

RECORD OF ORAL HEARING  
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

-----

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

-----

COSTCO WHOLESALE CORP,

Petitioner

vs.

ROBERT BOSCH LLC

Patent Owner

-----

Case IPR2016-00034 (Patent 6,973,698)

Case IPR2016-00036 (Patent 6,944,905)

Case IPR2016-00038 (Patent 6,292,974)

Case IPR2016-00039 (Patent 7,228,588)

Case IPR2016-00040 (Patent 7,484,264)

Case IPR2016-00041 (Patent 8,099,823)

-----

Oral Hearing Held: January 18, 2017

Before: PHILLIP J. KAUFFMAN, WILLIAM V. SAINDON,  
and BARRY L. GROSSMAN, Administrative Patent Judges

The above-entitled matter came on for hearing at the U.S.  
Patent and Trademark Office, 600 Dulany Street, Alexandria, Virginia in  
Courtroom A, at 10:00 a.m.

REPORTED BY: KAREN BRYNTESON, RMR, CRR,

FAPR

APPEARANCES:

ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER:

JAMES W. DABNEY, ESQ.  
RICHARD M. KOEHL, ESQ.  
JAMES R. KLAIBER, ESQ.  
STEFANIE LOPATKIN, ESQ.  
Hughes Hubbard & Reed LLP  
One Battery Park Plaza  
New York, NY 10004-1482  
212-837-6803

ON BEHALF OF THE PATENT OWNER:

MARK HANNEMANN, ESQ.  
PATRICK R. COLSHER, ESQ.  
JOSEPH PURCELL, ESQ.  
Shearman & Sterling LLP  
599 Lexington Avenue  
New York, NY 10022  
212-848-4000



Case Nos. IPR2016-00034 (Patent 6,973,698), IPR2016-00036 (Patent 6,944,905), IPR2016-00038 (Patent 6,292,974), IPR2016-00039 (Patent 7,228,588), IPR2016-00040 (Patent 7,484,264), and IPR2016-00041 (Patent 8,099,823)

1 microphone.

2 All right. So let's have appearances from Patent  
3 Owner now.

4 MR. HANNEMANN: Good morning, Your Honor,  
5 Mark Hannemann, Patrick Colsher, and Joseph Purcell of  
6 Shearman & Sterling for Patent Owner, Bosch.

7 JUDGE SAINDON: Thank you. Petitioner?

8 MR. DABNEY: Good morning, Your Honor, James  
9 Dabney, Richard Koehl, Jim Klaiber, and Stefanie Lopatkin of  
10 Hughes Hubbard & Reed for Costco, Petitioner.

11 JUDGE SAINDON: Good morning. You can stay  
12 up there and we can begin with IPR2016-34. Just as one other  
13 matter, the hearing record will count for all cases. Anything  
14 said in one counts for all the others, unless there is some  
15 specific statement you give otherwise. That way we don't have  
16 to repeat ourselves because there is so much overlap.

17 So with that, we will begin with IPR 2016-34. I  
18 budgeted 20 minutes. If you go over, we will borrow from the  
19 next one and so forth. So you may begin when ready.

20 MR. DABNEY: Thank you, Your Honor, James  
21 Dabney from Hughes Hubbard. And what I would like to do  
22 this morning is just to provide an overview of what we expect

Case Nos. IPR2016-00034 (Patent 6,973,698), IPR2016-00036 (Patent 6,944,905), IPR2016-00038 (Patent 6,292,974), IPR2016-00039 (Patent 7,228,588), IPR2016-00040 (Patent 7,484,264), and IPR2016-00041 (Patent 8,099,823)

1 to present to the Board over all of the six cases this morning.  
2 And my colleagues will make more specific arguments about  
3 the cases before, and I realize that may take up some of our  
4 time this morning on this first case.

5 The cases the Board is hearing this morning, as we  
6 see it, fall into basically two pots. The first pot is the first  
7 case up this morning involving the '698 patent, which claims a  
8 wiper comprising a spring elastic support element, and the  
9 other five cases all involve a wiper that comprises both a  
10 spring elastic support element and other structures, mostly a  
11 spoiler, but in one case a spoiler and end caps.

12 And it seems to me that you can think about the  
13 obviousness issues most effectively by focusing on them in  
14 those two groups. The first case up we're talking about today  
15 is unusual in that it basically is a case in which we are  
16 relitigating an issue that this Board's predecessor decided on  
17 May 28th of 2003.

18 And in the prosecution history of its Exhibit 1002,  
19 we have the primary reference at issue in this proceeding,  
20 which is Arai. And may the record show I am showing Arai  
21 figure 1 on the ELMO.

22 And the Board took a very careful look at the prior

# 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.