of Onishi	40
B.	Onishi Does Not Disclose “While Said Ignition Is So Retarded, Increasing The Fuelling Rate Of Said At Least One Cylinder”	41
C.	Petitioner’s Reliance On Griese, Eichler ‘791, And Bernhardt Does Not Cure The Deficiencies Of Onishi.....	43
VII.	CONCLUSION.....	43

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
<i>Apple Inc., v. ZiiLabs, Ltd.</i> , IPR2015-00963, Paper 8 (PTAB, Oct. 1, 2015)	20
<i>CFMT, Inc. v. Yieldup Int’l Corp.</i> , 349 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	36
<i>Cisco Systems, Inc. v. AIP Acquisition, LLC</i> , IPR2014-00247, Paper 20 (PTAB, July 10, 2014)	9
<i>Cisco Systems, Inc. v. Constellation Techs.</i> , IPR2014-01085, Paper 11 (PTAB, Jan. 9, 2015)	30
<i>In re Cronyn</i> , 890 F.2d 1158 (Fed. Cir. 1989)	30
<i>Dell et al. v. Selene Commc’n</i> , IPR2014-01411, Paper 23 (PTAB, Feb. 26, 2015)	30
<i>EMC Corp. v. Personalweb Techs., LLC</i> , IPR2013-00084, Paper 64 (PTAB, May 15, 2014)	31
<i>Endo Pharmaceuticals v. Depomed</i> , IPR2014-00652, Paper 12 (PTAB, Sep. 29, 2014)	36
<i>In re Hall</i> , 781 F.2d 897 (Fed. Cir. 1986)	31
<i>Interactive Gift Express, Inc. v. Compuserve Inc.</i> , 256 F.3d 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	14
<i>Karsten Mfg. Corp. v. Cleveland Golf Co.</i> , 242 F.3d 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	26
<i>In re Klopfenstein</i> , 380 F.3d 1345 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	30
<i>KSR Int’l Co v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007)	37
<i>Liebel-Flarsheim Co. v. Medrad, Inc.</i> , 358 F.3d 898 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	19
<i>In re Lister</i> , 583 F.3d 1307 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	30
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Proxyconn, Inc.</i> , IPR2012-00026, Paper 17 (PTAB, Dec. 21, 2012)	37

<i>NetMoneyIn, Inc. v. Verisign, Inc.</i> , 545 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	26
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (<i>en banc</i>)	8, 18
<i>Pitney Bowes, Inc. v. Hewlett-Packard Co.</i> , 182 F.3d 1298 (Fed. Cir.1999)	14
<i>In re Rambus, Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 42 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	8
<i>Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.</i> , 868 F.2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1989)	26
<i>In re Royka</i> , 490 F.2d 981 (CCPA 1974)	36
<i>Samsung Elecs. Co. v. Rembrandt Wireless Techs.</i> , IPR2014-00514, Paper 18 (PTAB, Sept. 9, 2014)	31
<i>Scripps Clinic & Research Found. v. Genentech, Inc.</i> , 927 F.2d 1565 (Fed. Cir. 1991)	26
<i>Square, Inc. v. Unwired Planet, LLC</i> , CBM2014-00156, Paper 11 (PTAB, Dec. 24, 2014)	30
<i>Vivid Techs., Inc. v. Am. Sci. & Eng'g, Inc.</i> , 200 F.3d 795 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	20
<i>ZTE v. ContentGuard</i> , IPR2013-00134, Paper 12 (PTAB, June 19, 2013)	26
STATUTES	
35 U.S.C. § 102(b)	32
35 U.S.C. § 311(b)	29, 32
35 U.S.C. § 313	1
35 U.S.C. § 314	26, 29, 36
OTHER AUTHORITIES	
37 C.F.R. § 42.107	1
M.P.E.P. § 2131	26
M.P.E.P. § 2701	3

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.