

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 No. IPR2020-00013

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

PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

Table of Contents

I. INTRODUCTION6

A. U.S. Patent No. 8,069,8396

B. References Relied Upon in the Petition and Proposed Grounds for Institution.....10

1. U.S. Patent No. 7,225,787 (“Bromberg”) (Ex. 1140).....10

2. U.S. Patent No. 7,694,666 (“Lewis”) (Ex. 1141).11

C. Proposed grounds of institution12

II. THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE THE PREMISE OF PETITIONER’S WRITTEN DESCRIPTION ARGUMENT IS THAT “SINGLE FUEL” SYSTEMS FALL WITHIN THE SCOPE OF THE CLAIMS AS CONSTRUED, AND THE PETITION FAILS TO IDENTIFY THE CLAIM TERMS AND CLAIM CONSTRUCTIONS THAT PETITIONER KNOWS TO BE ESSENTIAL TO THE BOARD’S MAKING THIS DETERMINATION.....12

A. Claim construction is required by the rules, and is also a necessary predicate to an analysis of written description13

B. Petitioner has knowingly failed to “identify” let alone present claim constructions of key claim terms.....14

C. Petitioner’s statement that it “adopts” unspecified aspects of Patent Owner’s arguments does not satisfy its claim construction burden.19

1. Petitioner fails to specify what aspects of Patent Owner’s alleged “construction” it is adopting.....19

2. Petitioner disagrees with the “construction” it purports to adopt.....20

D. The Board should deny institution because Petitioner has made a strategic decision not to provide this Board with required guidance on claim construction in order to advance conflicting arguments in district court.....22

III. BY FAILING TO ENGAGE IN ANY ANALYSIS OF CLAIM LANGUAGE OR ANY ANALYSIS OF THE CLAIMS, PETITIONER UTTERLY FAILS TO MEET ITS BURDEN IN SHOWING LACK OF ENTITLEMENT TO THE PRIORITY CLAIM.24

IV. THIS PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE, IRRESPECTIVE OF WHETHER “SINGLE FUEL” SYSTEMS FALL WITHIN THE SCOPE OF THE CLAIMS, PETITIONER HAS FAILED TO SHOW THAT THE IDENTITY OF THE “FUEL” RECITED IN THE SYSTEMS CLAIMS OF THE PATENT IS A CLAIM LIMITATION HAVING PATENTABLE WEIGHT.26

V. PETITIONER’S ARGUMENT THAT THE CLAIMS NEED TO INCLUDE THE ADVANTAGES OF METHODS OF USING THE CLAIMED “ENGINE” ARE MISPLACED: A CLAIMED “ENGINE” NEED NOT PROVIDE ADVANTAGES TAUGHT IN THE SPECIFICATION THAT RESULT FROM METHODS OF ITS USE.32

VI. THE COMMON SPECIFICATION DOES NOT DISPARAGE USES OF THE CLAIMED ENGINES WITH GASOLINE AS BOTH THE DIRECTLY INJECTED AND PORT INJECTED FUEL, NOR USE OF A COMBINATION OF THE CLAIMED ENGINES WITH FUEL TANKS CONTAINING A “SINGLE FUEL” AS ADDITIONAL SYSTEM COMPONENTS.....36

VII. EACH OF THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS IS ENTITLED TO THE PRIORITY DATE OF THE PARENT APPLICATION.....43

VIII. FOR THE FOREGOING REASONS, NONE OF THE CITED REFERENCES ARE PRIOR ART TO THE ’839 PATENT, AND BOTH GROUNDS OF INSTITUTION SHOULD BE DENIED.....48

Table of Authorities

Cases

Amazon.com, Inc. v. Barnesandnoble.com, Inc., 239 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2001)..18

Amgen Inc. v. Hoechst Marion Roussel, Inc., 314 F.3d 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2003)33

Application of Goffe, 542 F.2d 564 (C.C.P.A. 1976)37

Application of Otto, 312 F.2d 937 (CCPA, 1963)29

C.R. Bard, Inc. v. M3 Systems, Inc., 157 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 1998)14

Cont'l Circuits LLC v. Intel Corp., 915 F.3d 788 (Fed. Cir. 2019)..... 40, 41

Crown Packaging Technology, Inc. v. Ball Metal Beverage Container Corp., 635 F.3d 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....33

Dynamic Drinkware, LLC v. Nat'l Graphics, Inc., 800 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2015)25

Ex Parte Bergdoll, No. 2009-011825 (BPAI, Mar. 23, 2011).....28

Harmonic Inc. v. Avid Tech., Inc., 815 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2016)..... 12, 14

Hologic, Inc. v. Enzo Life Sciences, Inc., IPR 2018-00019 (PTAB Apr. 18, 2018)21

i4i Ltd. P'Ship v. Microsoft Corp., 598 F.3d 831 (Fed. Cir. 2010)41

In re Wright, 866 F.2d 422 (Fed. Cir. 1989).....25

Intellectual Ventures I LLC v. Motorola Mobility LLC, 870 F. 3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2017)13

Koninklijke Philips Elecs. N.V. v. Cardiac Sci. Operating Co., 590 F.3d 1326 (Fed. Cir. 2010)14

Lochner Technologies, LLC v. Vizio, Inc., 567 Fed. App'x. 931 (Fed. Cir. 2014) .31

Lucent Techs., Inc. v. Gateway, Inc., 543 F.3d 710 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....25

Orthopediatrics Corp. v. K2M, Inc., Case IPR2018-01548 (PTAB, Mar 1, 2019)21,
22

Purdue Pharma L.P. v. Faulding Inc., 230 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2000) 26, 39

Ralston Purina Co. v. Far-Mar-Co, Inc., 772 F.2d 1570 (Fed. Cir. 1985)25

Spine Sols., Inc. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek USA, Inc., 620 F.3d 1305 (Fed. Cir.
2010) 26, 27

Stiftung v. Renishaw PLC, 945 F.2d 1173 (Fed. Cir. 1991)35

Unwired Planet, LLC v. Apple Inc., 829 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 2016)40

Waldemar Link GmbH & Co. v. Osteonics Corp., 32 F.3d 556 (Fed.Cir.1994)26

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(3).....12

35 U.S.C. § 3136

Rules

37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(3)..... 13, 16, 18, 22

37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(4)..... 13, 16, 18, 22

37 C.F.R. § 42.1076

37 C.F.R. § 42.2451

37 C.F.R. § 42.24(b)(1).....51

37 C.F.R. §§ 42.6(e).....52

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.