UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SMR AUTOMOTIVE SYSTEMS USA, INC., Petitioner,

v.

MAGNA MIRRORS OF AMERICA, INC., Patent Owner.

Case IPR2018-00491 Patent No. 7,934,843

PATENT OWNER MAGNA MIRRORS OF AMERICA, INC.'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE



TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODU	JCTIO:	N	• • • • • • • • • •	1		
BACKGR	OUND)	•••••	2		
I.	Mag	Magna				
II.	The	The '843 Patent				
				OW A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT THE MS ARE ANTICIPATED OR OBVIOUS9		
I.	Lega	Legal Standards				
II.	The	e Board Should Deny Institution On Grounds 1 And 21				
	A.			and 2 Should Be Denied Because Lynam '026 r Art, As The PTO Repeatedly Found10		
		1.	The	Prosecution History of the '843 Patent11		
		2.	Reco Pater	R Fails To Show Why The Board Should onsider The PTO's Conclusion That The '843 ont Properly Claims Priority To The '872 risional		
			a.	The '666 application incorporates by reference the '451 and '712 patents in their entirety16		
			b.	The Written Description Of The '666 Application Supports The Claims Of The '843 Patent19		
		3.	Reco	R Fails To Show Why The Board Should onsider The PTO's Conclusion That Lynam Is Not Prior Art23		
	В.	Rais	e Inve	and 2 Should Also Be Denied Because They ntorship Questions That Are Better Addressed Court		
III.	That	The P	rior A	Should Be Denied Because SMR Has Not Shown rt Discloses All Claim Limitations Or A Sufficient ombine		



	A.		Petition Improperly Incorporates By Reference The n Declaration.	30
	B.		on '013 Discloses A Trailer Towing Mirror, Not A Spot Mirror	33
	C.		on '013 Does Not Disclose Or Render Obvious ing Generally Towards The Blind Spot	36
		1.	Claim Construction	36
		2.	SMR Does Not Show That Henion '013 Discloses A Reflective Element That "Generally Views Towards A Blind Spot"	40
	D.	SMR Cannot Rely On The Adjustable Auxiliary Embodiment Of Henion '013 To Meet Claims 15 And 34 Because It Does Not Include The Claimed "Backing Plate."		
		1.	Claim Construction	41
		2.	Henion '013 Does Not Disclose The Limitations Of Claims 15 And 34.	45
	E.		's Obviousness Arguments Rely On The Unsupported ons Of Its Unqualified "Expert."	47
		1.	SMR's Expert Is Not A POSA	47
		2.	SMR Fails To Show That Claims 15 and 34 Are Obvious.	49
		3.	SMR Fails To Show That Element 1[i] Is Obvious	51
	F.		o Does Not Disclose Or Render Obvious The Width Limitation Of Claim 33	51
CONCLUSIO	ON			54



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
Allergan, Inc. v. Apotex Inc., 754 F.3d 952 (Fed Cir. 2014)	24
Apple, Inc. v. Contentguard Holdings, Inc., IPR2015-00358, Paper 9 (PTAB July 2, 2015)	32
Ariad Pharm., Inc. v. Eli Lily & Co., 598 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (en banc)	19
Callaway Golf Co. v. Acushnet Co., 576 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	18, 19
Cisco Sys., Inc. v. C-Cation Techs., LLC, IPR2014-00454, Paper 12 (PTAB Aug. 29, 2014)	32
Cultec, Inc. v. Stormtech LLC, IPR2017-00777, Paper 7 (PTAB Aug. 22, 2017)	10
Harari v. Lee, 656 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	16, 17, 18
Hopkins Mfg. Corp. v. Cequent Performance Prods., Inc., IPR2015-00616, Paper 9 (PTAB Aug. 17, 2015)	9, 30
Hospira, Inc. v. Genentech, Inc., IPR2017-00739, Paper 16 (PTAB July 27, 2017)	10
Husky Injection Molding Sys. Ltd. v. Athena Automation Ltd., 838 F.3d 1236 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	18, 19
Johns Manville Corp. v. Knauf Insulation Inc., IPR 2015-01633	50
<i>In re Katz</i> , 687 F.2d 450 (C.C.P.A. 1982)	24



Modine Mfg. Co. v. ITC, 75 F.3d 1545 (Fed. Cir. 1996), abrogated by Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co., Ltd., 234 F.3d 558 (Fed. Cir. 2000) (en banc)
In re NuVasive, Inc., 693 F. App'x 893 (Fed. Cir. 2017)
PPC Broadband, Inc. v. Corning Optical Commc'ns RF, LLC, 815 F.3d 747 (Fed. Cir. 2016)
SCHOTT Gemtron Corp. v. SSW Holding Co., IPR2014-00367, Paper No. 62 (PTAB May 26, 2015)49
Sewall v. Walters, 21 F.3d 411 (Fed. Cir. 1994)28
In re Smith Int'l, Inc., 871 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2017)
In re Suitco Surface, Inc., 603 F.3d 1255 (Fed. Cir. 2010)
Telemac Cellular Corp. v. Topp Telecom, Inc., 247 F.3d 1316 (Fed. Cir. 2001)
Unified Patents Inc. v. Berman, IPR2016-01571, Paper 10 (PTAB Dec. 14, 2016)
WBIP, LLC v. Kohler Co., 829 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2016)
Zenon Envtl., Inc. v. U.S. Filter Corp., 506 F.3d 1370 (Fed. Cir. 2007)
Statutes
35 U.S.C. § 102(a)
35 U.S.C. § 102(b)
35 U.S.C. § 102(e)
35 U.S.C. § 256(b)



DOCKET A L A R M

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.

