

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SHENZHEN SILVER STAR INTELLIGENT CO. LTD.,
Petitioner

v.

IROBOT CORP.,
Patent Owner

Case IPR2018-00897
Patent 6,809,490

**PATENT OWNER'S
PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Pages</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. OVERVIEW OF the '490 PATENT	2
III. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	3
IV. THE PETITION'S RELIANCE ON PREVIOUSLY CONSIDERED REFERENCES, ACCESS TO PATENT OWNER'S EARLIER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE, ACCESS TO THE BOARD'S EARLIER INSTITUTION DECISION, AND EXCESSIVE NUMBER OF CHALLENGES WARRANT DENIAL OF INSTITUTION	3
A. The Guidelines of <i>General Plastic</i> Compel Non-Institution	7
a) Whether at the time of the filing of the first petition the petitioner knew of the prior art asserted in the second petition or should have known of it (factor two).....	11
b) Whether at the time of filing of the second petition, the petitioner already received the patent owner's preliminary response to the first petition or received the Board's decision on whether to institute review in the first petition (factor three)...	13
c) The length of time that elapsed between the time the petitioner learned of the prior art asserted in the second petition and the filing of the second petition (factor four).....	17
d) Whether the petitioner provides adequate explanation for the time elapsed between the filings of multiple petitions directed to the same claims of the same patent (factor five)	18
e) The finite resources of the Board (factor six)	18
f) Statutory requirement to issue a final determination not later than 1 year after the date of institution (factor seven)	20
g) Whether the same petitioner previously filed a petition directed to the same claims of the same patent (factor one).....	21

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Pages</u>
V. THE ZHANG DECLARATION SHOULD BE AFFORDED LITTLE OR NO WEIGHT	23
A. The Zhang declaration should be afforded little or no weight because it largely repeats attorney argument	24
B. The Zhang declaration should be afforded little or no weight because Dr. Zhang was not a POSITA at the time of the invention	25
VI. NEITHER UENO NOR BOTTOMLEY IN VIEW OF THE AAAI ARTICLE DISCLOSE “A SPOT-COVERAGE MODE WHEREBY THE ROBOT OPERATES IN AN ISOLATED AREA” (CLAIM 1 – ELEMENT 1[F]; CLAIM 42 – ELEMENT 42[G]).....	25
A. Claim construction for “a spot-coverage mode whereby the robot operates in an isolated area”	26
B. Ueno fails to disclose “a spot-coverage mode whereby the robot operates in an isolated area”	30
C. Bottomley in view of AAAI Article fails to disclose “a spot-coverage mode whereby the robot operates in an isolated area”	32
VII. UENO FAILS TO DISCLOSE “A BOUNCE MODE WHEREBY THE ROBOT TRAVELS SUBSTANTIALLY IN A DIRECTION AWAY FROM AN OBSTACLE AFTER ENCOUNTERING THE OBSTACLE” (CLAIM 1 – ELEMENT 1[H]; CLAIM 42 – ELEMENT 42[I]) WHILE BOTTOMLEY FAILS TO DISCLOSE “AN OBSTACLE FOLLOWING MODE” (CLAIM 1 – ELEMENT 1[G]; CLAIM 42 – ELEMENT 42[H]) .	34
A. Claim construction for “bounce mode whereby the robot travels substantially in a direction away from an obstacle after encountering the obstacle”	34
B. Ueno fails to disclose “a bounce mode”	37
C. Bottomley in view of AAAI Article fails to disclose “an obstacle following mode”	38

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Pages</u>
VIII. THE PETITION FAILS TO ESTABLISH THAT THE AAAI ARTICLE WAS PUBLICLY AVAILABLE PRIOR TO THE CRITICAL DATE	39
IX. THE PETITION FAILS TO NAME ALL REAL PARTIES IN INTEREST	40
X. CONCLUSION.....	48

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

<u>CASES</u>	<u>PAGES</u>
<i>Alcatel-Lucent USA Inc. v. Oyster Optics LLC</i> , IPR2018-00257.....	9
<i>Alere Inc. v. Rembrandt Diagnostics, LP</i> , IPR2017-01130.....	9, 18
<i>Apple Inc. v. Chestnut Hill Sound Inc.</i> , IPR2015-01464	24
<i>Applications in Internet Time, LLC v. RPX Corp.</i> , 2018 U.S. App. LEXIS 20605, *34 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	43
<i>Ashland Oil, Inc. v. Delta Resins & Refractories, Inc.</i> , 776 F.2d 281, 294 (Fed. Cir. 1985).....	24
<i>Atlanta Gas Light Co. v. Bennett Regulator Guards, Inc.</i> , Case IPR2013-00453 ..	46
<i>Bicon, Inc. v. Straumann Co.</i> , 441 F.3d 945, 950 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	32, 33
<i>Bruckelmyer v. Ground Heaters, Inc.</i> , 445 F.3d 1374, 1378 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	40
<i>Corning Inc. v. DSM IP Assets B.V.</i> , IPR2013-00048.....	24
<i>Fisher & Paykel Healthcare Ltd. v. ResMed Ltd.</i> , IPR2017-01789	20
<i>Galderma S.A. v. Allergan Industrie, SAS</i> , Case IPR2014-01422.....	46, 47
<i>General Electric Co. v. TAS Energy Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00163	24
<i>General Plastic Industrial Co., Ltd. v. Canon Kabushiki Kaisha</i> , IPR2016-01357	7, 8, 9, 12, 21, 23
<i>Google LLC v. Uniloc Luxembourg S.A.</i> , IPR2017-02081.....	22
<i>Google v. Uniloc</i> , IPR2017-01665.....	23
<i>Google v. Uniloc</i> , IPR2017-02067.....	17, 23
<i>H&S Mfg. Co., Inc., v. OXBO Int’l Corp</i> , IPR2016-00909	40
<i>In re Hall</i> , 781 F.2d 897, 898–99 (Fed. Cir. 1986).....	39

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.