

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

FORD MOTOR COMPANY,

Petitioner,

v.

MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY,

Patent Owner; and

ETHANOL BOOSTING SYSTEMS, LLC,

Exclusive Licensee

---

Case: IPR 2019-01400  
Patent 8,069,839

**PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

**Table of Contents**

I. INTRODUCTION .....6

A. U.S. Patent No. 8,069,839 .....6

B. References Relied Upon in the Petition and Proposed Grounds for Institution.....8

1. Unexamined Japanese Patent Application Publication No. JPS63230920 to Takehiko Kiyota (“Takehiko”) (Ex. 1029) .....8

2. U.S. Patent No. 7,188,607 (“Kobayashi”) (Ex. 1005).....9

3. Japanese Patent Application Publication No. JP2002227697 (“Kinjiro”) (Ex. 1008).....11

4. German Patent Application No. DE19853799 (“Rubbert”) (Ex. 1007). .....12

5. Bosch Automotive Handbook (3<sup>rd</sup> Ed.) (“Bosch”) (Ex. 1031). .....13

C. Proposed grounds for institution .....13

II. THE PETITION DOES NOT ESTABLISH A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT ANY OF CLAIMS 1 – 8 OF THE ’839 PATENT IS UNPATENTABLE .....13

A. Ground 1 should be denied for failure to establish a reasonable likelihood that Takehiko renders Claims 1, 2 and 5-8 unpatentable as anticipated.....14

1. Claims 1, 2 and 5-8; The Petitioner fails to show that Takehiko inherently discloses that “above a selected torque value the ratio of fuel that is directly injected to fuel that is port injected increases.” .....14

2. Claims 1, 2 and 5-8; The Petitioner fails to show that Takehiko discloses “a spark ignition engine . . . operated at a substantially stoichiometric fuel/air ratio.” .....18

B.	Ground 2 should be denied for failure to establish a reasonable likelihood that Takehiko and Kobayashi render Claims 3 and 4 unpatentable.....	21
1.	Claims 3 and 4; The Petitioner fails to show that the combination of Takehiko and Kobayashi teaches or suggests “a spark ignition engine . . . wherein above a selected torque value the ratio of fuel that is directly injected to fuel that is port injected increases... operated at a substantially stoichiometric fuel/air ratio.”.....	21
2.	Claims 3 and 4; The Petitioner fails to show that the combination of Takehiko and Kobayashi teaches or suggests “where the ratio of directly injected fuel is determined by a signal from a knock detector.”.....	22
3.	Claims 3 and 4; Petitioner fails completely to analyze the limitations of dependent Claim 2, from which Claims 3 and 4 depend .....	24
C.	Ground 3 should be denied for failure to establish a reasonable likelihood that Kinjiro renders Claims 1-4, 6 and 7 unpatentable as anticipated.....	26
1.	The Petitioner fails to show that Kinjiro discloses “wherein above a selected torque value the ratio of fuel that is directly injected to fuel that is port injected increases.” .....	26
D.	Ground 4 should be denied for failure to establish a reasonable likelihood that Kinjiro and Kobayashi render Claim 5 unpatentable.....	31
E.	Ground 5 should be denied for failure to establish a reasonable likelihood that Rubbert and Bosch render Claims 1-5 and 8 unpatentable.....	32
1.	Claims 1-5 and 8; The Petitioner fails to show that the combination of Rubbert and Bosch teach or suggest “a spark ignition engine . . . operated at a substantially stoichiometric fuel/air ratio.” .....	32

III. CONCLUSION.....35

**Table of Authorities**

**Cases**

*CFTM, Inc. v. YieldUp Int’l Corp.*, 349 F.3d 1333, 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2003) .....22

*Connell v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.*, 722 F.2d 1542, 1548 (Fed. Cir. 1983) .....26

*Cont’l Can Co. USA, Inc. v. Monsanto Co.*, 948 F.2d 1264, 1269 (Fed. Cir. 1991)  
.....15

*Guangdong Alison Hi-Tech Co. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n*, 936 F.3d 1353, 1364 (Fed.  
Cir. 2019) ..... 15, 16, 27, 30

*Harmonic Inc. v. Avid Tech., Inc.*, 815 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2016)..... 13, 20

*In re Oelrich*, 666 F.2d 578, 581 (C.C.P.A. 1981) .....15

*Therasense, Inc. v. Becton, Dickinson and Co.*, 593 F.3d 1325, 1332 (Fed. Cir.  
2010) .....26

**Statutes**

35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(3)..... 13, 20

35 U.S.C. § 313 .....6

**Rules**

37 C.F.R. § 42.107 .....6

37 C.F.R. § 42.24 .....38

37 C.F.R. § 42.24(b)(1).....38

37 C.F.R. §§ 42.6(e).....39

# 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.