

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

FLIR SYSTEMS, INC. and
FLIR MARITIME US, INC. (F/K/A RAYMARINE, INC.),

Petitioner

v.

GARMIN SWITZERLAND GmbH,

Patent Owner

Case IPR2017-00946

Patent 7,268,703 B1

PATENT OWNER RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction.....	1
A. Summary of the '703 Patent.....	1
B. Summary of de Jong.....	2
C. Summary of Patentability Arguments	6
D. Level of a POSITA and Comparison of Garmin's and FLIR's Experts Expert Satisfies the Board's Adopted Level of a POSITA.....	9
1. Brief Summary of Capt. Browne's Qualifications.....	9
2. Capt. Browne Meets the Level of POSITA Applied By the Board and Garmin's Proposed Level of a POSITA	9
3. FLIR's Expert Does Not Meet Garmin's Level of a POSITA.....	11
4. The Board Should Reconsider the Adopted Level of a POSITA	13
II. Claim Construction.....	14
A. "re-rout[ing]" – Claims 1, 12, 20, and 27.....	15
B. "course" – Claims 1, 2, 12-13, 20-21, 26-29, and 41-45.....	21
III. Claims 1, 12, 20, and 27: de Jong Does Not Teach or Suggest "re-routing the course"	28

A. The “Route Network Data Set” Is the Set of All Possible Routes, and the “Filtered Route Network” Is the Set of All Navigable Routes After Applying the Sailing Order, But No Route Within Either Set Is Ever *Re-Routed* 28

IV. Claims 1, 12, 20, and 27: de Jong Does Not Teach or Suggest “Avoiding the Preselected Conditions” 39

V. Claims 1, 12, 20, 27, and 28: de Jong Does Not Teach Routing or Re-Routing a “Course” 49

A. de Jong Defines a Route to Include a Track and that the Route Is an Outline of the Areas the Ship Is to Pass 49

B. The Claimed “Course” Is Used to Mean “Track” 51

VI. Patent Owner Does Not Consent to the PTAB Adjudicating the Patentability or Validity of the Challenged Claims of the ’703 Patent 54

VII. Conclusion 55

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases:	Page No(s).
<i>Cuozzo Speed Techs. v. Lee</i> , 136 S. Ct. 2131 (2016)	14
<i>Kruse Tech. Partnership v. Volkswagen AG</i> , 544 Fed. Appx. 943 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	45
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Proxyconn, Inc.</i> , 789 F.3d 1292 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	15
<i>Oil States Energy Services, LLC v. Greene’s Energy Group, LLC</i> , No. 16-712, 2017 WL 2507340 (June 12, 2017)	59
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	19
 Regulations:	
37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b)	14
37 C.F.R. § 42.24(a)(1)(i)	61
37 C.F.R. § 42.24(a)(1)	61
37 C.F.R. § 42.6	62

I. Introduction

A. Summary of the '703 Patent

The Challenged Claims recite a marine route calculation algorithm that routes a course between a first location and a potential waypoint. This routing includes identifying any preselected conditions that may be along the course. If preselected conditions are identified, the marine route calculation algorithm re-routes the course relative to the previous routing to avoid the identified preselected conditions. The re-routed course includes non-user selected waypoints. This process is summarized by the '703 Patent as follows:

As shown in FIG. 6, a method for marine navigation is provided. The method includes identifying a potential waypoint at 600. In the various embodiments, identifying the potential waypoint can be accomplished by identifying the potential waypoint on or through a display. Cartographic data, including the marine craft data, for the area between a first location and the potential waypoint can be analyzed for preselected conditions at 610. In one example, analyzing the area between the first location and the potential waypoint includes identifying one or more preselected conditions in the area between the first location and the potential waypoint. [¶] The one or more preselected conditions identified in the analysis can be used, along with other factors, in performing the marine route calculation algorithm to calculate the course so as to best avoid preselected conditions between the first location and the potential waypoint at 620. *One approach to avoiding the preselected conditions includes re-routing the course to avoid the preselected*

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.