

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

U.S. Patent No. RE46,828

IPR2019-01539

**PETITIONER BENTLEY'S RANKING AND EXPLANATION FOR TWO
PETITIONS CHALLENGING U.S. PATENT NO. RE46,828**

I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to the July 2019 Trial Practice Guide Update (“Update”), Petitioners Bentley Motors Limited and Bentley Motors, Inc. (“Petitioner”) rank, and explain the need to file, two Petitions challenging certain claims in Jaguar Land Rover’s (“Patent Owner”) U.S. Patent No. RE46,828 (“the ’828 patent”).

II. RANKING OF PETITIONS

Petitioner ranks the two Petitions challenging claims 21, 24, 30, 32-34, 37, 39, 41-43, 45, and 46 of the ’828 patent as follows:

Rank	Petition	Grounds
1	IPR2019-01502 (“-1502 Petition”)	Grounds 1-6: Claims 21, 24, 30, 32-34, 37, 39, 41-43, 45, and 46 Obvious over the Porsche 959 Art in combination with various references.
2	IPR2019-01539 (“-1539 Petition”)	Grounds 1-5: Claims 21, 24, 30, 32-34, 37, 39, 41-43, 45, and 46 Obvious over GB ’580 and the Lancer Art in combination with various references.

III. EXPLANATION FOR TWO PETITIONS

A. Disputed Claim Construction and Thirteen Lengthy Claims with Multiple Invalidating References Not Considered by the Examiner

The ’828 patent claims a control system for a conventional motor vehicle with multiple driving modes. The driver selects a driving mode based on the driving surface and the vehicle configures various subsystems in response (e.g.

suspension, transmission, brakes). Within each driving mode the controller configures integrated subsystems to be suitable for different types of terrain.

Patent Owner's reissue declaration stated the "error to be corrected is the omission of a claim directed to a vehicle control system having driving modes that include *at least two off-road modes* and an on-road mode." Ex. 1021, Page 425. (emphasis added). During reissue, Petitioner provided Patent Owner with a copy of one of the primary invalidating references in the -1502 Petition—the Porsche 959 Driver's Manual (Ex. 1003)—yet Patent Owner did not disclose it to the Examiner. The reference discloses driver selection of two off-road driving modes based on the driving surface. Patent Owner asserted, however, that the reference does not disclose two "off-road modes" when properly construed. Petitioner has addressed Patent Owner's presumed claim construction argument in the -1502 Petition.

The -1539 Petition relies on GB '580 in combination with the Lancer Art (Exs. 1017, 1048, 1059, 1060), because the Lancer Art incontrovertibly discloses driver selection of two off-road modes based on two driving surfaces (gravel and snow). GB '580 was the primary reference relied upon in the corresponding European prosecution, which rejected Applicant's application. Patent Owner cited the January 2001 Lancer Press Information (Ex. 1017) to the Patent Office during reissue, but the Examiner never relied on it to reject the claims. Ex. 1021, Pages

423-463, 609-634. Petitioner has located *dated library copies* of automobile magazines published prior to April 2002 in Japan that discuss the Lancer's drivetrain system in detail. Those articles have certified translations into English with publication dates of May 13, 2001 and October 27, 2001. Exs. 1059, 1060.

Patent Owner has asserted infringement of thirteen claims from the '828 patent against Petitioner and real parties in interest. The challenged claims are lengthy and recite limitations that invoke multiple vehicle subsystems. The claims implicate at least the following subsystems: brakes, suspension, transmission, throttle control, and powertrain. Petitioner submits that two petitions are necessary to address each of the implicated vehicle subsystems because none of the prior art combinations relied on in the Petitions was ever considered by the Examiner.

B. “Reasonably Could Have Raised” Estoppel

35 U.S.C. § 315(e)(2) provides:

The petitioner in an inter partes review . . . that results in a final written decision under section 318(a) . . . may not assert in either a civil action arising in whole or in part under section 1338 of title 28 . . . that the claim is invalid on any ground that the petitioner raised *or reasonably could have raised* during that inter parties review. (emphasis added).

Post *SAS Institute*,¹ “reasonably could have raised” estoppel is being aggressively asserted in, and accepted by, the district courts. “[T]he majority of District Courts have determined that IPR estoppel applies to any prior art that

¹ *SAS Institute, Inc. v. Iancu*, 138 S. Ct. 1348 (2018).

reasonably could have been raised, even if not actually raised in the IPR proceeding.” *Novartis Pharms. Corp. v. Par Pharm. Inc.*, Civil Action No. 14-1289-RGA, 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 62489, at *6 (D. Del. April 11, 2019) (citing *Bio-Rad Labs., Inc. v. 10X Genomics, Inc.*, 322 F. Supp. 3d 537, 541 (D. Del. 2018)); see also *Am Tech. Ceramics Corp. v. Presidio Components, Inc.*, 2019 WL 365709, at *2, 4-5 (E.D.N.Y. Jan. 30, 2019); *Milwaukee Electric Tool Corp. v. Snap-On Inc.*, 271 F. Supp. 3d 990, 1029-30 (E.D. Wisc. 2017); *Network-I Techs., Inc. v. Alcatel-Lucent USA, Inc.*, No. 6:11-cv-00492-RWS, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 178857, at *6-7 (E.D. Tex. Oct. 27, 2017); *Sionyx v. Hamamatsu Photonics K.K.*, 330 F. Supp. 3d 574, 601-02 (D. Mass Aug. 30, 2018). Therefore, it is incumbent upon Petitioner to provide the Board with all of the well-grounded bases for finding the challenged ’828 claims unpatentable, or run the risk of being estopped in district court. See *Intex Recreation Corp. v. Team Worldwide Corp.*, IPR2018-00874, Paper 14, 11-12 (PTAB October 29, 2018) (“[Reasonably could have raised estoppel] forces a petitioner to decide the breadth of the challenge to bring given the risk that certain grounds may not be brought in a parallel civil action. Accordingly, the statute contemplates that a petitioner may decide that the appropriate breadth of a challenge warrants multiple petitions.”). Petitioner needs more than the allotted 14,000 words in one petition to present a thorough analysis of each ground in this case. See *id.* at 12 (“This approach [5 petitions] allowed

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.