

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re *Inter Partes* Review of:)
U.S. Patent No. 8,550,642)
Issued: October 8, 2013)
Application No.: 13/590,854)

For: **Exterior Rearview Mirror Assembly**

FILED VIA E2E

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW
OF U.S. PATENT NO. 8,550,642**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction.....1

II. Mandatory Notices under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8.....2

 A. Real Parties-In-Interest.....2

 B. Related Matters.....3

 C. Grounds For Standing3

 D. Lead And Backup Counsel And Service Information3

 E. Fee For *Inter Partes* Review4

III. Identification Of Challenges (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(B)).....4

IV. Background.....5

 A. The '642 Patent (Ex. 1001)5

 B. The Person Of Ordinary Skill In The Art (“POSA”).....6

 C. Claim Construction6

V. Magna’s ’026 Publication Is Prior Art Under §§ 102(a), (e)7

VI. The ’642 Patent Is Entitled To An Effective Filing Date No Earlier Than August 5, 2010, So The ’026 Publication Is Also § 102(b) Prior Art.....7

 A. Background Law8

 B. Background Facts.....9

 1. Magna previously prosecuted, and abandoned, a two-mirror design in the ’712 patent family9

 2. Magna impermissibly used the ’843 patent’s application to revive prosecution of the abandoned ’712 patent family10

3.	Magna’s defective attempt to antedate the prior art and effectively claim priority to the ’712 patent family.....	13
4.	The examiner legally erred by finding the declaration sufficient to antedate the prior-art ’026 publication	18
C.	The ’642 Patent Is Not Entitled To The Filing Date Of Earlier-Filed Applications Because The Relevant Portions Of The ’451 And ’712 Patents Were Not Incorporated By Reference.....	20
D.	The ’642 Patent’s Claims Are Not Supported By The ’666 Application Regardless Of The Extent Of Incorporation By Reference.....	24
1.	The written description requirement in 35 U.S.C. § 120.....	24
2.	The ’666 application lacks written description support for the ’642 patent’s claims even if the ’712 and ’451 patents were incorporated in their entireties	25
VII.	Ground 1: Claims 1-11 Are Anticipated By The ’026 Publication (Ex. 1011).....	33
A.	Independent Claim 1	33
1.	Preamble, [a] bracket, [b] casing	34
2.	[c], [d], [e] mirrors and backing plate	36
3.	[f], [g] demarcation	38
4.	[h] Injection Molding.....	39
5.	[i] Tilted downwardly	39
B.	Independent Claim 4	39
1.	All elements except [g] addressed in Claim 1	39
2.	4[g] Flat glass substrate with metallic coating	40
C.	Independent Claim 7	40
1.	All but elements [e] addressed in Claim 4.....	40

2.	[e] Spotting mirror angled.....	41
D.	Claims 2, 5, 8: Forward spotting mirror.....	41
E.	Claim 3, 6, 9: rearward spotting mirror.....	42
F.	Claim 10 - second field of view	43
G.	Claim 11 - spotting mirror angle	43
VIII.	Ground 2: Claims 7, 10, and 11 Would have Been Obvious Over Henion (Ex. 1012), Platzer (Ex. 1013), Catlin (Ex. 1034), and Silvestre (Ex. 1037)	44
A.	Overview	44
B.	The Asserted Prior Art	45
1.	International Pub. No. WO 2001/44013 (“Henion”, Ex. 1012)	45
2.	International Pub. No. WO 2001/81956 (“Platzer,” Ex. 1013)	45
3.	U.S. Pat. No. 5,721,646 (“Catlin”, Ex. 1034).....	47
4.	FR 2650982 (“Silvestre” [certified translation] (Ex. 1037)).....	47
C.	Motivation to Combine	47
D.	Independent Claim 7	48
1.	Preamble.....	48
2.	[a] Bracket.....	49
3.	[b] Mirror Casing	50
4.	[c] Primary Mirror.....	52
5.	[d] Spotting Mirror.....	53
6.	[e] Angled	54

Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of USP 8,550,642

7. [f] Backing Plate55

8. [g], [i] Divider and demarcation55

9. [h] Reflective Element Substrates.....56

10. [j] Injection molding57

11. [k] About 0.75 to 5 Degrees.....59

E. Claim 10 – Outwardly and Downwardly63

F. Claim 11 - spotting mirror angle65

IX. Secondary Considerations68

X. Conclusion69

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.