

Filed: October 24, 2016

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

COSTCO WHOLESALE CORPORATION,
Petitioner,

v.

ROBERT BOSCH LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2016-00034
Patent 6,973,698

**PETITIONER'S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF PETITION
PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.23**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page(s) |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|
| TABLE OF AUTHORITIES | iii |
| CERTIFICATE OF WORD COUNT | 2 |
| I. THE BOARD PROPERLY SET FORTH THE LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART..... | 1 |
| II. ARAI AND APPEL ‘770 RENDER CLAIM 1 UNPATENTABLE | 2 |
| A. Arai Discloses a Wiper Blade Having Contact Force Greater in a Center Section Than in at Least One End Section | 2 |
| B. Appel ‘770 Discloses a Wiper Blade Having a Center Section Curvature That Is Greater Than an End Section Curvature | 4 |
| C. Providing Arai With a Progressive Curvature of Appel ‘770 Was a Design Step Well Within the Grasp of a Person Having Ordinary Skill in the Art..... | 7 |
| III. BOSCH’S EVIDENCE OF PURPORTED SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS ARE INSUFFICIENT TO OVERCOME A FINDING OF OBVIOUSNESS | 11 |
| A. There Is No Nexus Between the ‘698 Patent and Any Purported Commercial Success, and No Success Is Established..... | 11 |
| B. Bosch’s Proffered “Evidence” of Skepticism and Unexpected Results Does Not Undercut Obviousness | 14 |
| C. There Is No Evidence of Failure by Others or Long-Felt Need..... | 15 |
| D. Bosch’s Vague Claims of Industry Praise Are Insufficient | 17 |
| E. Bosch’s Fails to Show Copying by its Competitors | 17 |
| F. Bosch’s Licensing “Evidence” Does Not Support Nonobviousness..... | 18 |

IV. SWANEOPOEL ANTICIPATES THE ‘698 PATENT.....19

 A. Swanepoel Teaches a Contact Force Greater in the Center
 Section than in the End Sections 19

 B. Swanepoel Teaches a Force Distribution “Over an Entire
 Length” 21

 C. Swanepoel Inherently Teaches the Recited Force Distribution 22

V. ATTACKS ON DR. DAVIS’S CREDIBILITY ARE
INSUPPORTABLE IN FACT AND LAW.....23

 A. Prior Consistent Statements of Dr. Davis Support His
 Credibility and Are Consistent with His Deposition Testimony 23

 B. Prior Indefiniteness Opinions In District Court Proceedings Are
 Irrelevant to Dr. Davis’s Current Opinions In This Proceeding 24

VI. CONCLUSION.....24

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE 1

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

| Cases | Page(s) |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| <i>Amgen Inc. v. Hoechst Marion Roussel, Inc.</i> , 314 F.3d 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2003) | 2 |
| <i>In re Antor Media Corp.</i> , 689 F.3d 1282 (Fed. Cir. 2012) | 18 |
| <i>Arlington Indus., Inc. v. Bridgeport Fittings, Inc.</i> , 581 Fed. App'x 859 (Fed. Cir. 2014) | 14, 17 |
| <i>Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp. v. Philip Morris Inc.</i> , 229 F.3d 1120 (Fed. Cir. 2000) | 11 |
| <i>Cardiac Pacemakers, Inc. v. St. Jude Med., Inc.</i> , 381 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2004) | 10 |
| <i>Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee</i> , 136 S. Ct. 2131 (2016)..... | 21, 24 |
| <i>In re GPAC Inc.</i> , 57 F.3d 1573 (Fed. Cir. 1995) | 2, 18 |
| <i>GraftTech Int'l Holdings, Inc. v. Laird Techs. Inc.</i> , No. 2015-1796 No. 2015-1796, 2016 WL 3357427, (Fed. Cir. June 17, 2016)..... | 11 |
| <i>Grobler v. Apple Inc.</i> , No. 12-CV-01534-JST, 2014 WL 1867043 (N.D. Cal. May 6, 2014)..... | 24 |
| <i>In re Huang</i> , 100 F.3d 135 (Fed. Cir. 1996) | 12, 14 |
| <i>Husky Injection Molding Sys. v. Athena Automation Ltd.</i> , Nos. 2015- 1726, 2015-1727, 2016 WL 5335500 (Fed. Cir. Sept. 23, 2016) | 7 |
| <i>I/P Engine, Inc. v. AOL Inc.</i> , 576 F. App'x 982 (Fed. Cir. 2014) | 15 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**Cont'd**

| Cases | Page(s) |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| <i>Jervis B. Webb Co. v. S. Sys., Inc.</i> , 742 F.2d 1388 (Fed. Cir. 1984) | 4 |
| <i>K-Swiss Inc. v. Glide N Lock GmbH</i> , 567 F. App'x 906 (Fed. Cir. 2014) | 17 |
| <i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007)..... | 2, 9, 10, 11 |
| <i>Leo Pharm. Prods., Ltd. v. Rea</i> , 726 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2013) | 10, 17 |
| <i>In re Lundberg</i> , 280 F.2d 865 (C.C.P.A. 1960) | 2 |
| <i>MRC Innovations, Inc. v. Hunter Mfg., LLP</i> , 747 F.3d 1326 (Fed. Cir. 2014) | 14 |
| <i>Nike, Inc. v. Adidas AG</i> , 812 F.3d 1326 (Fed. Cir. 2016) | 17 |
| <i>Norgren v. Int'l Trade Comm'n</i> , 699 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2012) | 15 |
| <i>Okajima v. Bourdeau</i> , 261 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2001) | 1 |
| <i>Ormco Corp. v. Align Tech., Inc.</i> , 463 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2006) | 12, 16 |
| <i>Perfect Web Techs., Inc. v. InfoUSA, Inc.</i> , 587 F.3d 1324 (Fed. Cir. 2009) | 16 |
| <i>Pregis Corp. v. Kappos</i> , 700 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2012) | 14 |
| <i>Tex. Instruments v. U.S. Int'l Trade Comm'n</i> , 988 F.2d 1165 (Fed.Cir.1993) | 16 |

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.