

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

VALVE CORPORATION
Petitioner,

v.

IRONBURG INVENTIONS LTD.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2016-00948
Patent 8,641,525

PATENT OWNER RESPONSE

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction..... 1

II. Claim Construction..... 7

 A. Relevant Law..... 7

 B. Technology Overview And State Of The Art..... 7

 C. All Intrinsic and Extrinsic Evidence Demonstrates The Construction Of A “Hand held Controller” Must Be “A Controller That Is Held In And Operated By Both Hands Of A User” 9

 D. “Located On The Back Of The Controller” Means “Located On The Back Of The Hand-Held Controller That Is Held In And Operated By A User Using Both Hands” 14

 E. “A Recess” Is Properly Construed As “An Indentation In The Back Surface Of The Hand Held Controller That Joins The First Handle And The Second Handle For Receiving A User’s Fingers” 15

 F. “Elongate Members Converge Towards The Front End Of The Controller With Respect To One Another” Means “Elongate Members Converge Towards One Another And Towards The Front Of The Controller” 20

III. Tosaki Does Not Anticipate Claims 1, 6, 13, 14, 16, 17, 19, And 20 (Ground A)..... 23

 A. Tosaki Does Not Disclose A Hand-held Controller That Is Held In And Operated By Both Hands Of A User (Claims 1, 6, 13, 14, 16, 17, 19, And 20)..... 23

 B. Tosaki’s “Gearshift Levers” On The Rear Side Of The “Steering Wheel” Do Not Anticipate The Claimed Elongate Members “Located On The Back Of The Controller” (Claims 1, 6, 13, 14, 16, 17, 19, And 20)..... 27

C. Tosaki Does Not Disclose Elongate Members Converge Towards The Front End Of The Controller With Respect To One Another (Claim 13).....31

IV. The Proffered Combination Of Enright in view of Tosaki Does Not Render Obvious Any Of Claims 1-11, 13, 16, 17, and 20 (Ground B).....32

A. Legal Standard For Combining References32

B. Level of Ordinary Skill34

1. Petitioner Conceded A Lower Level Of Ordinary Skill36

2. Petitioner Failed To Show That UK Examiner Qualifies As A POSITA Under Dr. Rempel’s Proposed Minimum Qualifications37

C. Petitioner Cherry-Picks Teachings From Enright And Tosaki Without Regard To How Such Features Would Actually Be Combined38

D. Enright Does Not Disclose “Inherently Resilient And Flexible” Back Controls (Claim 1)39

E. Petitioner Cherry-Picks Teachings From Enright And Tosaki Without Regard To How Such Features Would Actually Be Combined41

1. Tosaki Teaches Away From Combining With Enright Because The Gearshift Levers Are Positioned And Operated Through An Arched Openings43

2. Petitioner Misrepresents The References and Fails To Explain How To Implement The Gearshift Levers Of Tosaki With The Enright Controller45

3. Tosaki’s Fixed Thigh-Held Steering Wheel Control Apparatus Is Non-Analogous Art47

4. Petitioner’s Obviousness Argument To Modify Enright In View Of Tosaki Is Only Driven By Impermissible Hindsight.....49

F.	Combining Enright With Tosaki Would Change Enright’s Principle Of Operation And Render It Inoperable Device For Its Intended Purpose	52
1.	Petitioner Offers No Proof That The Alleged Combination Would Work.....	52
2.	Tosaki’s Gearshift Levers In Arched Openings Would Change Enright’s Principle of Operation.....	53
3.	Tosaki’s Gearshift Levers In Arched Openings Would Render Enright Inoperable For Its Intended Purpose	55
G.	Petitioner Improperly Conflates Enright’s “Mode Switches” With The Claimed “Paddle Levers” In Contradiction Of The Board’s Claim Construction (Claim 16)	57
V.	The Proffered Combination Of Enright in view of Tosaki and Oelsch Does Not Render Obvious Claim 18 (Ground C).....	58
VI.	Conclusion	63

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**Page****CASES**

<i>Apotex Inc. v. Wyeth LLC</i> , IPR2015-00873, Paper 8, slip op at 11-12 (September 16, 2015).....	63
<i>AVX Corp. v. Greatbatch Ltd.</i> , IPR2015-00710, Paper 9 (August 12, 2015)	16
<i>Broadcom Corp. v. Emulex Corp.</i> , 732 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	32
<i>CFMT, Inc. v. Yieldup Int’l Corp.</i> , 349 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	39
<i>Circuit Check Inc. v. QXQ Inc.</i> , 795 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	47
<i>Connell v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.</i> , 722 F.2d 1542 (Fed. Cir. 1983)	30
<i>Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee</i> , 136 S.Ct. 2131 (2016).....	7
<i>Depuy Spine, Inc. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc.</i> , 567 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	53
<i>Eaton Corp. v. Rockwell Int’l Corp.</i> , 323 F.3d 1332 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	10
<i>Endo Pharmaceuticals v. Depomed</i> , IPR2014-00652, Paper 12 at 10 (Sep. 29, 2014).....	39
<i>Heart Failure Techs., LLC v. Cardiokinetix, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00183, Paper 12 at 9 (PTAB July 31, 2013).....	34
<i>In re Clay</i> , 966 F.2d 656 (Fed. Cir. 1992)	47
<i>In re Gordon</i> , 733 F.2d 900 (Fed. Cir. 1984)	33, 53
<i>In re Gordon</i> , 733 F.3d at 902	55
<i>In re Irani</i> , 427 F.2d 806 (CCPA 1970).....	50

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.