UNITED STATES PA	TENT AND TRA	DEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE PATE	ENT TRIAL AND	APPEAL BOARD

THE BOEING COMPANY Petitioner,

v.

SEYMOUR LEVINE Patent Owner

\_\_\_\_\_

Case IPR2015-01341

Patent RE039,618

\_\_\_\_\_

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE TO PETITION PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.120



### **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

				<u>Page</u>
I.	INTF	RODU	CTION	1
	A.	Proce	edural Background	1
	B.	Sumr	mary of Argument	2
II.	THE	'618 F	PATENT AND RELATED TECHNOLOGY	5
III.			ons of the Challenged Claims Are Entitled to Patentable	6
	A.		Claim Limitation is Comprised Of Functional Descriptive rial and Should Therefore Be Afforded Patentable Weight	6
	B.		of the Limitations of the Challenged Claims Are Directed ended Uses of Prior Art Systems	11
IV.			ER HAS NOT ESTABLISHED THAT THE GED CLAIMS ARE UNPATENTABLE	13
	A.		oner Has Not Established that Dependent Claim 8, 9 and e Unpatentable	13
		1.	Grounds 1-3: Patent Owner Can Swear Behind Monroe Without Which Petitioner Cannot Demonstrate that Claims 8-10 are Obvious in Grounds 1-3	13
		2.	Ground 4: The Combination of ARINC 702-6 With the References of Ground 1 Do Not Render Obvious Claims 8, 9 and 10	21
		3.	Ground 5: The Combination of Farmakis and the References of Ground 1 Do Not Render Obvious Claims 8, 9 and 10	24
	В.	Cited	Petition Cites No Evidence that Any of the References for any Ground Disclose or Suggest a Transmitter that is able" or "positionable"	26
		1.	None of the References Cited for Ground 1 Disclose or Suggest a Transmitter that is "Portable" or "Positionable".	28
		2.	None of the References Cited for Ground 2 Disclose or Suggest a transmitter that is "portable" or "positionable"	29



### Case IPR 2015-01341 Patent Owner Response

		3.	None of the References Cited for Ground 3 Disclose or Suggest a transmitter that is "portable" or "positionable"	29
	C.		References of Ground 2 Do Not Disclose or Render tous the Generation of "Maintenance Advice"	30
		1.	Construction of the Term "Maintenance Advice" (Claims 4 and 14)	30
		2.	As Properly Construed, "Maintenance Advice" is not Disclosed or Suggested by the References of Ground 2	34
V.	CON	ICLUS	SION	36



#### **TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page</b>
Cases	
Bey v. Kollonitsch, 806 F.2d 1024 (Fed. Cir. 1986)	18, 19
Bicon, Inc. v. Straumann Co., 441 F.3d 945 (Fed.Cir. 2006)	26
Brown v. Barbacid, 276 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	14
Cont'l Can Co. USA v. Monsanto Co., 948 F.2d 1264 (Fed. Cir. 1991)	11
Cooper v. Goldfarb, 154 F.3d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	14, 15, 17
Crown Operations Int'l, Ltd. v. Solutia Inc., 289 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	11, 12
In re Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC, 793 F.3d 1268 (Fed. Cir. 2015), cert granted, 84 U.S.L.W. 3562 (U.S. Jan. 15, 2016	30
Ericsson v. Intellectual Ventures IPR2014-00919, December 7, 2015	33
In re Gulack, 703 F.2d 1381 (Fed. Cir. 1983)	7, 8, 11
KSR International, Co. v. Teleflex, Inc., 550 U.S. 398 (2007)	23, 24, 25
King Pharms., Inc. v. Eon Labs, Inc., 616 F.3d 1267 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	11
Loral Fairchild Corp. v. Matsushita Elec., 266 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	14
<i>In re Lowry</i> , 32 F.3d 1579 (Fed. Cir. 1994)	7, 8
<i>Mahurkar v. C.R. Bard, Inc.</i> , 79 F.3d 1572 (Fed. Cir. 1996)	14, 15
Microsoft Corp. v. Proxyconn, Inc.,	30.33



<i>In re Mulder</i> 716 F.2d 1542 (Fed. Cir. 1983)19
Ex Parte Nehl, 88 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1883, 2008 WL 258370 (BPAI 2008)7
Phillips v. AWH Corp., 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)
<i>Price v. Symsek</i> , 988 F.2d 1187 (Fed.Cir. 1993)
Rieser v. Williams, 255 F.2d 419 (CCPA 1958)20, 21
Taurus IP, LLC v. DaimlerChrysler Corp., 726 F.3d 1306 (Fed. Cir. 2013)14
Townsend v. Smith, 36 F.2d 292 (C.C.P.A. 1929)15
In re Translogic Tech., Inc., 504 F.3d 1249 (Fed. Cir. 2007)
Ex Parte United States of America Patent Owner, Appellant, 2015 WL 2354023, Appeal 2014-09367 (PTAB May 13, 2015)19, 20
In re Wilson, 57 C.C.P.A. 1029, 424 F.2d 1382 (C.C.P.A.1970)26, 27
<u>Statutes</u>
35 U.S.C. § 102(e)(2)14, 21
35 U.S.C. § 102(g)
35 U.S.C. § 3111
35 U.S.C. § 3371
37 C.F.R. 1.131(b)
37 C.F.R. § 42.1001
37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b)
37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(4)25
37 C.F.R. § 42.1071
37 C.F.R. § 42.1201
M.P.E.P. § 2111.05



# DOCKET A L A R M

# 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.

