

Paper No. \_\_\_\_  
Date: April 4, 2017

By: Cary Kappel, Lead Counsel  
William Gehris, Backup Counsel  
David Petroff, Backup Counsel  
Davidson, Davidson & Kappel, LLC  
589 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue, 16<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, NY 10018  
Telephone: (212) 736-1257  
(212) 736-2015  
(212) 736-1940  
Facsimile: (212) 736-2427  
Email: ckappel@ddkpatent.com  
wgehris@ddkpatent.com  
dpetroff@ddkpatent.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

VALEO NORTH AMERICA, INC. and VALEO EMBRAYAGES,

Petitioner,

v.

SCHAEFFLER TECHNOLOGIES AG & CO. KG,

Patent Owner.

---

Case: IPR2017-00441

Patent 8,573,374 B2

---

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Claim Construction.....	2
A.	"Torsional Vibration Absorber".....	3
B.	Torsional Vibration Absorber "Is Parallel To" Both Damper Stages....	6
1.	Petitioner Improperly Ignores The Claim Language "Both Damper Stages".....	7
2.	Petitioner Improperly Imports The Language "Power Path" And "Torque Generated" Into The Claims .....	11
3.	Petitioner Improperly Relies On Alleged Prior Art Haller To Support Their Construction.....	13
4.	Patent Owner's Construction "the Torsional Vibration Absorber is Connected Via a Single Piece Connection to the Input of the Second Stage and to the Output of the First Stage" is Supported by the Claim Language and the Specification.....	15
III.	Petitioner Cannot Demonstrate A Reasonable Likelihood Of Prevailing On Any Asserted Ground Because Their Construction Of "Is Parallel To" Is Improper And Required For Every Claim .....	17

IV.	Petitioner's Expert Report Is Conclusory And Not Entitled To Any Weight.....	18
V.	Ground 1: Claims 1 And 3 Are Not Anticipated By Haller .....	19
A.	Claim 1: Haller Fails To Disclose A Torsional Absorber That Is Parallel To Both Damper Stages .....	19
1.	Petitioner Fails To Identify Sufficient Evidence To Anticipate Claim 1 .....	19
2.	Petitioner Relies On Inapplicable Passages Of Haller To Support Their Analysis .....	25
3.	Haller Figure 8, At The Very Least, Fails To Disclose A Torsional Absorber That Is "Parallel To Both Damper Stages" .....	28
VI.	Ground 3: Claims 1-3, 8-10 And 14-16 Are Not Obvious Over Sasse And Haller.....	32
A.	Claim 1: Neither Sasse Nor Haller Discloses The Limitation: "The Torsional Vibration Absorber Is Parallel To Both Damper Stages" .....	32
1.	Sasse Does Not Disclose A Torsional Vibration Absorber .....	33
2.	Haller Does Not Disclose a Torsional Vibration Absorber .....	

	That is Parallel to Both Damper Stages".....	35
B.	Petitioner's Proposed Modification of Sasse in View of Haller is Improper Because it Changes the Principle Operation of Sasse ...	36
C.	Petitioner's Allegation of Invalidity under Ground 3 for Dependent Claims 2, 3, 8-10 And 14-16 Fail For the Same Reasons as Claim 1 From Which They Depend .....	38
VII.	Ground 7: Claims 1-3, 10 And 14-16 Are Not Obvious Over Heuler And Haller.....	38
VIII.	Grounds 2, 4, 5, 6, 8 and 9 Each Fail For the Same Reasons as Grounds 1 and 3.....	39
IX.	Conclusion .....	40

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### CASES

<i>Ashland Oil, Inc. v. Delta Resins &amp; Refractories, Inc.</i> , 776 F.2d 281 (Fed. Cir. 1985) .....	12
<i>Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee</i> , 136 S. Ct. 2131 (2016) .....	3
<i>Ex parte Habashi et al</i> , Appeal 2011-008847, 2013 Pat. App. LEXIS 8057 (Pat. App. 2013) .....	18
<i>Ex parte Vanscoyoc</i> , Appeal 2011-011717, 2013 Pat. App. LEXIS 7627 (Pat. App. 2013) .....	18
<i>Ex parte Yasuhisa Ito</i> , Appeal 2009-001701, 2009 Pat. App. Lexis 8758, 5-6 (Pat. App. 2009).....	37
<i>In re Abbott Diabetes Care, Inc.</i> , 696 F.3d 1142 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	10
<i>In re American Academy Of Science Tech Center</i> , 367 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2004) .....	9
<i>In re Paulsen</i> , 30 F.3d 1475 (Fed. Cir. 1994).....	14
<i>In re Ratti</i> , 270 F.2d 810 (CCPA 1959).....	37
<i>In re Suitco Surface, Inc.</i> , 603 F.3d 1255 (Fed. Cir. 2010) .....	3
<i>Medtronic, Inc. And Medtronic Vascular, Inc. v. Lifepoint Sciences LLC</i> , IPR2014-00288, Final Written Decision, Paper 34, 2015 .....	18
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Proxyconn, Inc.</i> , 789 F.3d 1292 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	3

# 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.