

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

LKQ Corporation and Keystone Automotive Industries, Inc.,

Petitioners,

v.

GM Global Technology Operations LLC,

Patent Owner.

U.S. Design Patent No. D840,306

Filed: June 28, 2017

Issued: February 12, 2019

Title: Vehicle Endgate

**PETITION FOR POST GRANT REVIEW
OF U.S. DESIGN PATENT NO. D840,306**

Post Grant Review No.: *To Be Assigned*

Mail Stop "PATENT BOARD"

Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	MANDATORY NOTICES UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.8.....	4
III.	FEES UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.203	6
IV.	REQUIREMENTS UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.204.....	6
	A. Grounds for Standing – 37 C.F.R. § 42.204(a)	6
	B. Identification of Challenged Claims for Which Post Grant Review is Requested and Specific Statutory Grounds on which the Challenge is Based – 37 C.F.R. § 42.204(b)(1) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.204(b)(2)	6
	C. Overview of the '306 Patent and Claim Construction Thereof – 37 C.F.R. § 42.204(b)(3)	7
	1. The '306 Patent	7
	2. Claim Construction of the '306 Patent	11
	D. How the Challenged Claim is Unpatentable – 37 C.F.R. § 42.204(b)(4).....	15
	E. Evidence Relied Upon to Support the Challenge and the Relevance of the Evidence to the Challenge Raised – 37 C.F.R. § 42.204(b)(5).....	16
V.	APPLICABLE LEGAL STANDARDS.....	17
	A. Obviousness Under 35 U.S.C. § 103.....	17
	B. Designs Found Obvious Under 35 U.S.C. § 103	21
	C. Designer of Ordinary Skill	27
	D. Ordinary Observer.....	28
VI.	THE '306 PATENT IS OBVIOUS OVER PATENT OWNER'S 2015 CHEVROLET COLORADO IN VIEW OF THE 2013 FORD FLEX.....	29
VII.	IN THE ALTERNATIVE, THE '306 PATENT IS OBVIOUS OVER PATENT OWNER'S 2015 CHEVROLET COLORADO IN VIEW OF THE 2013 FORD FLEX IN FURTHER VIEW OF THE 2010 DODGE RAM AND SCHIAVONE.....	41
VIII.	THE '306 PATENT IS OBVIOUS OVER PATENT OWNER'S 2014 CHEVROLET SILVERADO IN VIEW OF THE 2013 FORD FLEX.	51

IX. IN THE ALTERNATIVE, THE '306 PATENT IS OBVIOUS OVER
PATENT OWNER'S 2014 CHEVROLET SILVERADO IN VIEW OF
THE 2013 FORD FLEX IN FURTHER VIEW OF THE 2010 DODGE
RAM AND SCHIAVONE.58

X. CONCLUSION.....68

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Apple, Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , 678 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	18, 19
<i>C & D Zodiac, Inc. v. b/e Aerospace, Inc.</i> , PGR2017-00019, Paper No. 37, 2018 WL 5298631 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 23, 2018) ..	27
<i>Campbell Soup Co. v. Gamon Plus, Inc.</i> , IPR2017-00096, Paper No. 28, 2018 WL 1582298 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 27, 2018). 20, 24, 25	
<i>Contessa Food Prods., Inc. v. Conagra, Inc.</i> , 282 F.3d 1370 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	12
<i>Dobson v. Dornan</i> , 118 U.S. 10 (1886).....	12
<i>Door-Master Corp. v. Yorktowne, Inc.</i> , 256 F.3d 1308 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	18
<i>Durling v. Spectrum Furniture Co.</i> , 101 F.3d 100 (Fed. Cir. 1996)	passim
<i>Egyptian Goddess, Inc. v. Swisa, Inc.</i> , 543 F.3d 665 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	12, 13
<i>Ethicon Endo-Surgery, Inc. v. Covidien, Inc.</i> , 796 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	12
<i>High Point Design LLC v. Buyers Direct, Inc.</i> , 730 F.3d 1301 (Fed.Cir.2013)	13
<i>In re Borden</i> , 90 F.3d 1570 (Fed. Cir. 1996)	passim
<i>In re Carter</i> , 673 F.2d 1378 (C.C.P.A. 1982).....	19
<i>In re Chung</i> , No. 00-1148, 2000 WL 1476861 (Fed. Cir. Oct. 4, 2000)	19

<i>In re Lamb</i> , 286 F.2d 610 (C.C.P.A. 1961)	passim
<i>In re Nalbandian</i> , 661 F.2d 1214 (C.C.P.A. 1981)	19, 21
<i>In re Rosen</i> , 673 F.2d 388 (C.C.P.A. 1982)	19, 29, 51
<i>In re Smith Int'l, Inc.</i> , 871 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	18
<i>Int'l Seaway Trading Corp v. Walgreens Corp.</i> , 589 F.3d 1233 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	20
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007)	20
<i>Marten Transport, Ltd. v. Platform Advertising, Inc.</i> , No. 14-2464-JWL, 2016 WL 1718862 (D. Kan. Apr. 29, 2016)	45
<i>MRC Innovations, Inc. v. Hunter Mfg., LLP</i> , 747 F.3d 1326 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	passim
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	12
<i>Schwinn Bicycle Co. v. Goodyear Tire & Rubber, Co.</i> , 444 F.2d 295 (9th Cir. 1970)	21
<i>Sofpool LLC v. Kmart Corp.</i> , No. S-10-3333 (LKK), 2013 WL 2384331 (E.D. Cal. May 30, 2013), <i>aff'd</i> , 550 Fed. Appx. 896 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	20
<i>Sport Dimension, Inc. v. Coleman Co., Inc.</i> , 820 F.3d 1316 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	13
<i>Titan Tire Corp. v. Case New Holland, Inc.</i> , 566 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	20
<i>Voter Verified, Inc. v. Premier Election Sols., Inc.</i> , 698 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	38, 45, 62, 65

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.