

Appeal No. 2014-1301

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

IN RE CUOZZO SPEED TECHNOLOGIES, LLC

Appeal from the United States Patent and Trademark Office,
Patent Trial and Appeal Board in No. IPR2012-00001.

**BRIEF FOR INTERVENOR – DIRECTOR OF
THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

NATHAN K. KELLEY
Solicitor

SCOTT C. WEIDENFELLER
ROBERT J. MCMANUS
Associate Solicitors

Office of the Solicitor – Mail Stop 8
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
571-272-9035

*Attorneys for the Director of the
United States Patent and
Trademark Office*

June 5, 2014

Representative Claim

10. A speed limit indicator comprising:
- a global positioning system receiver;
 - a display controller connected to said global positioning system receiver, wherein said display controller adjusts a colored display in response to signals from said global positioning system receiver to continuously update the delineation of which speed readings are in violation of the speed limit at a vehicle's present location; and
 - a speedometer *integrally attached* to said colored display.

A58, col. 7, ll. 1-11 (emphasis added to indicate disputed claim term).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION	1
II. STATEMENT OF THE ISSUES	1
A. Decision To Institute	1
B. Final Written Decision	2
III. STATEMENT OF THE CASE	3
A. Introduction	3
B. Statutory And Regulatory Background.....	4
1. Administrative Review Of Issued Patents	4
2. Inter Partes Review Procedures Under The AIA.....	5
3. USPTO Rules For Inter Partes Review	7
C. Factual Background And Procedural History	8
1. The '074 Patent: A Speed Limit Indicator That Indicates Both A Vehicle's Speed And The Pertinent Speed Limit	8
2. The Prior Art: Devices And Methods For Displaying Both Vehicle Speed And The Pertinent Speed Limit	10
a. Aumayer	10
b. Evans.....	11
c. Wendt.....	12
d. Tegethoff.....	13

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

	Page
e. Awada.....	14
3. The Board’s Decision To Institute The Inter Partes Review	15
4. The Board’s Final Written Decision.....	17
a. Claim construction.....	17
b. Obviousness over Aumayer, Evans, and Wendt	20
c. Obviousness over Tegethoff, Awada, Evans, and Wendt.....	23
d. Denial of Cuozzo’s motion to amend.....	25
IV. SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT.....	26
V. ARGUMENT.....	27
A. Standard Of Review	27
B. This Court Lacks Jurisdiction To Review The Director’s Decision To Institute An Inter Partes Review Of The ’074 Patent.....	29
1. Congress Expressly Barred Judicial Review Of The USPTO’s Decision Whether To Institute An Inter Partes Review	29
a. 35 U.S.C. § 314(d) expressly bars Cuozzo’s challenge.....	29

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

	Page
b. The history of appeals from USPTO post-grant proceedings further undermines Cuozzo’s arguments.....	34
2. Cuozzo’s Arguments Challenging The Board’s Decision To Institute The Inter Partes Review Lack Merit	37
C. The Board Correctly Concluded That Claims 10, 14, And 17 Of The ’074 Patent Were Unpatentable For Obviousness	39
1. The Board Properly Applies The USPTO’s Longstanding “Broadest Reasonable Interpretation” Standard In Inter Partes Review Proceedings	39
a. The promulgation of the regulation specifying that the BRI standard applies in inter partes reviews was well within the USPTO’s authority.....	40
b. Cuozzo’s invocation of the word “procedural” does not alter the analysis.....	44
2. The Board’s Claim Construction Was Reasonable	45
3. The Board Correctly Concluded That Claim 10 Was Obvious Over Aumayer, Evans, and Wendt.....	51
a. Aumayer determines “the speed limit at a vehicle’s present location,” as claimed.....	52
b. The Board correctly found a motivation to combine Aumayer, Evans, and Wendt.....	54
4. The Board Correctly Concluded That Claim 10 Was Obvious Over Tegethoff, Awada, Evans, and Wendt	56

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.