

Filed on behalf of Seymour Levine

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

THE BOEING COMPANY  
Petitioner,

v.

SEYMOUR LEVINE  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2015-01341

Patent RE039,618

---

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

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. THE '618 PATENT AND RELATED TECHNOLOGY .....	4
III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	6
A. "Maintenance advice" (claims 4, 14) .....	7
IV. All Limitations of the Challenged Claims Are Entitled to Patentable Weight.....	10
A. Each Claim Limitation is Comprised Of Functional Descriptive Material and Should Therefore Be Afforded Patentable Weight.....	10
B. None of the Limitations of the Challenged Claims Are Directed to Intended Uses of Prior Art Systems .....	15
V. NONE OF THE PROPOSED GROUNDS SHOW A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF PREVAILING WITH RESPECT TO THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS .....	16
A. Ground 1: The Proposed Combination of Ward, ARINC 624-1 and Monroe Does Not Render Obvious the Challenged Claims .....	16
1. The Petition Cites No Evidence that Any of the References Cited for Ground 1 Disclose or Suggest a Transmitter that is "portable" or "positionable" .....	16
2. Patent Owner Will Swear Behind Monroe Without Which Petitioner Cannot Demonstrate that Claims 8-10 are Obvious. ....	19
3. Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated a Motivation to Combine Monroe with the Other References of Ground 1.....	22
B. Ground 2: The Proposed Combination of Dyson, Chetail and Monroe Does Not Render Obvious the Challenged Claims .....	23
1. The References of Ground 2 do Not Disclose or Render Obvious the Generation of "Maintenance Advice" .....	23
2. The Petition Cites No Evidence that Any of the References Cited for Ground 2 Disclose or Suggest a transmitter that is "portable" or "positionable" .....	25

3.	Without Monroe Petitioner Cannot Demonstrate that Claims 8-10 are Obvious. ....	26
4.	Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated a Motivation to Combine Monroe with the Other References of Ground 2.....	27
C.	Ground 3: The Proposed Combination of Dowling, ARINC 624-1 and Monroe Does Not Render Obvious the Challenged Claims.....	28
1.	The Petition Cites No Evidence that Any of the References Cited for Ground 3 Disclose or Suggest a transmitter that is “portable” or “positionable” .....	28
2.	Without Monroe Petitioner Cannot Demonstrate that Claims 8-10 are Obvious. ....	29
3.	Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated a Motivation to Combine Monroe with the Other References of Ground 3.....	29
4.	Dowling Has Not Been Shown to Qualify as Prior Art.....	30
D.	Ground 4: Combination of the FAA Publication and ARINC 702-6 Do Not Render Obvious Claims 8, 9 and 10 .....	31
E.	Ground 5: The Combination of the FAA Publication and Farmakis Do Not Render Obvious Claims 8, 9 and 10.....	32
VI.	CONCLUSION.....	35

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<u>Page</u>
<u>Cases</u>	
<i>Bey v. Kollonitsch</i> , 806 F.2d 1024 (Fed. Cir. 1986) .....	21, 22
<i>Bicon, Inc. v. Straumann Co.</i> , 441 F.3d 945 (Fed.Cir. 2006) .....	17
<i>Brown v. Barbacid</i> , 276 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2002) .....	19
<i>Cont'l Can Co. USA v. Monsanto Co.</i> , 948 F.2d 1264 (Fed. Cir. 1991) .....	15
<i>Cooper v. Goldfarb</i> , 154 F.3d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 1998) .....	19
<i>In re Cronyn</i> , 890 F.2d 1158 (Fed. Cir. 1989) .....	2, 30
<i>Crown Operations Int'l, Ltd. v. Solutia Inc.</i> , 289 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2002) .....	15
<i>In re Gulack</i> , 703 F.2d 1381 (Fed. Cir. 1983) .....	10, 11, 14
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	23, 27, 30, 33
<i>King Pharms., Inc. v. Eon Labs, Inc.</i> , 616 F.3d 1267 (Fed. Cir. 2010) .....	14
<i>Loral Fairchild Corp. v. Matsushita Elec.</i> , 266 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2001) .....	19
<i>In re Lowry</i> , 32 F.3d 1579 (Fed. Cir. 1994) .....	11
<i>Mahurkar v. C.R. Bard, Inc.</i> , 79 F.3d 1572 (Fed. Cir. 1996) .....	19-20
<i>Microsoft Corporation v. Proxyconn, Inc.</i> , 789 F.3d 1292 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....	6
<i>Ex Parte Nehl</i> , 88 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1883, 2008 WL 258370 (BPAI 2008).....	10
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) ( <i>en banc</i> ).....	6, 8

*In re Suitco Surface, Inc.*,  
603 F.3d 1255 (Fed. Cir. 2010) .....6

*Synopsys, Inc. v. Mentor Graphics Corp.*,  
IPR2012-00041 (PTAB Feb. 22, 2013).....6

*Ex Parte United States of America Patent Owner, Appellant*,  
2015 WL 2354023, Appeal 2014-009367 (PTAB May 13, 2015).....21, 22

*In re Wilson*,  
57 C.C.P.A. 1029, 424 F.2d 1382 (C.C.P.A.1970) .....17

**Rules/Statutes**

35 U.S.C. § 102(b) .....2, 30

35 U.S.C. § 102(e)(2).....19, 21, 22

35 U.S.C. § 103 .....11, 14

35 U.S.C. § 314(a) .....4

37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b) .....6

37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(4).....17, 18, 26, 28, 29

**Other Authorities**

3 Annotated Patent Digest (Matthews) § 17:71.....15

The Manuel of Patent Examining Procedure § 2111.05.....10

# 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.