Paper No. _____
Filed: January 27, 2017

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY,
Petitioner,

v.

UNITED TECHNOLOGIES CORPORATION,
Patent Owner

Case No. IPR2016-00952
Patent No. 9,121,412

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction 1

II. Background 6

III. Claim Construction 14

A. "solidity" And "wherein . . . said row of propulsor blades has a solidity value (R) defined as CD/CP" 15

B. "pressure ratio . . . with regard to an inlet pressure and an outlet pressure of said bypass flow passage" 17

IV. The Prior Art Does Not Anticipate Or Render Obvious The Claimed Solidity Values And Ratios Of N/R, Together With All Other Claimed Features 23

A. Davies Cannot Anticipate Because The Only Solidity Value Disclosed By Davies Results In An N/R Ratio Outside Of The Claimed Range 24

1. Because Davies Uses The Same Conventional Definition Of Solidity As The '412 Patent, Its Stated Solidity Value Precludes Anticipation 24

2. Petitioner Improperly Ignores Davies's Expressly Disclosed 0.83 Solidity Value In Favor Of Its Inaccurate Derived Value 26

3. Davies Discloses Only One Fan Design And One Solidity Value Of 0.83 For Its Demonstrator Engine 31

B. Petitioner Has Presented No Obviousness Argument Based On N/R Ratio For Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, And 8 33

C. An Ordinary Artisan Would Not Modify Davies To Obtain The "N/R ratio . . . between 15 And 16" Required By Claim 11 34

1. Petitioner Improperly Asserts The Obviousness Of The Claimed N/R In Isolation, Without Considering The Invention As A Whole 35

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

2. Petitioner's Modification Of Davies Would Render Its Demonstrator Engine Inoperable For Its Intended Purpose 37

3. Petitioner Fails To Provide A Reason For Modifying Davies To Achieve The Claimed Invention, Or Even A Credible Means To Achieve The Claimed Parameter Ranges 39

V. The Prior Art Does Not Anticipate Or Render Obvious The Claimed Bypass Flow Passage Pressure Ratios, Together With All Other Claimed Features 44

A. Davies Does Not Anticipate The Claimed Bypass Flow Pressure Ratio 44

B. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, And 8 Are Not Obvious 46

1. Petitioner Improperly Asserts The Obviousness Of The Claimed Bypass Flow Passage Pressure Ratio In Isolation, Without Considering The Invention As A Whole 46

2. Modifying Davies To Incorporate The Claimed Bypass Flow Passage Pressure Ratios Would Not Have Been Obvious 47

VI. Conclusion 67

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Federal Cases **Page(s)**

Arendi S.A.R.L. v. Apple Inc.,
832 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2016) 33, 44

Bayer Pharma AG v. Watson Labs., Inc.,
183 F. Supp. 3d 538 (D. Del. 2016).....40

Cal. Med. Prods., Inc. v. Tecnol Med. Prods., Inc.,
921 F. Supp. 1219 (D. Del. 1995).....45, 46

Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee,
136 S. Ct. 2131 (2016).....14

Gillette Co. v. S.C. Johnson & Son, Inc.,
919 F.2d 720 (Fed. Cir. 1990) 36, 37, 47

In re Applied Materials, Inc.,
692 F.3d 1289 (Fed. Cir. 2012) 63

In re Gordon,
733 F.2d 900 (Fed. Cir. 1984) 38, 39, 44

In re Kahn,
441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006) 40

In re Magnum Oil Tools Int'l, Ltd.,
829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016) 33, 34, 37

In re Shuman,
361 F.2d 1008 (C.C.P.A. 1966).....52, 61

In re Wertheim,
541 F.2d 257 (C.C.P.A. 1976).....63

In re Zletz,
893 F.2d 319 (Fed. Cir. 1989) 14

Intelligent Bio-Sys., Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd.,
821 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016) 34, 43, 46

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

Janssen Prod., L.P. v. Lupin Ltd.,
109 F. Supp. 3d 650 (D.N.J. 2010).....40

KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.,
550 U.S. 398 (2007).....40

Microsoft Corp. v. Proxyconn, Inc.,
789 F.3d 1292 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....14

Net MoneyIN, Inc. v. VeriSign, Inc.,
545 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....44

Motorola, Inc. v. Interdigital Tech. Corp.,
121 F.3d 1461 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....24

Phillips v. AWH Corp.,
415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....22

Plas-Pak Indus., Inc. v. Sulzer Mixpac AG,
600 F. App'x 755 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....39, 44

Renishaw PLC v. Marposs Societa' per Azioni,
158 F.3d 1243 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....22

Sanofi-Synthelabo v. Apotex, Inc.,
550 F.3d 1075 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....4, 35, 46

Silicon Graphics, Inc. v. ATI Techs., Inc.,
607 F.3d 784 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....26, 44

Scientific Plastic Prods., Inc. v. Biotage AB,
766 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....40

Patent Trial and Appeal Board Decisions

Kingston Tech. Co. v. Imation Corp.,
IPR2015-00066, Paper 19 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 24, 2016).....62

Federal Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 102.....44

35 U.S.C. § 103.....4, 35, 46

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKET ALARM

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.