

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

KAWASAKI RAIL CAR, INC.
Petitioner,

v.

SCOTT BLAIR,
Patent Owner.

Case No. IPR2017-00117

Patent No. 6,700,602

Issue Date: March 2, 2004

Title: Subway TV Media System

**PETITIONER'S REPLY TO PATENT OWNER'S
RESPONSE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.23**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF EXHIBITS	ii
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. PO MISCHARACTERIZES THE '602 PATENT	3
III. PO'S MISSTATEMENTS ABOUT THE PRIOR ART	4
A. Namikawa.....	4
B. Sasao.....	7
C. Amano	7
D. Maekawa.....	8
IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	8
A. "substantially flushed"	8
B. "video signal source unit"	8
C. "mounted"	9
V. PO'S CRITICISMS OF PETITIONER'S EXPERT DECLARATION ARE UNWARRANTED	9
VI. CLAIMS 1-4 AND 6 ARE UNPATENTABLE ON THE GROUNDS STATED IN THE DECISION ON INSTITUTION	11
A. Scope and Content of the Prior Art	12
B. Differences Between the Prior Art and the Claims at Issue.....	15
C. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art	17
D. Motivation to Combine	19
E. Articulated Reasoning.....	22
F. Reasonable Expectation of Success	24
VII. CONCLUSION.....	25
CERTIFICATE OF WORD COUNT.....	27
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	28

TABLE OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit	Description
1001	U.S. Patent No. 6,700,602 (Issued March 2, 2004), <i>Subway TV Media System</i> (“’602 Patent”)
1002	Japan Train Operation Association Magazine, Vol. 37, issue no. 3 (March 1, 1995)
1003	Translation of Ex.-1002
1004	Japanese Publication No. 04-085379
1005	Translation of Ex.-1004
1006	Japanese Publication No. 07-181900
1007	Translation of Ex.-1006
1008	Japanese Publication No. 04-160991
1009	Translation of Ex.-1008
1010	Japanese Publication No. 04-322579
1011	Translation of Ex.-1010
1012	File history of ’602 Patent (“File History”)
1013	Reexamination file history of ’602 Patent (“Reexam File History”)
1014	Expert Declaration of Lowell Malo (“Malo Decl.”)
1015	Curriculum Vitae of Lowell Malo
1016	Declaration of Shuichi Matsuda
1017	Translation of Ex.-1016
1018	Certification from Japan National Diet Library Explaining Workflow Procedure in the Library

1019	Translation of Ex.-1018
1020	Japanese Publication No. 02-223985
1021	Translation of Ex.-1020
1022	U.S. Patent No. 5,293,244
1023	Certification from Japan National Diet Library Indicating Receipt Date of Japan Train Operation Association Magazine
1024	Translation of Ex.-1023
1025	Supplemental Expert Declaration of Lowell Malo (“Supp. Malo Decl.”)
1026	Deposition Transcript of Jack Long
1027	Long Deposition Exhibit 9
1028	Long Deposition Exhibit 10

I. INTRODUCTION

Patent Owner (“PO”) attempts to distinguish claims 1-4 and 6 of U.S. Patent No. 6,700,602 (“’602 Patent”) over the prior art by arguing that they do not teach or suggest: (1) monitors “mounted at the junction of the sidewall and ceiling”; (2) screens “substantially flushed with the adjacent wall surface structure of the car”; and (3) screens “directed obliquely downwardly towards seats.” (PO Scott Blair’s Response (“Response”), 2, 42). PO mischaracterizes the cited references, because they clearly disclose at least (1) and (3), and Petitioner has provided ample evidence showing why a person of ordinary skill in the art (“POSITA”) would have been motivated to place screens “substantially flushed” with the adjacent surfaces of a railcar to arrive at the claimed combinations. Contrary to PO’s assertions, doing so would not have been difficult, but well within the knowledge and ability of a POSITA prior to the filing date of the ’602 Patent.

The central theme in PO’s argument appears to be that Sasao and Namikawa cannot be physically combined with a reasonable expectation of success, because Sasao allegedly pertains to different types of televisions and physical environments than Namikawa, and a POSITA could not use the teachings of Sasao to modify Namikawa to arrive at the claimed inventions. But this is the same argument that the Board already rejected in its Decision on Institution. (Paper No. 11, 23-24 (“Patent Owner’s arguments... are based on the notion that a person of ordinary

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.