

Filed on behalf of: Jaguar Land Rover Limited

Entered: December 11, 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 IPR2019-01539
Patent RE46828

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page(s)</u>
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 Lancer and GB '580	11
C. Procedural History.....	15
D. Person of Ordinary Skill In the Art	17
III. Petitioners Failed To Show A Likelihood Of Prevailing On The Merits	17
A. The proposed combination does not teach a vehicle control system that selects subsystem configuration modes for the respective driver-selected driving surface for a plurality of subsystems.....	18
1. Petitioners rely solely on Lancer for selecting subsystem configuration modes for the respective driver-selected driving surface for a plurality of subsystems.....	19
2. Lancer does not teaches multiple "subsystem configuration modes" for configuring multiple "vehicle subsystems" for respective driving surfaces.....	20
(a) The '828 patent defines the differential subsystem as a single subsystem.....	21
(b) Lancer describes its ACD+AYC system as a single integrated system	24
(c) Lancer's differential system is the differential system described in Shiraishi and already considered and rejected by the Examiner.....	26
3. Lancer does not teach any "subsystem configuration modes"	28
B. Petitioners fail to address known objective indicia of non-obviousness that demonstrate patentability.....	32

C.	Petitioners fail to allege, much less show, that Exhibit 1017 is a prior-art printed publication	38
IV.	The Petition Warrants Discretionary Denial Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 314(a) and 325(d)	41
A.	The Petition warrants denial under § 325(d).....	43
1.	B-D Factor 1: There are no material differences between the combinations of Shiraishi and Fioravanti and Lancer and GB '580	44
2.	B-D Factor 2: Lancer is cumulative of Shiraishi and GB '580 is cumulative of Fioravanti	46
3.	B-D Factor 3: The Examiner closely evaluated the combination of Shiraishi and Fioravanti, using that combination 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 in view of Fioravanti.....	47
5.	B-D Factor 5: Petitioners failed to address the Examiner's analysis of Shiraishi.....	48
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)	49
V.	Conclusion	52

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

<i>Alice Corp. Pty. v. CLS Bank Int'l</i> , 573 U.S. 208 (2014).....	16
<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)	31
<i>Blue Calypso, LLC v. Groupon, Inc.</i> , 815 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	38, 39, 40, 41
<i>E-One, Inc. v. OshKosh Corp.</i> , IPR2019-00162, Paper 16 (June 5, 2019).....	41
<i>Gaus v. Conair Corp.</i> , 363 F.3d 1284 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	31
<i>Harmonic Inc. v. Avid Tech., Inc.</i> , 815 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	29
<i>HTC Corp. v. Cellular Commc'ns Equip., LLC</i> , 701 F. App'x 978 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	31
<i>In re Lister</i> , 583 F.3d 1307 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	39
<i>Next Caller, Inc. 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, 49
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc)	50
<i>SmithKline Beecham Corp. v. Apotex Corp.</i> , 439 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	40

<i>Stryker Corp. & HowMedica Osteonics Corp. v. KFX Med., LLC</i> , IPR2019-00817, Paper 10 (Sept. 16, 2019).....	38, 42
<i>Trs. of Columbia Univ. v. Symantec Corp.</i> , 811 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	21
<i>Wasica Fin. GmbH v. Continental Automotive Sys., Inc.</i> , 853 F.3d 1272 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	39, 40

STATUTES

35 U.S.C.	
§ 101.....	16, 37
§ 102.....	38
§ 312(a)(3)	39, 40
§ 314(a)	2, 41, 42, 49
§ 325(d).....	<i>passim</i>

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.