

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

PRECISION PLANTING LLC, AGCO CORPORATION,  
Petitioners,

v.

DEERE & COMPANY,  
Patent Owner

---

IPR2019-01050  
U.S. Patent No. 9,807,922

---

**PATENT OWNER SUR-REPLY**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES ..... ii

I. INTRODUCTION ..... 1

II. KONING IS NON-ANALOGOUS ART ..... 2

III. A POSA WOULD HAVE NO MOTIVATION TO COMBINE AND  
NO REASONABLE EXPECTATION OF SUCCESS..... 4

    A. Petitioners Mischaracterize Deere’s Arguments..... 4

    B. A POSA Would Have Had No Motivation to Use Koning’s  
    Brush-belt in Hedderwick or Expectation of Success..... 5

    C. A POSA Would Have Had No Motivation or Reasonable  
    Expectation of Success in Loading Seeds Into a Brush-belt  
    With Yamahata’s Guide ..... 11

    D. Petitioners’ Proposed Combination Would Not Achieve the  
    Claimed Stationary “Loading Surface” And “Seed Delivery  
    Apparatus” ..... 18

    E. Deere’s Arguments Are Entirely Consistent..... 18

    F. Petitioners Are Judicially Estopped ..... 19

IV. PETITIONERS’ WRONGLY ATTACK DR. GLANCEY ..... 22

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Egenera, Inc. v. Cisco Systems, Inc.</i> , 2020 WL 5084288 (Fed. Cir. Aug. 28, 2020) .....	19, 21
<i>Fanduel, Inc. v. Interactive Games LLC</i> , 966 F.3d 1334 (Fed. Cir. 2020) .....	2, 12
<i>Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku, Ltd.</i> , 535 U.S. 722 (2002).....	22
<i>Henny Penny Corp. v. Frymaster LLC</i> , 938 F.3d 1324 .....	4
<i>High Point SARL v. Sprint Nextel Corp.</i> , 817 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	20
<i>In re Klein</i> , 647 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....	21
<i>In re Magnum Oil Tools Int’l, Ltd.</i> , 829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	11
<i>In re Mouttet</i> , 686 F.3d 1322 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	4
<i>In re Translogic Tech., Inc.</i> , 504 F.3d 1249 (Fed. Cir. 2007) .....	21
<i>K/S Himpp v. Hear-Wear Techs., LLC</i> , 751 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2014) .....	7
<i>KSR Intern. Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	1, 4, 21
<i>New Hampshire v. Maine</i> , 532 U.S. 742 (2001).....	21, 22
<i>Next Caller Inc. v. TrustID, Inc.</i> , IPR2019-00039, Paper 77, 20 (PTAB Feb. 24, 2020).....	23

<i>Otsuka Pharm. Co. v. Sandoz, Inc.</i> , 678 F.3d 1280 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	1, 6
<i>Perry v. Blum</i> , 629 F.3d 1 (1st Cir. 2010).....	20
<i>Pharma Tech Sols., Inc. v. LifeScan, Inc.</i> , 942 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2019) .....	20
<i>Samsung Elecs. Co. v. Elm 3DS Innovations, LLC</i> , 925 F.3d 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2019) .....	11, 17
<i>SAS Institute, Inc. v. Iancu</i> , 128 S.Ct. 1348 (2018).....	19
<i>TQ Delta, LLC v. CISCO Systems, Inc.</i> , 942 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2019) .....	7
<i>Wilson v. Martin</i> , 789 Fed.App'x 861 (Fed. Cir. 2019) .....	20
<b>Statutes</b>	
35 U.S.C. §316(e) .....	2
<b>Other Authorities</b>	
37 C.F.R. §1.97(h) .....	22
37 C.F.R. §42.24 .....	26
37 C.F.R. §42.65(a).....	25

## I. INTRODUCTION

The Petition is infected with “the distortion caused by hindsight bias,” *KSR Intern. Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S. 398, 421 (2007), and should be rejected. No prior art reference teaches use of a brush-belt such as that disclosed by Koning to convey seeds, as would be required in Petitioners’ Hedderwick-Koning-Yamahata combination. Thus, no motivation exists to replace Hedderwick’s flighted belt with Koning’s brush-belt as Petitioners propose. Pet. 6, 48. The only evidence in the record that discloses use of a brush-belt to convey seeds is the ’922 Patent, but it is improper to use the disclosure of the challenged patent as evidence of a motivation to combine. *Otsuka Pharm. Co. v. Sandoz, Inc.*, 678 F.3d 1280, 1296 (Fed. Cir. 2012) (“The inventor’s own path itself never leads to a conclusion of obviousness; that is hindsight.”)

Further, the unpredictable nature of a moving brush-belt, even at conventional planting speed, would have eliminated any expectation of successfully making Petitioners’ proposed combination and further dissuaded a POSA from attempting it. A POSA would have been further discouraged from adding Yamahata’s seed guide to the combination due to Hedderwick’s use of interfering fins on the seed meter. Moreover, even if added to the combination, a POSA would not have expected Yamahata’s seed guide to insert seeds into the

# 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.