

Filed: January 25, 2018

Filed on behalf of:

Patent Owner Intellectual Ventures II LLC
By: John R. King
Ted M. Cannon
Bridget A. Smith
KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP
2040 Main Street, 14th Floor
Irvine, CA 92614
Telephone: (949) 760-0404
Facsimile: (949) 760-9502
Email: BoxPGL53@knobbe.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MITSUBA CORPORATION AND
AMERICAN MITSUBA CORPORATION
Petitioners,

v.

INTELLECTUAL VENTURES II LLC,

Patent Owner.

Case No. IPR2018-00071
U.S. Patent No. 7,067,952

PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No.
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	7
A. “discrete stator segments each at least partially encased with a phase change material”	8
B. Reservation of rights	9
III. THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE IT FAILS TO SET FORTH AN ADEQUATE CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	10
IV. GROUND 2 SHOULD BE DENIED UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 325(D).....	12
A. This Petition’s challenge of claim 10 relies on substantially the same prior art and arguments as the -01497 petition.	14
1. Both petitions rely on Ishihara as allegedly disclosing key limitations of claim 10.	14
2. The petitions rely on the cumulative references Ishihara and Nakahara as allegedly disclosing a “stator assembly.”	15
3. The petitions rely on the cumulative references Ishihara and Nakahara as allegedly disclosing “a plurality of discrete stator segments each at least partially encased with a phase change material.”	16
4. Ground 2 should be denied with respect to claim 10.....	18

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(Cont'd)

	Page No.
B. This Petition’s challenge of claim 11 relies on substantially the same prior art and arguments as the -01497 petition.	19
1. Ground 2 of this Petition presents substantially the same prior art and arguments against claim 10 as presented by ground 1 of the -01497 petition.	19
2. The petitions rely on the cumulative references Nakatsuka and Lieu as allegedly disclosing the “held in a toroidal shape by an overmolded thermoplastic material” limitation of claim 11.	19
3. The Board already determined in IPR2017-01497 that the petitioners likely would not show that claim 11 would have been obvious in view of Nakahara, Ishihara, and Lieu.	20
4. Ground 2 should be denied with respect to claim 11.	20
C. This Petition’s challenge of claim 12 relies on substantially the same prior art and arguments as the -01497 petition.	21
1. Ground 2 of this Petition presents substantially the same prior art and arguments against claim 10 as presented by ground 1 of the -01497 petition.	21
2. The petitions rely on the cumulative references Nakatsuka and Ishihara as allegedly disclosing the “held in a toroidal shape by a retaining member” limitation of claim 12.	21

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(Cont'd)

	Page No.
3. The Board already determined in IPR2017-01497 that the petitioners likely would not show that claim 12 would have been obvious in view of Nakahara and Ishihara.....	23
4. Ground 2 should be denied with respect to claim 12.....	23
D. Mitsuba does not provide any legitimate reason that the Board should expend resources adjudicating a ground that presents substantially the same prior art and arguments as ground 1 of the -01497 petition.....	24
V. GROUND 3 SHOULD BE DENIED UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 325(D).....	26
A. This Petition’s challenge of claim 10 relies on substantially the same prior art and arguments as the -01497 petition.	26
1. Both petitions rely primarily on Iikuma as allegedly disclosing the limitations of claim 10.	26
2. The only difference between the petitions is that this Petition relies on Scherzinger, while the -01497 relies on the cumulative reference Nakahara, as allegedly disclosing the “phase change material.”	27
3. Ground 3 should be denied with respect to claim 10.....	29
B. This Petition’s challenge of claim 11 relies on substantially the same prior art and arguments as the -01497 petition.	29

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(Cont'd)

	Page No.
1. Ground 3 of this Petition presents substantially the same prior art and arguments against claim 10 as presented by ground 1 of the -01497 petition.	29
2. The petitions rely on the cumulative references Nakatsuka and Lieu as allegedly disclosing the “held in a toroidal shape by an overmolded thermoplastic material” limitation of claim 11.	30
3. Ground 3 should be denied with respect to claim 11.	30
C. This Petition’s challenge of claim 12 relies on substantially the same prior art and arguments as the -01497 petition.	31
1. Ground 3 of this Petition presents substantially the same prior art and arguments against claim 10 as presented by ground 2 of the -01497 petition.	31
2. Both petitions rely on Iikuma as allegedly disclosing the “held in a toroidal shape by a retaining member” limitation of claim 12.	31
3. Ground 3 should be denied with respect to claim 12.	32
D. Mitsuba does not provide any legitimate reason that the Board should expend resources adjudicating a ground that presents substantially the same prior art and arguments as ground 3 of the -01497 petition.	32

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.