

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

YITA LLC,
Petitioner

v.

MACNEIL IP LLC,
Patent Owner

Case No. IPR2020-01138
Patent No. 8,382,186

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. FACTUAL BACKGROUND.....1

II. SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT2

III. THE '186 Patent8

 A. Development of the '186 Patent Vehicle Floor Tray8

 B. The '186 Patent Family Priority Chain9

 C. The '186 Patent Technology10

IV. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART19

V. YITA'S OWN EXPERT ADMITS THAT EACH PATENT IN THE
MACNEIL PATENT FAMILY PROVIDES EXPRESS WRITTEN
DESCRIPTION SUPPORT FOR THE CHALLENGED CLAIM
LANGUAGE21

VI. THE PETITION IMPROPERLY CONSTRUES THE CLAIMS TO
MANUFACTURE A PRIORITY CHALLENGE29

 A. Yita Misrepresents the Scope of Claim 1 and Proposes an
 Improper and Unsupported Construction of “Substantially
 Uniform” Thicknesses31

 1. Claim 1 Does Not Require That the Entire Floor Tray
 Have a Substantially Uniform Thickness31

 2. “Substantially Uniform Thicknesses” Does Not Require
 “a Uniformity in Thickness Approaching Complete
 Uniformity”34

 B. When Properly Construed, the “Substantially Uniform
 Thicknesses” of the Specifically Identified Tray Features
 Account for Variations in Thickness That Occur as a Result of
 the Manufacturing Process41

VII. THE SINGLE GROUND OF THE PETITION FAILS BECAUSE
MACNEIL '748 IS NOT PRIOR ART TO THE '186 PATENT49

A.	The '441 Application and All Intervening Applications Provide Written Description Support for the '186 Patent Claims.....	50
1.	All Intervening Applications in the '186 Priority Chain Provide Written Description Support Substantively Identical to the '441 Application Disclosure	53
2.	The '441 Application Provides Written Description Support for the '186 Patent Claims.....	55
B.	The '186 Patent has Priority to the '441 Application	71
C.	MacNeil '748 is Not Prior Art.....	71
VIII.	THE BOARD SHOULD ALSO DENY THE PETITION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 325(D) BECAUSE THE OFFICE HAS ALREADY CONSIDERED THE PETITION'S PRIORITY-BASED WRITTEN DESCRIPTION SUPPORT CHALLENGE.....	72
IX.	CONCLUSION.....	74

EXHIBIT LIST

Exhibit No.	Description
2001	Redline comparing the '441 application with the subsequently filed '703 application
2002	Prosecution history of application 10/976,441 (U.S. Patent No. 7,316,847) filed 10/29/2004
2003	Redline comparing the '441 application with the subsequently filed '203 application
2004	Declaration of James L. Throne, Ph.D.
2005	Redline comparing the '203 application with the subsequently filed '899 application
2006	Reserved
2007	Reserved
2008	Prosecution history of application 11/463,203 (abandoned) filed 8/8/2006
2009	Prosecution history of application 13/595,703 (U.S. Patent No. 8,382,186) filed 8/27/2012
2010	Reserved

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
<i>Anchor Wall Sys. v. Rockwood Retaining Walls</i> , 340 F.3d 1298 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	39
<i>Andrew Corp. v. Gabriel Elecs., Inc.</i> , 847 F.2d 819 (Fed. Cir. 1988)	47
<i>Ariad Pharms., Inc. v. Eli Lilly & Co.</i> , 598 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	52
<i>Blue Coat Sys., Inc. v. Finjan, Inc.</i> , IPR2016-01444, Paper 9 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 16, 2017).....	51
<i>Circle R, Inc. v. Trail King Indus.</i> , 21 Fed. Appx. 894 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	39
<i>Coalition for Affordable Drugs VII LLC v. Pozen Inc.</i> , IPR2015-01344, Paper 22 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 17, 2015)	51
<i>Cordis Corp. v. Medtronic AVE, Inc.</i> , 339 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	39
<i>Crown Packaging Tech., Inc. v. Ball Metal Beverage Container Corp.</i> , 635 F.3d 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	52
<i>Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee</i> , 136 S. Ct. 2131 (2016).....	4
<i>Deering Precision Instruments, L.L.C. v. Vector Distrib. Sys.</i> , 347 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	39
<i>Ecolab, Inc. v. Envirochem, Inc.</i> , 264 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	38
<i>Ex Parte Nobuya Sato & Kazunari Saitou</i> , No. 2012-001276, 2014 WL 1154010 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 20, 2014).....	68

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.