

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY  
Petitioner

v.

UNITED TECHNOLOGIES CORPORATION,  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2016-01289  
Patent 7,060,360

---

**UNITED TECHNOLOGIES CORPORATION'S  
PATENT OWNER RESPONSE**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
I. Introduction.....	1
II. Overview of the Patent .....	3
III. Overview of the Prior Art.....	6
A. Field of the Prior Art.....	6
B. Designing Coating Systems for Aviation or Space Applications.....	9
IV. Defects in the Proposed Grounds of Unpatentability .....	12
A. It Would Not Have Been Obvious to Combine the Layers in Petitioner’s Proposed Combinations .....	13
1. Petitioner’s Proposed Combination Would Hinder or Eliminate the Healing Functionality of Terentieva’s Protective Layer .....	15
(a) Function of Healing Layers.....	16
(b) Preserving the Healing Function of the Protective Coating is Essential to Terentieva’s Teaching .....	18
(c) Whether Terentieva’s Healing Layer Will Work Properly Depends on the Environmental Temperature to which the Layer is Exposed...	19
(d) Thermal Barrier Layers Reduce the Temperature to Which Underlying Layers Are Exposed.....	21
(e) Petitioner’s Proposed Combination of a Thermal Barrier Layer with Terentieva Would Render Terentieva’s Healing Layer Inoperative.....	22
2. Redundant Functionality of Layers and Unaddressed Drawbacks Resulting from Proposed Combinations Negate Petitioner’s Proposed Motivation for the Combinations.....	27
(a) A POSITA Would Not Have Added the Environmental Barrier Layer from Eaton ’456 or the ’360 Patent’s Background to Terentieva	

Because It Would Render Terentieva’s Protective Coating Redundant.  
28

(b) Adding the Environmental Barrier Layer Would also Have Made the Resulting Coating Thicker, Contributing to its Stress and Making Failure More Likely.....29

(c) Adding the Environmental Barrier Layer Negates a Key Design Motivation of Terentieva’s Protective Coating.....30

3. Insufficient Evidence Regarding Likelihood of Success of Combination Belies Existence of *Prima Facie* Proof of Obviousness .....31

(a) Petitioner Fails to Address Factors its Own Expert Identifies as Key to Perceiving a Reasonable Likelihood of Success .....32

(b) The Evidence that Petitioner Does Put Forth Bears Little Relation to the Claimed Invention .....34

(i) The Evidence Proffered in the Petition to Demonstrate the Compatibility of the Thermal Expansion Coefficients of the Layers in the Proposed Combination Is Irrelevant.....34

(ii) The Evidence Proffered in the Petition to Demonstrate the Chemical Compatibility of the Layers in the Proposed Combination is Irrelevant.....37

(c) Petitioner Ignores the Conditions Under Which the Invention Must Operate and the Unpredictability of the Art.....38

B. Terentieva’s Protective Coating is Not a Bond Layer .....40

1. A “bond layer” Must Bond.....40

2. Terentieva Does Not Have a Bond Layer .....45

C. The “Allegedly Admitted Prior Art” Utilized in Ground 2 is Not a Proper Basis for an IPR Ground of Unpatentability .....47

D. Petitioner Has Failed to Make a Case re Claim 6, 8, and 10 .....52

V. Conclusion .....53

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>Coalition For Affordable Drugs XI LLC v. Insys Pharma, Inc.</i> (IPR2015-01797) .....	53
<i>DePuy Spine, Inc. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc.</i> , 567 F. 3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2009) .....	26
<i>Gemstar-TV Guide Int’l, Inc. v. ITC</i> , 383 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2004) .....	44
<i>Kaneka Corp. v. Xiamen Kingdomway Group Co.</i> , 790 F. 3d 1298 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....	44
<i>Kingbright Electronics Co. Ltd., et al. v. Cree, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00741, Paper No. 8 (PTAB August 20, 2015) .....	48, 49
<i>Kingbright Electronics Co. Ltd., et al. v. Cree, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00743, Paper No. 8 (PTAB September 9, 2015).....	48
<i>Kingbright Electronics Co. Ltd., et al. v. Cree, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00744, Paper No. 8 (PTAB September 9, 2015).....	48
<i>Kingbright Electronics Co. Ltd., et al. v. Cree, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00746, Paper No. 8 (PTAB August 20, 2015) .....	48
<i>LG Electronics, Inc. v. Core Wireless Licensing S.A.R.L.</i> , IPR2015-01987, Paper No. 7 (PTAB March 24, 2016) .....	48
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Proxyconn, Inc.</i> , 789 F. 3d 1292 .....	43
<i>PharmaStem Therapeutics, Inc. v. ViaCell, Inc.</i> , 491 F. 3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2007) .....	31
<i>Teleflex, Inc. v. Ficosa N. Am. Corp.</i> , 299 F.3d 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2002) .....	45
<i>Texas Digital Sys., Inc. v. Telegenix, Inc.</i> , 308 F.3d 1193 (Fed. Cir. 2002) .....	44

*In re Wilson*,  
424 F.2d 1382, 165 USPQ 494 (CCPA 1970).....43

**Statutes, Rules and Regulations**

35 U.S.C. § 311(b) .....*passim*  
37 CFR § 42.6(e)(4).....56  
37 CFR § 42.24(b)(1).....55  
37 CFR § 42.24(d) .....55  
37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(4).....47, 49  
M.P.E.P. § 2143.02 .....40

# 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.