

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 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	iv
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 OBVIOUS OVER HITOMI IN VIEW OF ONISHI	21
A. Summary Of Hitomi.....	21
B. Summary Of Onishi	24
C. Hitomi And Onishi Do Not Render Obvious The Challenged Claims.....	25
1. Hitomi And Onishi Do Not Disclose “While Said Ignition Is So Retarded, Increasing The Fuelling Rate Of Said At Least One Cylinder”	26
2. Petitioner’s Reliance On Eichler ‘089 And Takada Does Not Cure The Deficiencies Of Hitomi And Onishi	29
V. THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE NOT OBVIOUS BY GRIESE IN VIEW OF EICHLER ‘791 AND ONISHI.....	30
A. Summary Of Griese.....	30
B. Summary Of Eichler ‘791	33
C. Griese, Eichler ‘791, And Onishi Do Not Render Obvious The Challenged Claims	35

1.	Griese, Eichler '791, And Onishi Do Not Disclose “While Said Ignition Is So Retarded, Increasing The Fuelling Rate Of Said At Least One Cylinder”	36
2.	Petitioner’s Reliance On Takada Does Not Cure The Deficiencies Of Griese, Eichler '791, And Onishi	39
VI.	THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE NOT OBVIOUS BY AHERN IN VIEW OF BERNHARDT	39
A.	Summary Of Ahern	40
B.	Summary Of Bernhardt	43
C.	Ahern And Bernhardt Do Not Render Obvious The Challenged Claims.....	46
1.	Ahern And Bernhardt Do Not Disclose “While Said Ignition Is So Retarded, Increasing The Fuelling Rate Of Said At Least One Cylinder”	47
2.	Petition Fails To Establish Bernhardt As Prior Art	49
3.	Petitioner’s Reliance On Griese Does Not Cure The Deficiencies Of Ahern And Bernhardt	52
VII.	CONCLUSION.....	52

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)	25
<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)	50
<i>In re Cronyn</i> , 890 F.2d 1158 (Fed. Cir. 1989)	50
<i>Dell et al. v. Selene Commc’n</i> , IPR2014-01411, Paper 23 (PTAB, Feb. 26, 2015)	50
<i>EMC Corp. v. Personalweb Techs., LLC</i> , IPR2013-00084, Paper 64 (PTAB, May 15, 2014)	51
<i>Endo Pharmaceuticals v. Depomed</i> , IPR2014-00652, Paper 12 (PTAB, Sep. 29, 2014)	25, 26
<i>In re Hall</i> , 781 F.2d 897 (Fed. Cir. 1986)	51
<i>Interactive Gift Express, Inc. v. Compuserve Inc.</i> , 256 F.3d 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	14
<i>In re Klopfenstein</i> , 380 F.3d 1345 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	50
<i>KSR Int’l Co v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007)	26
<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)	50
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Proxyconn, Inc.</i> , IPR2012-00026, Paper 17 (PTAB, Dec. 21, 2012)	26
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (<i>en banc</i>)	9, 10

Pitney Bowes, Inc. v. Hewlett-Packard Co., 182 F.3d 1298 (Fed. Cir.1999)..... 13

In re Rambus, Inc., 694 F.3d 42 (Fed. Cir. 2012)..... 8

In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981 (CCPA 1974) 25

Samsung Elecs. Co. v. Rembrandt Wireless Techs., IPR2014-00514,
Paper 18 (PTAB, Sept. 9, 2014) 51

Square, Inc. v. Unwired Planet, LLC, CBM2014-00156, Paper 11
(PTAB, Dec. 24, 2014) 50

Vivid Techs., Inc. v. Am. Sci. & Eng’g, Inc., 200 F.3d 795 (Fed. Cir. 1999) 20

STATUTES

35 U.S.C. § 102(b) 52

35 U.S.C. § 311(b) 49, 52

35 U.S.C. § 313 1

35 U.S.C. § 314 25, 36, 47, 50

OTHER AUTHORITIES

37 C.F.R. § 42.107 1

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.