

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SHENZHEN ZHIYI TECHNOLOGY CO. LTD., D/B/A ILIFE,
Petitioner

v.

IROBOT CORP.,
Patent Owner

Case IPR2017-02061
Patent 6,809,490

**PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.120**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Pages</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. OVERVIEW OF the '490 PATENT	3
III. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	4
IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	4
V. UENO-642 HAS ALREADY BEEN FOUND NOT TO DISCLOSE “SAID CONTROL SYSTEM CONFIGURED TO ... SELECT FROM AMONG THE PLURALITY OF MODES IN REAL TIME IN RESPONSE TO SIGNALS GENERATED BY THE OBSTACLE DETECTION SENSOR” (CLAIM 1 – ELEMENT [1D])	12
A. The Description of Ueno-642’s “travel mode pointer” Demonstrates that Mode Selection is Accomplished Without Use of Sensor Signals	12
B. Transitioning Modes After the Robot has Traveled “for a planned time (or distance)” is Not in Response to Sensor Signals	14
C. Ueno-642 Prioritizes “Operations,” not Operating Modes	15
D. New Arguments Raised in Petitioner’s Request for Rehearing	15
VI. UENO-642 FAILS TO DISCLOSE “A SPOT-COVERAGE MODE WHEREBY THE ROBOT OPERATES IN AN ISOLATED AREA” (CLAIM 1 – ELEMENT [1D-1]; CLAIM 42 - ELEMENT [42E-1])	20
VII. UENO-642 FAILS TO DISCLOSE “A BOUNCE MODE WHEREBY THE ROBOT TRAVELS SUBSTANTIALLY IN A DIRECTION AWAY FROM AN OBSTACLE AFTER ENCOUNTERING THE OBSTACLE” (CLAIM 1 – ELEMENT [1D-3]; CLAIM 42 - ELEMENT [42E-3])	24
VIII. UENO-642 FAILS TO DISCLOSE “WHEREBY SAID OBSTACLE DETECTION SENSOR COMPRISES A TACTILE SENSOR” (CLAIM 7) BECAUSE “CONTACT SENSOR 5A” DOES NOT GENERATE	

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont'd)

	<u>Pages</u>
SIGNALS USED TO SELECT FROM AMONG THE PLURALITY OF MODES	25
IX. UENO-642 FAILS TO DISCLOSE “A MEANS FOR MANUALLY SELECTING AN OPERATIONAL MODE” (CLAIM 12)	27
X. THE PETITION INCLUDES NUMEROUS DEFICIENCIES WHICH FURTHER COMPEL AFFIRMANCE OF PATENTABILITY OF THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS	31
A. Ueno-642 fails to disclose “wherein, when in the obstacle following mode, the robot travels adjacent to an obstacle for a distance at least twice the work width of the robot” (Claim 1 – Element [1d-4]; Claim 42 - Element [42e-2])	31
B. Bisset-612 is not prior art	33
1. The ’490 Patent is Entitled to a Priority Date of June 12, 2001	33
2. Bisset-612 is Not Prior Art Under § 102(a).....	43
3. Bisset-612 is Not Prior Art Under § 102(e).....	43
C. The Petition fails to meet the requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b) for claim elements that invoke 35 U.S.C. § 112, para. 6.	46
1. Petitioner has Failed to “Identify the Specific Portions of the Specification that Describe the Structure” Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)	47
2. Petitioner’s Failure Warrants Confirmation of Patentability of the Challenged Claims	48
3. Reliance on Arguments or Citations in the ITC Claim Construction Constitutes Improper Incorporation by Reference	52

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont'd)

	<u>Pages</u>
XI. CONCLUSION.....	53

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

<u>CASES</u>	<u>PAGES</u>
<i>Apple Inc. v. ContentGuard Holdings, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00456.....	49, 50
<i>Apple Inc. v. Core Wireless Licensing S.A.R.L.</i> , IPR2015-01902	50
<i>Bicon, Inc. v. Straumann Co.</i> , 441 F.3d 945, 950 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	23
<i>Carefusion Corp. v. Baxter Int., Inc.</i> , IPR2016-01456.....	48
<i>Conopco v. The Procter & Gamble Company</i> , IPR2013-00510	52
<i>Cont'l Can Co. v. Monsanto Co.</i> , 948 F.2d 1264, 1268 (Fed. Cir., 1991).....	28, 29, 31, 33
<i>EnOcean GmbH v. Face Int'l Corp.</i> , 742 F.3d 955, 957 at note 3, (Fed. Cir. 2014)	44
<i>Facebook, Inc. v. Sound View Innovations, LLC</i> , IPR2017-00985.....	50,51
<i>Fidelity Nat'l Info. Serv., Inc. v. Datatrans Corp.</i> , IPR2014-00489	52
<i>Google LLC v. Uniloc USA, Inc.</i> , IPR2017-02082.....	16
<i>Hansgig v. Kemmer</i> , 26 C.C.P.A. 937, 102 F.2d 212, 214, 40 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) 665, 667 (CCPA 1939)	29
<i>HP Inc. v. Memjet Technology Ltd.</i> , IPR2016-00356.....	50
<i>In re Magnum Oil Tools Int'l, Ltd.</i> , 829 F.3d 1364, 1380–81 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	17
<i>In re Oelrich</i> , 666 F.2d 578, 581, 212 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) 323, 326 (CCPA 1981)....	29
<i>Intelligent Bio-Systems, Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge LTD.</i> , IPR2013-00517	52
<i>Karsten Mfg. Corp.</i> 242 F.3d at 1383	31
<i>Kingston Technology Company, Inc. v. Polaris Innovations Ltd.</i> , IPR2017-00114.....	50

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.