

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

YITA LLC,  
Petitioner,

v.

MACNEIL IP LLC,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case No. IPR2020-01139  
Patent No. 8,382,186

---

**PATENT OWNER RESPONSE**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b>Page</b>
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. THE '186 PATENT .....	4
III. EXPERT TESTIMONY .....	6
IV. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART .....	7
V. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	7
A. The preamble of Claim 1 is limiting. ....	8
B. The Board should construe “closely conforming” to require close conformance between a panel surface and a corresponding surface of a vehicle foot well wall. ....	9
C. The Board should reject Petitioner’s construction of “thickness ... being substantially uniform throughout the tray.” .....	11
VI. THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE NOVEL AND NOT OBVIOUS.....	12
A. The Rabbe-Yung-Gruenwald combination does not teach every element of the claims.....	12
1. The combination does not teach a vehicle floor tray thermoformed from a sheet of thermoplastic polymeric material.....	13
a. Yung’s intrinsic record reveals that Yung’s flexible, universal floor mat was compression molded, not thermoformed, using foamed materials.....	14
b. A POSITA would immediately recognize that Yung’s mat is not thermoformable.....	16
c. Gruenwald does not disclose the thermoformed vehicle floor tray absent from Rabbe and Yung.....	18

2.	Petitioner’s translator concedes he mistranslated the exact purported disclosure of Rabbe on which the Board relied to institute.....	19
a.	It is not the “sides” of the tray where Rabbe discloses conformance, it is at the rims on the upper perimeter of the tray. ....	19
b.	Petitioner’s translation of Rabbe does not disclose close conformance of the sides.....	22
c.	Petitioner’s Rabbe translation suffers from another material flaw. ....	24
d.	PO can now prove that the sides of Rabbe’s tray did not conform at all to the sides of the foot well of a Lada Niva 4x4, let alone “perfectly conform.” .....	27
e.	The Rabbe-Yung-Gruenwald combination does not disclose the claimed close conformance.....	42
3.	The relied-upon references do not teach the claimed integrally formed panels. ....	42
a.	Rabbe discloses an assembly, not an integrally formed tray.....	42
b.	The combination of Rabbe, Yung, and Gruenwald does not disclose the claimed integrally formed panels. ....	46
B.	A POSITA would not have combined Rabbe, Yung, and Gruenwald, and could not have done so with a reasonable expectation of success. ....	48
1.	Even if the relied-upon references were combined, there is no reasonable expectation of success to achieve the claimed invention.....	48
a.	PO invented, and patented, a mold-making method that enabled achievement of close conformance.....	49

b.	Petitioner’s arguments regarding reasonable expectation of success are completely unsupported.....	50
2.	A POSITA would not have been motivated to thermoform Rabbe’s tray based on Yung and Gruenwald. ....	53
a.	Yung would have led a POSITA to use compression molding.....	54
b.	A POSITA would have known that Yung’s foamed thermoplastic materials are not suitable for Rabbe’s tray or thermoforming. ....	55
i.	Thermoplastics materially differ from Rabbe’s thermoset rubber.....	55
ii.	Yung’s foamed materials could not be used to thermoform Rabbe’s tray. ....	56
iii.	Even if Yung described a sheet of PE, a POSITA would not have been led to thermoforming.....	58
iv.	A POSITA would not be motivated to look to Yung’s middle layer in isolation.....	59
3.	Yung teaches away from thermoforming a floor tray that closely conforms. ....	60
4.	Gruenwald teaches away from thermoforming Rabbe’s floor tray as claimed.....	62
5.	Petitioner has not identified a realistic motivation to combine.....	67
a.	Thermoforming Rabbe’s trays would not be cost-effective and would result in significant material waste. ....	67
b.	Petitioner’s other motivation to combine arguments fail. ....	68

C.	The objective evidence weighs heavily in favor of nonobviousness. ....	69
1.	WeatherTech’s® products embody the claimed invention. ....	70
2.	PO is entitled to a presumption of nexus. ....	74
3.	The invention solved a long-felt need for a floor tray that fits well.....	75
4.	The claimed invention’s commercial success is extraordinary. ....	77
5.	The industry praised WeatherTech’s® floor trays for claimed features. ....	78
6.	Multiple competitors have licensed PO’s vehicle floor tray patents, including the ’186 Patent.....	79
VII.	CONCLUSION.....	80

# 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.