

Filed on behalf of: Jaguar Land Rover Limited

Entered: November 25, 2019

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

BENTLEY MOTORS LIMITED
and
BENTLEY MOTORS, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

JAGUAR LAND ROVER LIMITED,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2019-01502
Patent RE46828

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. Introduction.....	1
II. Background.....	3
A. Overview of the '828 patent's award-winning technology.....	3
B. Prosecution History: The Examiner allowed the challenged claims over art similar to the Porsche 959 references.....	9
C. Procedural History.....	12
D. Person of Ordinary Skill In the Art	14
III. Petitioners Failed To Show A Likelihood Of Prevailing On The Merits	14
A. The Porsche 959 references do not teach the claimed vehicle control system that controls a plurality of subsystems	14
1. The '828 patent defines the differential subsystem as a single subsystem	16
2. Figures 5 and 6 do not describe a vehicle's center and rear differentials as two distinct subsystems.....	17
3. The Porsche 959's differential system is the same as every other differential system described in the prior art, such as Shiraishi, already considered by the Examiner.....	20
B. The Porsche 959 references do not teach both "driving modes" and "subsystem configuration modes"	22
C. Petitioners fail to address known objective indicia of non-obviousness that demonstrate patentability.....	24
D. Petitioners fail to show that their primary references are prior art printed publications	30
1. Petitioners fail to allege, much less show, that the Porsche 959 manual was publicly available	31
2. Petitioners fail to allege, much less show, that the Porsche ATZ articles were publicly available	38

IV.	The Petition Warrants Discretionary Denial Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 314(a) and 325(d)	42
A.	The Petition warrants denial under § 325(d).....	43
1.	B-D Factor 1: There are no material differences between the Porsche 959 art and Shiraishi.....	44
2.	B-D Factor 2: The Porsche 959 references are cumulative of Shiraishi	45
3.	B-D Factor 3: The Examiner closely evaluated Shiraishi, using it as a basis for rejections	46
4.	B-D Factor 4: Petitioners make the same arguments here already rejected by the Examiner when considering Shiraishi	46
5.	B-D Factor 5: Petitioners failed to address the Examiner's analysis of Shiraishi.....	47
6.	B-D Factor 6: Petitioners have presented no reasons to reconsider the Examiner's conclusions.....	48
B.	The Petition warrants denial under § 314(a).....	48
V.	Conclusion	51

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**Page(s)****CASES**

<i>Acceleration Bay, LLC v. Activision Blizzard Inc.</i> , 908 F.3d 765 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	39
<i>Alice Corp. v. CLS Bank Int'l</i> , 523 U.S. 209 (2014).....	13
<i>ASM IP Holding B.V. v. Kokusai Elec. Corp.</i> , IPR2019-00369, Paper 8 (June 27, 2019).....	37
<i>Becton, Dickinson & Co. v. B. Braun Melsungen AG</i> , IPR2017-01586, Paper 8 (Dec. 15, 2017).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Becton, Dickinson & Co. v. Tyco Healthcare Grp.</i> , 616 F.3d 1249 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	23
<i>Blue Calypso, LLC v. Groupon, Inc.</i> , 815 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	30, 31, 32, 33, 38
<i>In re Cronyn</i> , 890 F.2d 1158 (Fed. Cir. 1989)	32, 38, 40
<i>DeSilva v. DiLeonardi</i> , 181 F.3d 865 (7th Cir. 1999)	34
<i>E-One, Inc. v. OshKosh Corp.</i> , IPR2019-00162, Paper 16 (June 5, 2019).....	42
<i>Gaus v. Conair Corp.</i> , 363 F.3d 1284 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	23
<i>Goss Int'l Americas, Inc. v. Graphic Mgmt. Assocs., Inc.</i> , 739 F. Supp. 2d 1089 (N.D. Ill. 2010).....	37
<i>Gross v. Town of Cicero</i> , 619 F.3d 697 (7th Cir. 2010)	34
<i>Harmonic Inc. v. Avid Tech, Inc.</i> , 815 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	41

<i>HTC Corp. v. Cellular Commc'ns Equip., LLC</i> , 701 F. App'x 978 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	23
<i>Int'l Bus. Machs. Corp. v. Intellectual Ventures II LLC</i> , IPR2015-01323, Paper 38 (Sept. 27, 2016).....	41
<i>Intel Corp. v. Alacritech, Inc.</i> , IPR2017-01395, Paper 8 (Nov. 22, 2017)	41
<i>In re Lister</i> , 583 F.3d 1307 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	38
<i>Next Caller v. TRUSTID, Inc.</i> IPR2019-00961, -00962, Paper 10 (Oct. 16, 2019).....	42, 49
<i>NHK Spring Co. v. Intri-Plex Techs., Inc.</i> , IPR2018-00752, Paper 8 (Sept. 12, 2018).....	42, 48, 49
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc)	50
<i>Samsung Elecs. Co. v. Infobridge Pte. Ltd.</i> , 929 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2019)	32
<i>Stryker Corp. & HowMedica Osteonics Corp. v. KFX Med., LLC</i> , IPR2019-00817, Paper 10 (Sept. 16, 2019).....	30, 42
<i>Wasica Fin. GmbH v. Continental Automotive Sys., Inc.</i> , 853 F.3d 1272 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	30

STATUTES

35 U.S.C. § 102	30
35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(3).....	30, 39
35 U.S.C. § 314(a)	2, 42, 48
35 U.S.C. § 325(d)	2, 42, 43, 49

REGULATIONS

37 C.F.R. § 1.68	40, 41
------------------------	--------

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.