

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

DYNACRAFT BSC, INC.,
Petitioner

v.

MATTEL, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2018-00038
Patent 7,222,684

Title: SYSTEM, APPARATUS, AND METHOD FOR PROVIDING CONTROL
OF A TOY VEHICLE

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE
PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.107**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. SUMMARY OF ARGUMENTS	1
III. CONTROLLING LEGAL STANDARDS	5
A. STANDARDS FOR IPR INSTITUTION AND OBVIOUSNESS	5
IV. BRIEF OVERVIEW OF THE '684 PATENT.....	7
A. '684 Patent Specification.....	7
B. Prosecution History of the '684 Patent.....	14
C. Claim Construction.....	19
1. Ordinary Meaning Support's Mattel's Construction	20
2. The '684 Patent's Specification Supports Mattel's Construction.....	23
V. PETITIONER'S PRIOR ART.....	25
A. One of Ordinary Skill Would Not Be Motivated to Combine Petitioner's References.....	25
B. Bienz.....	28
C. Klimo.....	31
D. Ribbe.....	42
VI. PETITIONER'S ALLEGED GROUNDS FOR OBVIOUSNESS	45
A. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art	45
B. Motivation to Combine.....	46
C. Secondary Considerations of Nonobviousness	49
D. Petitioner's Specific Grounds of Unpatentability	51
1. Ground 1: Petitioner's Claim That Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 9, 22-24 and 28 Are Obvious Based on the Combination of Bienz and Klimo Is Not Likely to Succeed	51
a. Neither Bienz Nor Klimo Disclose All of the Elements of Claim 1.....	51

b. Dependent Claim 2.....	56
c. Dependent Claims 3, 5, 6 and 9	56
d. Independent Claim 22	57
e. Dependent Claim 23.....	60
f. Dependent Claim 24.....	61
g. Dependent Claim 27.....	62
h. Dependent Claim 28.....	62
2. Ground 2: Petitioner’s Argument That Claims 11-13, 15, 16, 27, 32-34, and 38 Are Obvious Over Bienz and Klimo in Further View of Ribbe Are Also Not Likely to Succeed	62
a. Independent Claim 11	62
b. Dependent Claims 12, 13, 15 and 16	65
c. Independent Claim 32	65
d. Dependent Claims 33 and 34	67
e. Dependent Claims 34, 37 and 38	68
VII. CONCLUSION	69

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases

<i>Black & Decker, Inc. v. Positec USA, Inc.</i> , 646 Fed.Appx. 1019 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Cheese Sys. Inc. v. Tetra Pak Cheese and Powder Sys., Inc.</i> , 725 F.2d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	26
<i>DePuy Spine, Inc. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc.</i> , 567 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	49, 50
<i>Free-Flow Packaging Int’l v Automated Packaging Sys.</i> , IPR2016-00350, Paper 7 at 11-13 (June 27, 2016)	3, 27
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co. of Kansas City</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	6
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	6
<i>Nautilus Hyosung, Inc. v. Diebold, Inc.</i> , IPR2016-00633, Paper 9 at 21-22 (Aug. 22, 2016).....	25
<i>In re Nuvasive, Inc.</i> , 842 F.3d 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	3, 47
<i>SAS Inst., Inc. v. ComplementSoft, LLC</i> , IPR2013-00581, Paper 15 at 12 (PTAB Dec. 30, 2013)	6
<i>Tietex Int’l, Ltd. v. Precision Fabrics Group, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-01671, Paper 7 at 14 (PTAB February 11, 2016)	26
<i>Vizio, Inc. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n</i> , 605 F.3d 1330 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	5

...

TABLE OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit #	Exhibit Description
2001	Declaration of Jeff Reynolds
2002	Declaration of Robert Mimlitch
2003	Declaration of Peter vom Scheidt
2004	U.S. Patent No. 6,287,167 to Kondo
2005	U.S. Patent No. 5,056,613 to Porter
2006	U.S. Patent No. 5,349,276 to Mezzatesta
2007	The Merriam-Webster Dictionary, 1998, p. 51
2008	The American Heritage Dictionary, Second College Ed., 1985, pp. 106, 396, 970
2009	“Difference Between Analog and Digital Signals,” available at https://techdifferences.com/difference-between-analog-and-digital-signal.html
2010	Declaration of Daria DeLizio

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.