UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SMR AUTOMOTIVE SYSTEMS USA, INC., Petitioner,

v.

MAGNA MIRRORS OF AMERICA, INC., Patent Owner.

Case IPR2018-00533 Patent No. 8,783,882

PATENT OWNER MAGNA MIRRORS OF AMERICA, INC.'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE



TABLE OF CONTENTS

				rage		
INTRODU	CTION	J		1		
BACKGRO	OUND	•••••	•••••	2		
I.	Magr	Magna2				
II.	The '	The '882 Patent				
				W A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT LAIMS ARE ANTICIPATED OR OBVIOUS7		
I.	Legal	Legal Standards				
II.	The Board Should Deny Institution On Ground 1					
	A.			aould Be Denied Because Lynam '026 Is Not s The PTO Repeatedly Found8		
		1.	The P	rosecution History of the '882 Patent9		
		2.	Recon Patent	Fails To Show Why The Board Should asider The PTO's Conclusion That The '882 Properly Claims Priority To The '872 Sional		
			a.	The '666 application incorporates by reference the '451 and '712 patents in their entirety		
			b.	The Written Description Of The '666 Application Supports The Claims Of The '882 Patent		
		3.	The '8	882 Patent Priority Claim Is Not Defective21		
		4.	Recon	Fails To Show Why The Board Should asider The PTO's Conclusion That Lynam s Not Prior Art		



	В.	Inven	nd 1 Should Also Be Denied Because It Raises torship Questions That Are Better Addressed In ct Court	27
III.	The Board Should Deny Institution On Ground 2 Because SMR Has Not Shown That The Prior Art Discloses All Claim Limitations Or A Sufficient Motivation To Combine			
	A.		etition Improperly Incorporates By Reference The Declaration.	30
	B.		on '013 Discloses A Trailer Towing Mirror, Not A Spot Mirror	32
	C.	Embo Becau	Cannot Rely On The Adjustable Auxiliary diment of Henion '013 To Meet Claims 18 and 20 use It Does Not Include The Claimed "Backing".	35
		1.	Claim Construction	36
		2.	Henion '013 and/or Yamabe Do Not Disclose Limitation 18[j] or Claim 20.	40
	D.	Hinds	s Obviousness Arguments Rely On Impermissible ight And The Unsupported Opinions Of Its alified "Expert."	41
		1.	SMR's Expert Is Not A POSA.	42
		2.	SMR Fails To Show That Specific Degrees Of Overlap Are Obvious	
		3.	SMR Fails To Show That Claim 20 Is Obvious	46
		4.	SMR Fails To Show That A Field Of View Of Between 25 Degrees And 50 Degrees Is Obvious	48
CONCLUSI	ON	•••••		50
CEDTIEICA	TE O	E CON	ADI LANCE	<i>5</i> 1



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
Allergan, Inc. v. Apotex Inc., 754 F.3d 952 (Fed Cir. 2014)	24
Apple, Inc. v. Contentguard Holdings, Inc., IPR2015-00358, Paper 9 (PTAB July 2, 2015)	32
Ariad Pharm., Inc. v. Eli Lily & Co., 598 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (en banc)	18
Callaway Golf Co. v. Acushnet Co., 576 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	17
Cisco Sys., Inc. v. C-Cation Techs., LLC, IPR2014-00454, Paper 12 (PTAB Aug. 29, 2014)	31, 32
Cultec, Inc. v. Stormtech LLC, IPR2017-00777, Paper 7 (PTAB Aug. 22, 2017)	8
Harari v. Lee, 656 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	15, 16, 17
Hopkins Mfg. Corp. v. Cequent Performance Prods., Inc., IPR2015-00616, Paper 9 (PTAB Aug. 17, 2015)	8, 30
Hospira, Inc. v. Genentech, Inc., IPR2017-00739, Paper 16 (PTAB July 27, 2017)	8
Husky Injection Molding Sys. Ltd. v. Athena Automation Ltd., 838 F.3d 1236 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	17
Johns Manville Corp v. Knauf Insulation Inc., IPR 2015-1633	46
In re Katz, 687 F.2d 450 (C.C.P.A. 1982)	24
Medtronic CoreValve, LLC v. Edwards Lifesciences Corp., 741 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	22. 23



Modine Mfg. Co. v. ITC, 75 F.3d 1545 (Fed. Cir. 1996), abrogated by Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co., Ltd., 234 F.3d 558 (Fed.	
Cir. 2000) (en banc)	19
PPC Broadband, Inc. v. Corning Optical Commc'ns RF, LLC, 815 F.3d 747 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	37
SCHOTT Gemtron Corp. v. SSW Holding Co., IPR2014-00367, Paper No. 62 (PTAB May 26, 2015)	44
Sewall v. Walters, 21 F.3d 411 (Fed. Cir. 1994)	28
In re Smith Int'l, Inc., 871 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	36
In re Suitco Surface, Inc., 603 F.3d 1255 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	36
Telemac Cellular Corp. v. Topp Telecom, Inc., 247 F.3d 1316 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	18
Unified Patents Inc. v. Berman, IPR2016-01571, Paper 10 (PTAB Dec. 14, 2016)	9, 29
WBIP, LLC v. Kohler Co., 829 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	32, 35
Zenon Envtl., Inc. v. U.S. Filter Corp., 506 F.3d 1370 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	17
Statutes	
35 U.S.C. § 102(a)	passim
35 U.S.C. § 102(b)	23
35 U.S.C. § 102(e)	passim
35 U.S.C. § 256(b)	28
35 II S C 8 314(a)	7



DOCKET A L A R M

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.

