

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 IPR2016-00038  
Patent 6,292,974

---

**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.....	1
I. THE BOARD PROPERLY SET FORTH THE LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART.....	1
II. THE COMBINATIONS OF APPEL AND PROHASKA, AND HOYLER AND PROHASKA, RENDER THE CLAIMS OBVIOUS.....	5
A. A Wiper Strip’s Profile Is the Well-Known Cause of Wind-Lift, Which Is Fundamentally the Same in Conventional and Flat- Spring Wipers.....	5
B. The ’974 Patent Addressed the Well-Known Wind-Lift Problem With a Well-Known Spoiler Solution .....	9
C. Bosch Ignores Petitioner’s Hindsight-Free Reasons for Combining Prohaska’s Spoiler With a Flat-Spring Wiper .....	10
III. BOSCH’S EVIDENCE OF PURPORTED SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS ARE INSUFFICIENT TO OVERCOME A FINDING OF OBVIOUSNESS .....	11
A. There Is no Nexus Between the ’974 Patent and Any Purported Commercial Success, and No Success Has Been Established.....	12
B. Bosch’s Proffered “Evidence” of Skepticism and Unexpected Results Does Not Undercut Obviousness .....	16
C. There Is No Evidence of Failure of Others or Long-Felt Need .....	17
D. Bosch’s Vague Claims of Praise Are Insufficient .....	18
E. Bosch’s Fails to Show Copying by Competitors .....	19

PETITIONER’S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF PETITION

F. Bosch’s Licensing “Evidence” Does Not Support  
Nonobviousness.....20

IV. ATTACKS ON DR. DAVIS’S CREDIBILITY ARE  
INSUPPORTABLE IN FACT AND LAW.....20

A. Prior Consistent Statements Support Dr. Davis’s Credibility and  
Accurately Represent Dr. Davis’s Opinions .....20

B. Prior Indefiniteness Opinions Regarding a Different Patent Are  
Immaterial to Dr. Davis’s Current Opinions.....21

V. CONCLUSION.....22

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

<b>Cases</b>	<b>Page(s)</b>
<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, 1293–1294 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	19
<i>Arlington Industries, Inc. v. Bridgeport Fittings, Inc.</i> , 581 F.App’x. 859, 867 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	15, 18
<i>Brown &amp; Williamson Tobacco Corp. v. Philip Morris Inc.</i> , 229 F.3d 1120, 1129 (Fed. Cir. 2000) .....	12
<i>Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee</i> , 136 S. Ct. 2131 (2016).....	21
<i>Dystar Textilfarben GmbH &amp; Co. Deutschland KG v. C.H. Patrick Co.</i> , 464 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2006) .....	4
<i>Ethicon Endo-Surgery, Inc. v. Covidien LP</i> , 812 F.3d 1023 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	13, 18
<i>In re GPAC Inc.</i> , 57 F.3d 1573 (Fed. Cir. 1995) .....	2, 19
<i>GraftTech Int’l Holdings, Inc. v. Laird Techs. Inc.</i> , No. 2015–1796, (Fed. Cir. June 17, 2016) .....	12
<i>Grobler v. Apple Inc.</i> , No. 12-CV-01534-JST, 2014 WL 1867043 (N.D. Cal. May 6, 2014).....	21
<i>In re Huang</i> , 100 F.3d at 140 .....	13, 15
<i>I/P Engine, Inc. v. AOL Inc.</i> , 576 F. App’x 982, 992 (Fed. Cir. 2014) .....	16
<i>K-Swiss Inc. v. Glide N Lock GmbH</i> , 567 F. App’x 906, 914 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	18

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Cont’d**

<b>Cases</b>	<b>Page(s)</b>
<i>KSR International Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Leo Pharm. Prod., Ltd. v. Rea</i> , 726 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....	18
<i>MRC Innovations, Inc. v. Hunter Mfg., LLP</i> , 747 F.3d 1326 (Fed. Cir. 2014) .....	15
<i>Nike, Inc. v. Adidas AG</i> , 812 F.3d 1326 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	18
<i>Norgren v. Int’l Trade Comm’n</i> , 699 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	16
<i>Okajima v. Bourdeau</i> , 261 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2001) .....	5
<i>Ormco Corp. v. Align Tech., Inc.</i> , 463 F.3d 1299 (Fed Cir. 2006) .....	13, 17
<i>Perfect Web Techs., Inc. v. InfoUSA, Inc.</i> , 587 F.3d 1324 (Fed. Cir. 2009) .....	17
<i>Pregis Corp. v. Kappos</i> , 700 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	15
<i>Sakraida v. Ag Pro, Inc.</i> , 425 U.S. 273 (1976).....	2, 4
<i>Tex. Instruments v. U.S. Int’l Trade Comm’n</i> , 988 F.2d 1165 (Fed.Cir.1993) .....	17
<i>W. Union Co. v. Moneygram Payment Systems, Inc.</i> , 626 F.3d 1361, 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2010) .....	11, 12, 14
<i>Wyers v. Master Lock Co.</i> , 616 F.3d 1231, 1246 (Fed. Cir. 2010) .....	19

# 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.