

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 IPR2018-00536
Patent No. 8,550,642

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
BACKGROUND	2
I. Magna	2
II. The ‘642 Patent	3
PETITIONER FAILS TO SHOW A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE ANTICIPATED OR OBVIOUS.	7
I. Legal Standards	7
II. The Board Should Deny Institution On Ground 1	7
A. Ground 1 Should Be Denied Because Lynam ‘026 Is Not Prior Art, As The PTO Repeatedly Found.....	7
1. The Prosecution History of the ‘642 Patent.	8
2. SMR Fails To Show Why The Board Should Reconsider The PTO’s Conclusion That The ‘642 Patent Properly Claims Priority To The ‘872 Provisional.	14
a. The ‘666 application incorporates by reference the ‘451 and ‘712 patents in their entirety.....	14
b. The Written Description Of The ‘666 Application Supports The Claims Of The ‘642 Patent.....	17
3. SMR Fails To Show Why The Board Should Reconsider The PTO’s Conclusion That Lynam ‘026 Is Not Prior Art.....	21

B. Ground 1 Should Also Be Denied Because It Raises Inventorship Questions That Are Better Addressed In District Court.....25

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.27

A. The Petition Improperly Incorporates By Reference The Sasian Declaration.28

B. Henion ‘013 Discloses A Trailer Towing Mirror, Not A Blind Spot Mirror.....30

C. SMR Cannot Rely On the Adjustable Auxiliary Embodiment of Henion ‘013 To Meet Claims 7 and 10 Because It Does Not Include The Claimed “Backing Plate.”33

1. Claim Construction.....34

2. Henion ‘013 Does Not Disclose Limitation 7[k] or Claim 10.....38

D. SMR’s Obviousness Arguments Rely On Impermissible Hindsight And The Unsupported Opinions Of Its Unqualified “Expert.”40

1. SMR’s Expert Is Not A POSA.40

2. SMR Fails To Show That Limitation 7[k] Is Obvious.....43

3. SMR Fails To Show That Claim 10 Is Obvious.....44

4. SMR Fails To Show That Claim 11 Is Obvious.....45

CONCLUSION.....46

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE.....47

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Allergan, Inc. v. Apotex Inc.</i> , 754 F.3d 952 (Fed Cir. 2014)	22
<i>Apple, Inc. v. Contentguard Holdings, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00358, Paper 9 (PTAB July 2, 2015)	30
<i>Ariad Pharm., Inc. v. Eli Lilly & Co.</i> , 598 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (en banc)	17
<i>Callaway Golf Co. v. Acushnet Co.</i> , 576 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	17
<i>Cisco Sys., Inc. v. C-Cation Techs., LLC</i> , IPR2014-00454, Paper 12 (PTAB Aug. 29, 2014)	29
<i>Cultec, Inc. v. Stormtech LLC</i> , IPR2017-00777, Paper 7 (PTAB Aug. 22, 2017)	7
<i>Harari v. Lee</i> , 656 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	14, 15, 16
<i>Hopkins Mfg. Corp. v. Cequent Performance Prods., Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00616, Paper 9 (PTAB Aug. 17, 2015)	7, 28
<i>Hospira, Inc. v. Genentech, Inc.</i> , IPR2017-00739, Paper 16 (PTAB July 27, 2017)	8
<i>Husky Injection Molding Sys. Ltd. v. Athena Automation Ltd.</i> , 838 F.3d 1236 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	17
<i>Johns Manville Corp. v. Knauf Insulation Inc.</i> , IPR 2015-01633	45
<i>In re Katz</i> , 687 F.2d 450 (C.C.P.A. 1982)	22

<i>Modine Mfg. Co. v. ITC</i> , 75 F.3d 1545 (Fed. Cir. 1996), <i>abrogated by Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co., Ltd.</i> , 234 F.3d 558 (Fed. Cir. 2000) (en banc)	18
<i>PPC Broadband, Inc. v. Corning Optical Commc'ns RF, LLC</i> , 815 F.3d 747 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	35
<i>SCHOTT Gemtron Corp. v. SSW Holding Co.</i> , IPR2014-00367, Paper No. 62 (PTAB May 26, 2015)	42
<i>Sewall v. Walters</i> , 21 F.3d 411 (Fed. Cir. 1994)	26
<i>In re Smith Int'l, Inc.</i> , 871 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	35
<i>In re Suitco Surface, Inc.</i> , 603 F.3d 1255 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	34
<i>Telemac Cellular Corp. v. Topp Telecom, Inc.</i> , 247 F.3d 1316 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	18
<i>Unified Patents Inc. v. Berman</i> , IPR2016-01571, Paper 10 (PTAB Dec. 14, 2016)	8, 27
<i>WBIP, LLC v. Kohler Co.</i> , 829 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	30, 33
<i>Zenon Envtl., Inc. v. U.S. Filter Corp.</i> , 506 F.3d 1370 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	16
Statutes	
35 U.S.C. § 102(a)	<i>passim</i>
35 U.S.C. § 102(b)	21
35 U.S.C. § 102(e)	<i>passim</i>
35 U.S.C. § 256(b)	26
35 U.S.C. § 314(a)	7

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.