

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. IPR2015-01259
U.S. Patent 5,655,365

PATENT OWNER'S REQUEST FOR REHEARING

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	ii
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. LEGAL STANDARDS	2
III. ARGUMENT	2
A. Patent Owner Did Not Argue That “The Fuelling Rate” Refers To A Quantity Per Unit-Time Or That “Increasing The Fuelling Rate” Refers To Changing The Quantity Per-Unit Time Within A Given Cycle	3
B. The Step Of “While So Retarded, Increasing The Fuelling Rate . . .” Refers To Crankangle Timing.....	7
C. The Decision Overlooks Patent Owner’s Arguments Regarding Petitioner’s Previous Statements To The USPTO	12
D. Instituted Grounds Should Be Denied In View Of The Proper Claim Construction	14
IV. CONCLUSION.....	15

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
<i>ACTV, Inc. v. Walt Disney Co.</i> , 346 F.3d 1082 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	8
<i>In re Gartside</i> , 203 F.3d 1305 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	2
<i>Interactive Gift Express, Inc. v. Compuserve Inc.</i> , 256 F.3d 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	11
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (<i>en banc</i>).....	1, 8
<i>Pitney Bowes, Inc. v. Hewlett-Packard Co.</i> , 182 F.3d 1298 (Fed. Cir. 1999).....	11
STATUTES	
35 U.S.C. § 312(a)	2
OTHER AUTHORITIES	
37 C.F.R. § 42.71(c).....	2
37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d)	1, 2
37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(3).....	10

PATENT OWNER'S REQUEST FOR REHEARING

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d), Orbital Australia Pty Ltd f/k/a/ Orbital Engine Company (Australia) Pty. Ltd. ("Patent Owner") hereby submits this Request for Rehearing in response to the Decision, Institution of *Inter Partes* Review dated December 30, 2015 (Paper No. 9, "Decision").

I. INTRODUCTION

In the Decision, the Board grants review of claims 1, 2, 5, 9, 10, 12-14, and 18 of U.S. Patent No. 5,655,365 (the '365 Patent) on various grounds following the Decision's construction of independent claim 1's recitation of "while said ignition is so retarded, increasing the fuelling rate of said at least one cylinder to a level higher than that required when the engine is operating normally." See Paper 9 at 7-10. The Decision construes this phrase to mean "increasing the quantity of fuel delivered to a cylinder, while the cylinder is in an ignition-retarded condition, to a level higher than the quantity of fuel that would be delivered in a normal operating condition." *Id.* at 10.

In construing this phrase under the standard set forth in *Phillips v. AWH Corp.*, 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (*en banc*), the Board misapprehends and overlooks Patent Owner's arguments regarding the meaning of critical terms, overlooks the challenged claims' plain language, and places undue emphasis on the specification of the '365 Patent in a manner inconsistent with the plain language.

The Decision's improper claim construction results in an erroneous decision with respect to the grounds for which trial was instituted. Patent Owner respectfully requests that the Board reconsider its decision with regard to claim construction, as well as deny the Petition with respect to all instituted grounds.

II. LEGAL STANDARDS

Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d), “[a] party dissatisfied with a decision may file a single request for rehearing without prior authorization from the Board.” “The request must specifically identify all matters the party believes the Board misapprehended or overlooked, and the place where each matter was previously addressed.” *Id.* “When rehearing a decision on petition, a panel will review the decision for an abuse of discretion.” 37 C.F.R. § 42.71(c). “An abuse of discretion occurs where the decision is based on an erroneous interpretation of the law, on factual findings that are not supported by substantial evidence, or represents an unreasonable judgment in weighing relevant factors.” *In re Gartside*, 203 F.3d 1305, 1315-16 (Fed. Cir. 2000).

III. ARGUMENT

Patent Owner respectfully submits that the Decision misapprehends and overlooks Patent Owner's arguments regarding the meaning of critical terms of the challenged claims, and additionally applies an erroneous legal standard in overlooking the challenged claims' plain language, while placing undue emphasis

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.