

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. IPR2016-00035  
U.S. Patent No. 6,836,926

---

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE PURSUANT TO 35  
U.S.C. § 313 AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.107**

**Table of Contents**

I. INTRODUCTION ..... 1

II. SUMMARY OF ARGUMENTS ..... 1

III. STANDARD FOR INSTITUTION..... 3

IV. BRIEF OVERVIEW OF U.S. PATENT. NO. 6,836,926 ..... 5

V. THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION OF IPR  
BECAUSE PETITIONER DISPUTES ITS OWN CLAIM  
CONSTRUCTIONS ..... 6

VI. THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION OF IPR  
BECAUSE SUBSTANTIALLY THE SAME ARGUMENTS  
WERE PREVIOUSLY BEFORE THE OFFICE ..... 11

VII. PETITIONER FAILS TO ESTABLISH THAT THE PRIOR  
ART DISCLOSES THE INEQUALITY DISCLOSED IN THE  
CHALLENGED CLAIMS ..... 14

    A. Ground 1 ..... 15

    B. Ground 2 ..... 16

VIII. PETITIONER FAILS TO ADEQUATELY EXPLAIN HOW  
OR WHY THE PRIOR ART WOULD BE MODIFIED, OR  
HOW ANY SUCH MODIFICATION WOULD ARRIVE AT  
THE SUBJECT MATTER OF THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ..... 17

IX. CONCLUSION..... 21

**Table of Authorities**

**Cases**

*ActiveVideo Networks v. Verizon Commc’ns, Inc.*,  
694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012). .....5

*August Technology Corp. v. Camtek Ltd.*,  
655 F.3d 1278 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....4

*Butamax Advanced Biofuels LLC v. Gevo, Inc.*,  
Case No. IPR2014-00581, Paper 8 (PTAB Oct. 14, 2014) .....9

*Cuozzo Speed Tech v. Lee, cert.  
granted* (U.S. Jan. 15, 2016).....10

*Farmwald v. ParkerVision, Inc.*,  
Case No. IPR2014-01107, Paper 7 (PTAB Jan. 8, 2015).....19, 20

*KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*,  
550 U.S. 398 (2007).....4, 19

*National Steel Car, Ltd. V. Canadian Pac. Ry.*,  
357 F.3d 1319 (Fed. Cir. 2004) .....13, 16

*Playtex Prods., LLC v. Munchkin, Inc.*,  
Case No. IPR2014-01130, Paper 15 (PTAB Jan. 13, 2015).....8

*SAS Inst., Inc. v. ComplementSoft, LLC*,  
IPR2013-00581, Paper 15 (PTAB Dec. 30, 2013) .....4

*Schering Corp. v. Geneva Pharm.*,  
339 F.3d 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2003) .....12

*Vizio, Inc. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n*,  
605 F.3d 1330 (Fed. Cir. 2010) .....4

*W.L. Gore & Assocs., Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*,  
842 F.2d 1275 (Fed. Cir. 1988) .....10

**Statutes**

35 U.S.C. § 112 .....3  
35 U.S.C. § 112(f).....3, 7, 8  
35 U.S.C. § 314(a) .....4  
35 U.S.C. § 316(e) .....4  
35 U.S.C. § 325(d) .....11

**Regulations**

37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b) .....10  
37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(2).....3  
37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(3).....3, 7, 8  
37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(4).....3, 4, 9  
37 C.F.R. § 42.108(c).....4

**Other Authorities**

Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48,756 (Aug. 14,  
2012) .....4

## I. INTRODUCTION

Patent Owner, Robert Bosch LLC (“Bosch”), submits this preliminary response to the Petition filed by Costco Wholesale Corporation (“Petitioner” or “Costco”) as Paper No. 1 in this proceeding, requesting *inter partes* review (“IPR”) of claims 1–3 of U.S. Patent No. 6,836,926 (“Petition”). This response is timely pursuant to the Board’s Notice in Paper No. 3.

The following arguments are not intended to be exhaustive with respect to the grounds asserted in the Petition. Bosch respectfully submits the streamlined arguments showing that denial of institution is appropriate here, and reserves the right to provide additional evidence, including testimonial evidence, and to include new arguments, should the Board decide to institute review in this case.

Bosch respectfully submits that Petitioner has not established a reasonable likelihood that it would prevail with respect to any of the challenged claims. Accordingly, Bosch respectfully requests that the Board decline to institute *inter partes* review for the reasons set forth below.

## II. SUMMARY OF ARGUMENTS

The Petition fails for several reasons.

First, Petitioner has proposed that the Board apply claim constructions that Petitioner explicitly disputes. These claim constructions are drawn from Bosch’s proposed claim constructions in district court. However, Bosch objects to

# 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.