

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.

IPR2020-00534

U.S. Design Patent No. D797,625

**PETITIONERS' REPLY
TO PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. LEGAL BACKGROUND.....3

A. Anticipation.....3

B. Obviousness.....3

II. ARGUMENT.....5

A. The Ordinary Observer Would Have Found Lian’s Disclosed Fender Design Substantially the Same as the Claimed Design, and a DOSA Would Have Found Lian Alone Obviates the Claimed Design.....5

1. Neither GM, nor its declarant, addressed the overall visual similarity of Lian and the ’625 Patent or weighed those similarities against the differences.....5

2. GM’s purported differences fail to distinguish Lian from the ’625 Patent for either anticipation or obviousness.....10

3. GM’s “crowded field” theory lacks support in fact and law. ...23

B. In the Alternative, the Tucson Suggests Changes that Would Render Lian Virtually Identical to the Claimed Design in Every Respect.....27

C. LKQ’s Expert Declarant Testimony is Well-Supported, Whereas GM’s was Conclusory and Entitled No Weight.31

1. LKQ’s experts declarations were appropriately prepared, and accurately reflect the experts’ opinions.31

2. LKQ’s experts’ declarations are not conclusory or “ipse dixit” declarations, but GM’s expert’s declaration is.32

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

<i>Arminak & Assocs. v. Saint-Gobain Calmar</i> , 424 F. Supp. 2d. 1188 (S.D. Cal. 2006).....	5
<i>Crocs v. International Trade Comm'n</i> , 598 F.3d 1294 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	7
<i>Durling v. Spectrum Furniture Co.</i> , 101 F.3d 100 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....	4
<i>Egyptian Goddess, Inc. v. Swisa, Inc.</i> , 543 F.3d 665 (Fed. Cir. 2008) (<i>en banc</i>)	20, 23, 24
<i>Gorham v. White</i> , 81 U.S. 511 (1871).....	3, 6
<i>Gruber ex rel. Gruber v. Sec. of Health and Human Services</i> , 91 Fed. Cl. 773 (2010)	31
<i>In re Harvey</i> , 12 F.3d 1061 (Fed. Cir. 1993).....	20, 24
<i>In re Nalbandian</i> , 661 F.2d 1214, 1217-18 (C.C.P.A. 1981).....	4, 13
<i>In re Rosen</i> , 673 F.2d 388 (CCPA 1982)	4
<i>Int'l Seaway v. Walgreens</i> , 589 F.3d 1233 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	3
<i>Jore Corp. v. Kouvato, Inc.</i> , 117 Fed.Appx. 761 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	4, 13
<i>L.A. Gear, Inc. v. Thom McAn Shoe Co.</i> , 988 F.2d 1117 (Fed. Cir. 1993).....	27
<i>MRC Innovations v. Hunter Mfg., LLP</i> , 747 F.3d 1326 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	4, 13, 27

IPR2020-00534

D797,625 S

Pac. Coast Marine Windshields v. Malibu Boats,
739 F.3d 694 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....3

Premier Gem Corp. v. Wing Yee Gems & Jewelry Limited,
IPR2016-00434, Paper 9 (PTAB Jul. 5, 2016)27

Smith v. Whitman Saddle Co.,
148 U.S. 674 (1893).....3

Titan Tire Corp. v. Case New Holland, Inc.,
566 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....4

TQ Delta v. Cisco Systems,
942 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....26

RULES

FED. R. CIV. P. 26(a)(2)(B)31

TABLE OF PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS

Exhibit No.	Description
1001	U.S. Patent No. D797,625 (“the ’625 Patent”).
1002	File History for U.S. Patent No. D797,625.
1004	Declaration of James M. Gandy, dated February 7, 2020.
1004	Declaration of Jason C. Hill, dated February 7, 2020.
1005	2018 Chevrolet Equinox Brochure, http://www.auto-brochures.com/makes/Chevrolet/Equinox/Chevrolet_US%20Equinox_2018.pdf .
1006	U.S. Design Patent No. D773,340 “Lian.”
1007	2010 Hyundai Tucson Brochure, http://www.auto-brochures.com/makes/Hyundai/Tucson/Hyundai_US%20Tucson_2010.pdf , archived on April 2, 2014 by Internet Archive organization’s “Wayback Machine” at https://web.archive.org/web/20140402003154/http://www.auto-brochures.com/makes/Hyundai/Tucson/Hyundai_US%20Tucson_2010.pdf .
1008	Exemplary images of the 2010 Hyundai Tucson Brochure, http://www.auto-brochures.com/makes/Hyundai/Tucson/Hyundai_US%20Tucson_2010.pdf , archived on April 2, 2014 by Internet Archive organization’s “Wayback Machine” at https://web.archive.org/web/20140402003154/http://www.auto-brochures.com/makes/Hyundai/Tucson/Hyundai_US%20Tucson_2010.pdf .
1009	File History of U.S. Patent No. D773,340 “Lian”

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.