

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

YITA LLC,
Petitioner

v.

MACNEIL IP LLC,
Patent Owner

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

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

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. THE PRIOR-ART COMBINATION DISCLOSES EVERY CLAIM ELEMENT. 2

 A. Rabbe discloses the conformance limitations. 3

 1. Both Rabbe translations disclose the conformance limitations. 3

 2. MacNeil’s comparisons of Rabbe’s patent drawings to the Lada Niva are irrelevant. 7

 B. The prior art combination discloses a thermoformed floor tray with integrally formed panels..... 9

III. MACNEIL’S NO-MOTIVATION-TO-COMBINE ARGUMENTS FAIL. .. 9

 A. MacNeil’s arguments use an improper bodily incorporation approach, ignore background knowledge, and misapply teaching away. 9

 B. MacNeil’s technical assertions are inaccurate.12

 1. Rabbe is not limited to thermosets; Rabbe discloses materials useful in thermoforming.....13

 2. Yung is not limited to compression molding.....16

 a) Foam sheets were regularly thermoformed without losing their waterproof characteristic.....16

 b) Laminate products were regularly thermoformed.....18

 c) Yung’s embossing suggests thermoforming.....19

 d) Yang’s mention of compression molding confirms that Yung is not intended to be limited to compression molding.20

 3. Yung’s materials would have provided the appropriate amount of elasticity and abrasion resistance.21

 C. The Petition showed multiple motivations to combine, and MacNeil has not overcome any of them.....22

IV. A POSA WOULD HAVE HAD A REASONABLE EXPECTATION OF SUCCESS.....23

 A. Portable coordinate measuring machines were readily available and commonly used in the automobile industry.23

 B. Computer-aided design software was readily available and commonly used for creating accurate molds from scan data.24

V. MACNEIL’S SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS EVIDENCE IS GROSSLY INSUFFICIENT.....25

- A. MacNeil did not show a nexus.25
- B. MacNeil falls short of establishing commercial success.....26
- C. MacNeil’s industry praise evidence is insufficient.27
- D. MacNeil’s own evidence belies its assertion of a long-felt need.....27
- E. MacNeil’s licensing evidence is insufficient.27

VI. CONCLUSION28

PETITIONER'S UPDATED EXHIBIT LIST

Exhibit No.	Description
1001	U.S. Patent No. 8,382,186 to MacNeil et al., issued February 26, 2013 (“186 Patent”)
1002	File History of U.S. Patent No. 8,382,186 (“186 Patent File History”)
1003	Declaration of Paul E. Koch, Ph.D.
1004	U.S. Patent No. 7,444,748 to MacNeil, issued November 4, 2008 (“MacNeil”)
1005	French Patent Application Pre-Grant Publication No. 2547252 to Rabbe, published December 14, 1984, with attached certified English-language translation (“Rabbe”)
1006	U.S. Patent Application Pre-Grant Publication No. 2002/0045029 A1 to Yung, published April 18, 2002 (“Yung”)
1007	Gruenwald, G., <i>Thermoforming: A Plastics Processing Guide</i> , CRC Press, 2nd Edition, 1998 (“Gruenwald”)
1008	Throne, J., <i>Technology of Thermoforming</i> , Hanser, 1996 (“Throne I”)
1009	Throne, J., <i>Understanding Thermoforming</i> , Hanser, 2nd Edition, 2008 (“Throne II”)
1010	U.S. Patent No. 2,057,873 to Atwood, issued October 20, 1936 (“Atwood”)
1011	U.S. Patent No. 2,657,948 to Sturtevant, issued November 3, 1953 (“Sturtevant”)
1012	U.S. Patent No. 6,793,872 to Buss, issued September 21, 2004 (“Buss”)
1013	U.S. Patent No. 6,361,099 to McIntosh, issued March 26, 2002 (“McIntosh”)
1014	U.S. Patent No. 4,568,581 to Peoples, issued February 4, 1986 (“Peoples”)
1015	U.S. Patent No. 5,298,319 to Donahue, issued March 29, 1994 (“Donahue”)
1016	DOW HDPE DGDA-5004 NT 7 Data Sheet, published October 10, 2003
1017	Black Armor Web Advertisement
1018	Husky Liner Advertisement, August 24, 2000

Exhibit No.	Description
1019	U.S. Patent No. 4,420,180 to Dupont et al., issued December 13, 1983 (“Dupont”)
1020	U.S. Patent No. 4,280,729 to Morawski, issued July 28, 1981 (“Morawski”)
1021	European Patent Application Publication No. 0379630 to Sagona, published August 1, 1990 (“Sagona”)
1022	File History of U.S. Patent No. 8,267,459 (“’459 Prosecution History”)
1023	U.S. Patent No. 3,390,912 to Stata, issued July 2, 1968 (“Stata”)
1024	German Patent Application Publication No. 4000877 to Weitbrecht et al., published July 18, 1991
1025	U.S. Patent No. 6,027,782 to Sherman, issued February 22, 2000
1026	Japanese Patent Application No. H11-268570 to Suzuki, published October 5, 1999, with attached certified English-language translation (“Suzuki”)
1027	Word Comparison of the ’703 Application as filed to the ’899 Application as filed
1028	U.S. Patent No. 8,833,834 to MacNeil et al., issued September 16, 2014 (“’834 Patent”)
1029	Plastic Extrusion Tolerance Guide
1030	Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, Eleventh Edition, 2003
1031	Oxford Compact English Dictionary, First Edition, 2000
1032	Curriculum Vitae of Paul E. Koch, Ph.D. (“Koch CV”)
1033	Declaration of Sylvia Hall-Ellis, Ph.D. (“Hall-Ellis Decl.”)
1034	U.S. Patent No. 8,910,995 to MacNeil et al. (“’995 Patent”)
1035	U.S. Patent No. 6,058,618 to Hemmelgarn et al. (“Hemmelgarn”)
1036	Webster’s Third New International Dictionary, 1961
1037	Transcript of Teleconference between Board and Parties, November 13, 2020
1038	Communications between MacNeil and Yita regarding the proposed modifications to the protective order
1039	Boston Patent Law Association Newsletter, Vol. 41 Issue 3 (Summer 2010)”

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.