

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

THE BOEING COMPANY
Petitioner

v.

SEYMOUR LEVINE
Patent Owner

Case No. IPR [Unassigned]
U.S. Patent No. RE39,618

**Petition for *Inter Partes* Review
of U.S. Patent No. RE39,618
Under 35 U.S.C. § 311**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction and Statement of Relief Requested (37 C.F.R. § 42.22(a)).....	1
II.	Mandatory Notices (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(a)(1)).....	1
	A. Real Party-In-Interest - 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1).....	1
	B. Related Matters - 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2).....	1
	C. Lead and Back-up Counsel - 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3).....	2
	D. Service Information - 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4).....	2
III.	Standing (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a)).....	2
IV.	Background.....	3
	A. Overview of the '618 patent and the claims for review.....	3
	B. State of the art prior to the December 1996 filing date.....	5
	1. Flight data recorders and regulatory context.....	5
	2. AIDS/ACMS systems.....	5
	3. Central maintenance computers.....	6
V.	Claim Construction.....	7
	A. The broadest reasonable interpretation of “digital aircraft performance data” is digital information about aircraft operation, identity, or configuration.....	7
	B. The broadest reasonable interpretation of “performance and control parameters” is variable aircraft operational measurements that make up the “digital aircraft performance data”.....	9
	C. The broadest reasonable interpretation of “maintenance advice” is problem-specific maintenance information, such as trends, alerts, or isolation of faults.....	10

D.	The broadest reasonable interpretation of “configuration label” is an indicator identifying or describing equipment onboard an aircraft.....	12
VI.	Limitations Lacking Patentable Weight	16
A.	Limitations concerning transmission of non-functional information lack patentable weight	16
B.	Numerous limitations are intended uses of prior art systems that are inherently disclosed.....	19
1.	Limitations identifying categories of data	20
2.	Generating maintenance advice “while said aircraft is in flight”	21
3.	A storage system “for archiving”	22
VII.	Each of the References Cited Is Available Prior Art.....	22
VIII.	Identification of the Challenge	24
A.	Ground 1: Ward renders claims 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 14, and 16 obvious in view of ARINC 624-1 and Monroe.....	26
1.	Obviousness of claims 4, 5, 14, and 16 over Ward in view of ARINC 624-1.....	26
2.	Obviousness of claims 8, 9, and 10 in further view of Monroe	31
3.	Location of each claim limitation	32
B.	Ground 2: Dyson renders claims 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 14, and 16 obvious in view of Chetail and Monroe.....	38
1.	Obviousness of claims 4, 5, 14, and 16 over Dyson in view of Chetail.....	39
2.	Obviousness of claims 8, 9, and 10 in further view of Monroe	41
3.	Location of each claim limitation	41

C.	Ground 3: Dowling renders claims 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 14, and 16 obvious in view of ARINC 624-1 and Monroe.....	47
1.	Obviousness of claims 4, 5, 14, and 16 over Dowling and ARINC 624-1	47
2.	Obviousness of claims 8, 9, and 10 in further view of Monroe	49
3.	Location of each claim limitation	49
D.	Ground 4: Ward renders claims 8, 9, and 10 obvious in view of ARINC 624-1, ARINC 702-6, and FAA, <i>Increased FDR Parameters</i>	55
1.	Claim 8: aircraft performance data includes position data directed to flight data recorder	56
2.	Claim 9: GPS used in calculation of position	57
3.	Claim 10: inertial navigation used in calculation of position.....	57
4.	Motivation to combine	57
E.	Ground 5: Ward renders claims 8, 9, and 10 obvious in view of ARINC 624-1, FAA, <i>Increased FDR Parameters</i> , and Farmakis.....	58
1.	Claim 8: aircraft performance data includes position data directed to flight data recorder	59
2.	Claim 9: GPS used in calculation of position	59
3.	Claim 10: inertial navigation used in calculation of position.....	59
4.	Motivation to combine	59
IX.	Conclusion	60
	Certificate of Service	62
	APPENDIX A Exhibit List.....	63

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

<i>Ex parte Nehls</i> , 88 U.S.P.Q.2d 1883, 2008 WL 258370 (BPAI 2008).....	18, 19
<i>Finjan, Inc. v. Secure Computing Corp.</i> , 626 F.3d 1197 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	21
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1996).....	27
<i>In re Kao</i> , 639 F.3d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	20
<i>In re Schreiber</i> , 128 F.3d 1473 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	21, 22, 23
<i>King Pharms., Inc. v. Eon Labs, Inc.</i> , 616 F.3d 1267 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	19
<i>KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	27
<i>Levine v. The Boeing Company</i> , No. 14-cv-1991 (W.D. Wash.).....	1
<i>Levine v. The Boeing Company</i> , No. 14-cv-6859 (C.D. Cal.)	1
<i>Ormco Co. v. Align Tech., Inc.</i> , 463 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	62, 64

STATUTES

35 U.S.C. § 102(b)	23, 59
35 U.S.C. § 102(e)	25, 59
35 U.S.C. § 103	5, 26, 27
35 U.S.C. § 103(a)	1
35 U.S.C. § 311	1

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.