

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

COSTCO WHOLESALE CORPORATION,
Petitioner,

v.

ROBERT BOSCH LLC,
Patent Owner.

CASE NO. IPR2016-00034
U.S. Patent No. 6,973,698

PATENT OWNER RESPONSE

Mail Stop "PATENT BOARD"
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent & Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. Introduction.....	1
II. Level of ordinary skill in the art.....	1
III. The combination of Arai and Appel '770 does not render obvious claim 1	2
A. The combination does not teach or suggest: “said contact force of said wiper strip being greater in said center section than in at least one of said two end sections”	3
1. Petitioner does not allege that Appel '770 teaches or suggests that the contact force is greater in the center section than in an end section	4
2. Arai does not teach or suggest that the contact force is greater in the center section than in an end section	5
B. The Institution Decision mistakenly cites to Appel '551 (which is not part of this ground) instead of Arai and Appel '770.....	10
C. The combination does not teach or suggest: “a concave curvature in said center sections of the carrying element is sharper than in said sections thereof”.....	16
D. A POSITA would not have been motivated to combine Arai and Appel '770, let alone to arrive at challenged claim 1	17
E. Arai and Appel '770 failed to recognize the problem solved by the '698 patent, and in fact, taught as a <i>solution</i> the '698 patent's identified <i>problem</i>	19
F. The objective indicia of non-obviousness.....	20
IV. Swanepoel does not anticipate claim 1	28
A. Swanepoel discloses—opposite to the challenged claim—that the contact force is less in the center section than in an end section	29

B. Swanepoel’s “at the tips” disclosure does not teach that the contact force is greater in the center section than in an end section ...31

1. The very “tip” of a wiper is not the end section33

2. The disclosure of a decrease in loading at some point near the tip of the wiper does not provide any evidence of whether or not (or where) the decreasing contact force ever passes below the contact force in the center section.....34

3. A force per unit length of zero along the length of the Swanepoel wiper takes the wiper outside the scope of the claim at issue, which requires a “spring-elastic carrying element extending parallel to an axis of elongation of said wiper strip to distribute a contact force against the window *over an entire length of said wiper strip*”35

4. Petitioner’s inherency argument fails35

V. Dr. Davis lacks credibility37

VI. Conclusion41

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page
Cases	
<i>ActiveVideo v. Verizon Communications, Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	17
<i>Advanced Display Sys., Inc. v. Kent State Univ.</i> , 212 F.3d 1272 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	14
<i>Alco Standard Corp. v. Tenn. Valley Auth.</i> , 808 F.2d 1490 (Fed. Cir. 1986)	25
<i>Cardiac Pacemakers, Inc. v. St. Judge Med., Inc.</i> , 381 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	19
<i>Continental Can USA, Inc. v. Monsanto Co.</i> , 948 F.2d 1264 (Fed. Cir. 1991)	36
<i>In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Patent Litigation</i> , 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	25
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co. of Kan. City</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	2, 21
<i>Hockerson-Halberstadt, Inc. v. Avia Group Int’l, Inc.</i> , 222 F.3d 951 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	8
<i>InTouch Techs., Inc. v. VGo Comm’ns, Inc.</i> , 751 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	18
<i>Leo Pharm. Prods., Ltd. v. Rea</i> , 726 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Metabolite Labs., Inc. v. Laboratory Corp. of Am. Holdings</i> , 370 F.3d 1354 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	27
<i>Net MoneyIN, Inc. v. VeriSign, Inc.</i> , 545 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	29
<i>Okajima v. Bourdeau</i> , 261 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	2
<i>In re Piasecki</i> , 745 F.2d 1468 (Fed. Cir. 1984)	25

In re Robertson, 169 F.3d 743 (Fed. Cir. 1999)36, 37

Schering Corp. v. Geneva Pharms., Inc., 339 F.3d 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2003)21, 28

Scripp Clinic Research Found. v. Genentech, Inc., 927 F.2d 1565 (Fed. Cir. 1991).....29

In re Sernaker, 702 F.2d 989 (Fed. Cir. 1983)28

Stratoflex, Inc. v. Aeroquip Corp., 713 F.2d 1530 (Fed. Cir. 1983).....21

Transocean Offshore Deepwater Drilling Inc. v. Maersk Drilling USA, Inc., 699 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....21

Truswal Sys. Corp. v. Hydro-Air Eng’g, Inc., 813 F.2d 1207 (Fed. Cir. 1987)21

WBIP, LLC v. Kohler Co., ___ F.3d ___, 2016 WL 3902668 (Fed. Cir. July 19, 2016).....*passim*

In re Wright, 569 F.2d 1124 (CCPA 1977)9

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 102(b) 1

35 U.S.C. § 1031

35 U.S.C. § 112.....40

Other Authorities

37 C.F.R. § 42.51(b)(1)(iii).....40

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.