

Paper No. _____

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

PARROT S.A., PARROT DRONES S.A.S., and PARROT INC.,
Petitioners

v.

QFO LABS, INC.,
Patent Owner

Case IPR2017-01400
Patent 9,645,580

**PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE
UNDER 37 C.F.R. §42.107**

Mail Stop: PATENT BOARD
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES iii

EXHIBIT LIST vii

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. BACKGROUND 5

A. The '580 Patent..... 5

B. The Challenged Claims..... 7

C. Person of Ordinary Skill..... 9

D. Related Proceedings..... 10

E. Asserted Grounds of Unpatentability..... 12

III. ARGUMENT 13

A. Petitioners Lack Standing to File this Fifth Petition 13

 1. *Petitioners Bear the Burden of Establishing Standing in the Petition..... 14*

 2. *Petitioners Do Not Have Standing Under the Statute..... 14*

 3. *Petitioners Do Not Have Standing Under the Rules..... 16*

B. The Board Should Exercise Its Discretion to Dismiss the Petition..... 17

 1. *Institution of an Inter Partes Review Trial is Discretionary..... 17*

 2. *The Petition Impermissibly Benefits from the Board’s Prior Decision 19*

 3. *The References and Arguments Are Substantially the Same as Previously Presented 20*

 4. *The Petition Fails to Justify Why the Board Should Exercise Its Discretion to Institute Trial..... 20*

C. Claim Construction..... 24

D. The Primary and Secondary References27

- 1. *Louvel Teaches a “Position” Controller Scheme27*
- 2. *Sato Teaches a “Motion” Controller Scheme.....28*
- 3. *Talbert Also Teaches a “Position” Controller Scheme32*

E. The Independent Claims Are Not Obvious Over the Combination of Louvel with Sato.....33

- 1. *The Petition Does Not Present a Sufficient Reasoned Rationale to Combine the References.....34*
 - a. *The Field of Endeavor and Problem Are Not the Same35*
 - b. *The Complexity of the Technology and Physics Precludes a Common Sense or a Simple Substitution Combination.....36*
 - c. *The Reasons for Allowance Confirm That Combination Is Not Obvious to Try and Is Only Due To Impermissible Hindsight37*
 - d. *Sato Expressly Teaches Away From Using Gravity as a Part of a Motion Controller Scheme.38*
- 2. *Even If Combined, the Proposed Combination Still Does Not Yield the Claimed Invention.41*
 - a. *Neither Louvel Nor Sato Teach the Use of “Orientation” as the Basis for the Control Commands Sent to the Craft42*
 - b. *Because Louvel Uses a “Position” Controller Scheme, It Does Not Produce the Same Behavior of the Craft as with the Claimed “Orientation” Controller Scheme43*
 - c. *Because Sato Uses “Floating” Sensors, the Resulting Behavior of the Craft Does Not Compare with the Claimed “Orientation” Controller Scheme46*
 - d. *The Reasons for Allowance in the ’580 Patent Confirm that the Proposed Combination Does Not Yield the Claimed Invention47*

CONCLUSION50

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Cuozzo Speed Technologies, LLC v. Lee.</i> , 579 U.S. ___, 136 S.Ct. 2131 (2016)...	24
<i>Harmonic, Inc. v. Avid Tech., Inc.</i> 815 F.3d 1356,1367 (Fed.Cir.2016).....	18
<i>In re Gurley</i> , 27 F.3d 551, 553 (Fed. Cir. 1994).....	40
<i>In re Suitco Surface, Inc.</i> , 603 F.3d 1255, 1259 (Fed. Cir. 2010).	24
<i>In re Translogic Tech., Inc.</i> , 504 F.3d 1249,1257 (Fed.Cir.2007)	25
<i>In re Urbanski</i> , 809 F.3d 1237, 1244 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	40
<i>Parrot S.A., et al. v. QFO Labs, Inc.</i> , Case No. 1:16-cv-00682-GMS (D. Del.).....	10
<i>PerfectVision Mfg., Inc. v. PPC Broadband, Inc.</i> 951 F.Supp.2d 1083 (E.D.Ark. 2013).....	2, 16, 17
<i>Personal Web Technologies, Inc. v. Apple, Inc.</i> ,848 F.3d 987,994 (Fed.Cir.2017)41	41
<i>QFO Labs, Inc. v. Brookstone Stores, Inc.</i> , Case No. 0:17-cv-01100-JNE-SR (D. Minn.)	11
<i>QFO Labs, Inc. v. Parrot S.A., et al.</i> , Case No. 16-cv-03443-JRT-HB (D. Minn.) 11	11
<i>TC Heartland LLC v. Kraft Foods Groups Brands LLC</i> , No.16-341 (May 22, 2017)	11
<i>Vivid Techs., Inc. v. Am. Sci. & Eng’g, Inc.</i> , 200 F.3d 795,803 (Fed.Cir.1999)	25

Other Authorities

Anova Food, LLC v. Sandau, IPR2013-00114, (PTAB Sept.13, 2013) (Paper No. 17, p.6 – Decision Denying <i>Inter Partes</i> Review)	13, 14, 15
<i>Biodelivery Sciences Int’l, Inc. v. RB Pharmaceuticals, Ltd.</i> , IPR2014-00998 (PTAB Dec.19, 2014) (Paper 12, fn.1 – Decision Denying Institution and Dismissing Motion for Joinder)	13
<i>Cisco Systems, Inc. v. C-Cation Techs., LLC</i> , IPR2014-00454, slip op. 7–10 (PTAB Aug. 29, 2014) (Paper 12 – Decision Denying Institution).....	10
<i>Coalition for Affordable Drugs IV LLC v. Pharmacyclics, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-01076, slip op. 6 (PTAB Oct. 19, 2015) (Paper 33 – Decision Denying Institution).....	10
<i>Conopco, Inc. v. Proctor & Gamble Co.</i> , IPR2014-00506, slip op. at 4 (PTAB Dec.10, 2014) (Paper 25 – Decision Denying Petitioner’s Request for Rehearing)	23
<i>Facebook, Inc. and Instagram LLC v. Skky LLC</i> , IPR2017-00688, slip op. 3-6 (PTAB August 2, 2017) (Paper 11 – Decision Denying Institution)	20
<i>Facebook, Inc. and Instagram LLC v. Skky LLC</i> , IPR2017-00689, slip op. 5–7 (PTAB July 26, 2017) (Paper 9 – Decision Denying Institution)	20
Fed.Reg., Vol.77, No.157, (August 14, 2012), p.48688.....	16
<i>General Plastic Industrial Co. Ltd. v. Canon Kabushiki Kaisha</i> , Case IPR2016-01358, slip op. at 9-12 (PTAB Nov. 14, 2016) (Paper 12 – Decision Denying Institution)	22
H.R. REP. NO. 112-98, 112 th Cong., 1 st Sess. (June 1, 2011) at 75	15

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.