

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'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.107(a)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. BACKGROUND	2
A. OVERVIEW OF THE TECHNOLOGY	2
B. SUMMARY OF THE ‘525 PATENT.....	3
C. PROSECUTION HISTORY OF THE ‘525 PATENT	4
III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	7
A. LEGAL STANDARD	7
B. PETITIONER’S CLAIM CONSTRUCTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112 IS IMPROPER UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 311(b)	8
C. PATENT OWNER’S PROPOSED CLAIM CONSTRUCTIONS	9
1. “thickness”	10
2. “elongate member”	11
3. “inherently resilient and flexible”	12
4. “recess”	13
5. “front end of the controller”	14
6. “paddle lever”	15
IV. PETITIONER HAS NOT SHOWN A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT AT LEAST ONE CLAIM OF THE ‘525 PATENT IS UNPATENTABLE.....	16
A. PETITIONER HAS FAILED TO CARRY ITS BURDEN TO SHOW THAT THE TOSAKI REFERENCE ANTICIPATES ANY CLAIM	17
1. The Base Reference Tosaki Is Characterized By Petitioner As A Hand Held Controller, But It Is Not; It Is Non-Analogous Art.....	18
2. Tosaki Is A Steering Wheel	20
3. Tosaki Does Not Include First And Second Back Controls Located On The Back Of The Controller As Claimed	21

Table of Contents
(continued)

	Page
4. Tosaki Does Not Have Back Controls With Elongate Members That Extend Substantially The Full Distance Between The Top Edge And The Bottom Edge	21
5. Tosaki Does Not Have A “Recess” On The Back Of The Controller Where The Elongate Member Is Mounted.....	21
B. PETITIONER’S OBVIOUSNESS CHALLENGES FAIL TO PERFORM GRAHAM ANALYSIS AND ARE CONCLUSORY	22
1. Failure to Perform Graham Analysis	22
2. Lack of Rationale to Combine and Improper Hindsight	26
3. Petitioner Has Failed To Establish The Level Of Ordinary Skill In The Art As Required By KSR.....	28
C. PETITIONER HAS FAILED TO CARRY ITS BURDEN TO SHOW THAT THE JIMAKOS REFERENCE QUALIFIES AS PRIOR ART	28
1. Failure To Authenticate Jimakos	29
2. Failure To Qualify Jimakos As Prior Art “Printed Publication”	30
3. Improper Reliance On Inadmissible Hearsay Evidence To Suggest Publication Date.....	32
D. PETITIONER HAS FAILED TO CARRY ITS BURDEN ON ALL FIVE STATUTORY GROUNDS	34
V. CONCLUSION.....	35

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page
CASES	
<i>A.R.M., Inc. v. Cottingham Agencies, Ltd.</i> , IPR2014-00671	31
<i>Actavis, Inc. v. Research Corp. Techs., Inc.</i> , IPR2014-0112	32
<i>Apple Inc. v. SmartFlash LLC</i> , Case CBM2015-00029, slip op. (PTAB May 28, 2015)	10, 11, 25
<i>Atofina v. Great Lakes Chem. Corp.</i> , 441 F.3d 991 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	17
<i>Bicon Inc. v. Straumann Co.</i> , 441 F.3d 945 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	8
<i>Bruckelmyer v. Ground Heaters, Inc.</i> , 445 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	30
<i>CCS Fitness, Inc. v. Brunswick Corp.</i> , 288 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	7
<i>Dexcowin Global, Inc. v. Aribex, Inc.</i> , IPR2016-00436	8
<i>DirectTV, LLC v. Qurio Holdings, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-02006	24, 27
<i>Dominion Dealer Sols., LLC v. AutoAlert, Inc.</i> , Case IPR2013-00225, slip op. (PTAB Oct. 10, 2013)	25
<i>EMC Corp. v. PersonalWeb Techs., LLC</i> , Case No. IPR2013-00085, 2014 WL 2090664 (P.T.A.B. May 15, 2014)	29
<i>Endo Pharmaceutical, Inc. v. Depomed, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00656	7
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966)	22
<i>In re Borkowski</i> , 422 F.2d 904, 164 USPQ 642 (CCPA 1970)	13

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
(continued)

	Page
<i>In re Cronyn</i> , 890 F.2d 1158 (Fed. Cir. 1989)	30, 31
<i>In re Hall</i> , 781 F.2d at 899	31
<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	26
<i>In re Klopfenstein</i> , 380 F.3d 1345 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	30
<i>In re: Magnum Oil Tools Int’l Ltd.</i> , Case No. 2015-1300, -- F.3d. ___, 2016 WL 3974202 (Fed. Cir. July 25, 2016)	1, 2, 9, 16
<i>In re NTP, Inc.</i> , 654 F.3d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	26, 27
<i>In re Paulsen</i> , 30 F.3d 1475 (Fed. Cir. 1994)	7
<i>In re Wyer</i> , 655 F.2d 221 (CCPA 1981)	30
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	passim
<i>Liberty Mut. Ins. Co. v. Progressive Casualty Ins. Co.</i> , Case CBM2012-00003, slip op. (PTAB Oct. 25, 2012) (representative)	25
<i>Lifewave, Inc. v. Edward Blendermann</i> , IPR2016-00131	10
<i>Loussier v. Universal Music Group, Inc.</i> , No. 02 CIV. 2447 (KMW), 2005 WL 5644421 (S.D.N.Y. July 14, 2005)	33
<i>Macronix Int’l v. Spansion LLC</i> , IPR2014-00106	7

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.