

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

PRECISION PLANTING LLC, AGCO CORPORATION,
Petitioners,

v.

DEERE & COMPANY,
Patent Owner

IPR2019-01044
U.S. Patent No. 8,813,663

PATENT OWNER SUR-REPLY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	2
III.	OBJECTIVE INDICIA DEMONSTRATES NONOBVIOUSNESS	4
IV.	KONING IS NON-ANALOGOUS ART	12
V.	A POSA WOULD HAVE NO MOTIVATION TO COMBINE AND NO REASONABLE EXPECTATION OF SUCCESS.....	13
A.	Petitioners Mischaracterize Deere’s Arguments.....	13
B.	A POSA Would Have Had No Motivation to Use Koning’s Brush-belt in Hedderwick or Expectation of Success.....	14
C.	A POSA Would Have Had No Motivation or Reasonable Expectation of Success in Inserting Seeds Into a Brush-belt With Benac’s Paddle Wheel.....	20
D.	Petitioners’ Proposed Combination Would Not Achieve the Claimed “Loading Wheel” And “Seed Delivery System”	29
E.	Deere’s Arguments Are Entirely Consistent.....	30
F.	Petitioners Are Judicially Estopped	31
VI.	PETITIONERS’ WRONGLY ATTACK DR. GLANCEY	33

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Demaco Corp. v. F Von Langsdorff Licensing Ltd.</i> , 851 F.2d 1387 (Fed. Cir. 1988).....	10
<i>Fanduel, Inc. v. Interactive Games LLC</i> , 2020 WL 4342681 (Fed. Cir. Jul. 29, 2020).....	1, 21
<i>Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku, Ltd.</i> , 535 U.S. 722 (2002).....	33
<i>Fox Factory, Inc. v. SRAM, LLC</i> , 944 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	9, 10
<i>Haynes Int’l, Inc. v. Jessop Steel Co.</i> , 8 F.3d 1573 (Fed. Cir. 1993).....	32
<i>Henny Penny Corp. v. Frymaster LLC</i> , 938 F.3d 1324	14, 27
<i>High Point SARL v. Sprint Nextel Corp.</i> , 817 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	31
<i>K/S Himpp v. Hear-Wear Techs., LLC</i> , 751 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	16
<i>In re Klein</i> , 647 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	33
<i>KSR Intern. Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	1, 14, 33
<i>Lectrosonics, Inc. v. Zaxcom, Inc.</i> , IPR2018-01129, Paper 33, 33 (PTAB Jan. 24, 2020).....	8, 9, 11
<i>In re Magnum Oil Tools Int’l, Ltd.</i> , 829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	20
<i>In re Mouttet</i> , 686 F.3d 1322 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	13
<i>New Hampshire v. Maine</i> , 532 U.S. 742 (2001).....	32, 33

<i>Next Caller Inc. v. TrustID, Inc.</i> , IPR2019-00039, Paper 77, 20 (PTAB Feb. 24, 2020).....	34
<i>Otsuka Pharm. Co. v. Sandoz, Inc.</i> , 678 F.3d 1280 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	15
<i>Packers Plus Energy Services, Inc. v. Baker Hughes Oilfield Operations LLC</i> , 773 Fed.App’x. 1083 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	27
<i>Perry v. Blum</i> , 629 F.3d 1 (1st Cir. 2010).....	32
<i>Power-One Inc. v. Artesyn Technologies Inc.</i> , 599 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	12
<i>Samsung Elecs. Co. v. Elm 3DS Innovations, LLC</i> , 925 F.3d 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	20, 26
<i>SAS Institute, Inc. v. Iancu</i> , 128 S.Ct. 1348 (2018).....	31
<i>Storage Technology Corp. v. Cisco Systems, Inc.</i> , 329 F.3d 823 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	3
<i>TQ Delta, LLC v. CISCO Systems, Inc.</i> , 942 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	16
<i>In re Translogic Tech., Inc.</i> , 504 F.3d 1249 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	32
<i>WBIP, LLC v. Kohler Co.</i> , 829 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	8
<i>Wilson v. Martin</i> , 789 Fed.App’x 861 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	31
Statutes	
35 U.S.C. §316(e)	1
Other Authorities	
37 C.F.R. §1.97(h)	33
37 C.F.R. §42.6(e).....	38
37 C.F.R. §42.24(d)	37
37 C.F.R. §42.65(a).....	36

I. INTRODUCTION

Petitioners cannot explain why, if it were so obvious based on thirty-year-old references, others did not develop the claimed inventions earlier, given the need to increase productivity by planting faster while maintaining spacing accuracy. Precision's own failures are undisputed, as is its praise of its own eventual success. POR 66-67 (moon shot). Petitioners engage in "the distortion caused by hindsight bias." *KSR Intern. Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S. 398, 421 (2007).

This bias is apparent when considered against Precision's characterization of Koning when it sought its own patent. As Precision persuasively argued then, Koning "is not directed to a seed planter for row crops" and a POSA "would not be motivated to look for planters for planting potatoes or bulbs." Ex.2001-7-Sauder-File-History, 318. Petitioners' current litigation-inspired arguments completely contradict this representation, as they attempt to shoehorn Koning into a three-way combination with Benac and Hedderwick to recreate the preferred embodiment of the '663 Patent by treating the prior art as a parts catalog. Petitioners must prove all propositions of unpatentability. *Fanduel, Inc. v. Interactive Games LLC*, 2020 WL 4342681, 6 (Fed. Cir. Jul. 29, 2020); 35 U.S.C. §316(e). They have not done so. Validity should be confirmed.

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.