

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

LKQ Corporation and Keystone Automotive Industries, Inc.,

Petitioners,

v.

GM Global Technology Operations LLC,

Patent Owner.

U.S. Design Patent No. D813,120

Filed: September 19, 2016

Issued: March 20, 2018

Title: Hood Panel of Car

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW
OF U.S. DESIGN PATENT NO. D813,120**

Inter Partes Review No.: *To Be Assigned*

Mail Stop "PATENT BOARD"

Patent Trial and Appeal Board

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	MANDATORY NOTICES UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.8.....	5
III.	FEES UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.103	7
IV.	REQUIREMENTS UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.104.....	7
A.	Grounds for Standing – 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a)	7
B.	Identification of Challenged Claim for Which <i>Inter Partes</i> Review is Requested and Specific Statutory Grounds on which the Challenge is Based – 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(1) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(2)	8
C.	Overview of the '120 Patent and Claim Construction Thereof – 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(3).....	8
1.	The '120 Patent	8
2.	Claim Construction of the '120 Patent	13
D.	How the Challenged Claim is Unpatentable – 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(4).....	22
E.	Evidence Relied Upon to Support the Challenge and the Relevance of the Evidence to the Challenge Raised – 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(5).....	22
V.	APPLICABLE LEGAL STANDARDS.....	24
A.	Anticipation Under 35 U.S.C. § 102.....	24
B.	Designs Found Anticipated Under 35 U.S.C. § 102	28
C.	Obviousness Under 35 U.S.C. § 103.....	31
D.	Designs Found Obvious Under 35 U.S.C. § 103	34
E.	Designer of Ordinary Skill	40
F.	Ordinary Observer	41
VI.	DETAILED EXPLANATION OF THE GROUNDS FOR UNPATENTABILITY	42
A.	Ground 1: The '120 Patent is Anticipated by the Patent Owner's Undisclosed Prior Art the 2014 and 2015 Chevrolet Traverse.	42
B.	Ground 2: In the Alternative, the '120 Patent is Unpatentable as Obvious Over the Prior Art Traverse in View of the Prior Art Sonic.	54

VII. CONCLUSION.....64

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>A&H Mfg. Co., Inc. v. Contempo Card Co.</i> , 576 F. Supp. 894 (D.R.I. 1983)	27
<i>Apple, Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , 678 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	32
<i>Application of Cornwall</i> , 230 F.2d 457 (C.C.P.A. 1956)	26
<i>Blue Calypso, LLC v. Groupon, Inc.</i> , 815 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	25
<i>C & D Zodiac, Inc. v. b/e Aerospace, Inc.</i> , PGR2017-00019, Paper No. 37, 2018 WL 5298631 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 23, 2018) ..	40
<i>Campbell Soup Co. v. Gamon Plus, Inc.</i> , IPR2017-00096, Paper No. 28, 2018 WL 1582298 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 27, 2018). 33, 37, 38, 39	
<i>Contessa Food Prods., Inc. v. Conagra, Inc.</i> , 282 F.3d 1370 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	14
<i>Dobson v. Dornan</i> , 118 U.S. 10 (1886).....	15
<i>Durling v. Spectrum Furniture Co.</i> , 101 F.3d 100 (Fed. Cir. 1996)	32, 55
<i>Egyptian Goddess, Inc. v. Swisa, Inc.</i> , 543 F.3d 665 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	14, 15, 25
<i>Ethicon Endo-Surgery, Inc. v. Covidien, Inc.</i> , 796 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	15, 25, 26
<i>Gorham Co. v. White</i> , 81 U.S. 511 (1871).....	25, 26, 28, 29

<i>High Point Design LLC v. Buyers Direct, Inc.</i> , 730 F.3d 1301 (Fed.Cir.2013)	15
<i>In re Borden</i> , 90 F.3d 1570 (Fed. Cir. 1996)	31, 33, 57
<i>In re Carter</i> , 673 F.2d 1378 (C.C.P.A. 1982)	32
<i>In re Chung</i> , No. 00–1148, 2000 WL 1476861 (Fed. Cir. Oct. 4, 2000)	32
<i>In re Gleave</i> , 560 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	25
<i>In re Lamb</i> , 286 F.2d 610 (C.C.P.A. 1961)	31, 55
<i>In re Nalbandian</i> , 661 F.2d 1214 (C.C.P.A. 1981)	32, 34
<i>In re Rosen</i> , 673 F.2d 388 (C.C.P.A. 1982)	32, 55
<i>In re Stevens</i> , 173 F.2d 1015 (C.C.P.A. 1949)	27
<i>In re Webb</i> , 916 F.2d 1553 (Fed. Cir. 1990)	27, 28
<i>Int’l Seaway Trading Corp. v. Walgreens Corp.</i> , 589 F.3d 1233 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	25, 26, 33, 44
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	33
<i>MRC Innovations, Inc. v. Hunter Mfg., LLP</i> , 747 F.3d 1326 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	passim
<i>Peters v. Active Mfg. Co.</i> , 129 U.S. 530 (1889).....	25

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.