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. D850,341

Filed: November 7, 2017

Issued: June 4, 2019

Title: Vehicle Fender

PETITION FOR POST GRANT REVIEW OF U.S. DESIGN PATENT NO. D850,341

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.	INTR	RODUCTION1
II.	MAN	NDATORY NOTICES UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.85
III.	FEES	S UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.203
IV.	REQ	UIREMENTS UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.2047
	A.	Grounds for Standing – 37 C.F.R. § 42.204(a)7
	В.	Identification of Challenged Claim 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)8
	C.	An Overview of the '341 Patent and Claim Construction Thereof - 37 C.F.R. § 42.204(b)(3)
		1. The '341 Patent
		2. Claim Construction of the '341 Patent
	D.	How the Challenged Claim is Unpatentable – 37 C.F.R. § 42.204(b)(4)20
	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)20
V.	APPI	LICABLE LEGAL STANDARDS26
	A.	Anticipation Under 35 U.S.C. § 102
	B.	Designs Found Anticipated Under 35 U.S.C. § 10227
	C.	Obviousness Under 35 U.S.C. § 103
	D.	Designs Found Obvious Under 35 U.S.C. § 103
	E.	Designer of Ordinary Skill
	F.	Ordinary Observer41
VI.		AILED EXPLANATION OF THE GROUNDS FOR ATENTABILITY43
	A.	Ground 1: The '341 Patent is Invalid because it is a Partial-product Patent, which Violates the Doctrine of Exhaustion and GM's Customers' Repair Right
	B.	Ground 2: The '341 Patent Claim is Unpatentable as Anticipated by Patent Owner's 2015 Cadillac ATS Coupe



	C.	C. Ground 3: In the Alternative, the '341 Patent Claim is Unpaten	
		as Obvious Over Patent Owner's 2015 Cadillac ATS Coupe	.58
	D.	Ground 4: The '341 Patent Claim is Unpatentable as Obvious Over Patent Owner's Uncited Prior Art the 2015 Cadillac ATS Coupe in	
		further view of USD722,534 to Munson	.64
VII.	CON	CLUSION	.72



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

3Form, Inc. v. Lumicor, Inc., 678 Fed. App'x. 1002 (Fed. Cir. 2017)31
3Form, Inc. v. Lumicor, Inc., Case No. 2:12-cv-00293-CW, 2015 WL 9463092 (D. Utah Dec. 28, 2015)63
Apple, Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co., 678 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2012) 30
Aro Mfg. Co. v. Convertible Top Replacement Co., 365 U.S. 336 (1961)44
Ashley Furniture Indus. Inc. v. Lifestyle Enter. Inc., 574 F. Supp. 2d 920 (W.D. Wis. 2008)
C & D Zodiac, Inc. v. b/e Aerospace, Inc., PGR2017-00019, Paper No. 37, 2018 WL 5298631 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 23, 2018)40
Campbell's Soup Company v. Gamon Plus, Inc., 939 F.3d 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2019)30
Contessa Food Prods., Inc. v. Conagra, Inc., 282 F.3d 1370 (Fed. Cir. 2002)
Dobson v. Dornan, 118 U.S. 10 (1886)13
Durling v. Spectrum Furniture Co., 101 F.3d 100 (Fed. Cir. 1996)
Egyptian Goddess, Inc. v. Swisa, Inc., 543 F.3d 665 (Fed. Cir. 2008)
Ethicon Endo-Surgery, Inc. v. Covidien, Inc., 796 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2015)
Field v. Google, Inc., 412 F. Supp. 2d 1106 (D. Nev. 2006)21



Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. v. Hercules Tire & Rubber Co., Inc., 162 F.3d 1113 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	41
Gorham Co. v. White, 81 U.S. (14 Wall.) 511 (1871)	43
Gorham Co. v. White, 81 U.S. 511 (1871)	26, 27, 28
Graham v. John Deere Co., 383 U.S. 1 (1966))	29
High Point Design LLC v. Buyers Direct, Inc., 730 F.3d 1301 (Fed.Cir.2013)	1, 32, 64, 71
Hulu, LLC v. Sound View Innovations, LLC, IPR2018-01039, Paper 29 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 20, 2019)	22
Impression Prod., Inc. v. Lexmark Int'l, Inc., 137 S. Ct. 1523 (2017)	45
In re Borden, 90 F.3d 1570 (Fed. Cir. 1996)	29, 31, 67
In re Carter, 673 F.2d 1378 (C.C.P.A. 1982)	32, 63
<i>In re Chung</i> , No. 00–1148, 2000 WL 1476861 (Fed. Cir. Oct. 4, 2000)	33, 63
<i>In re Lamb</i> , 286 F.2d 610 (C.C.P.A. 1961)	32, 63
<i>In re Nalbandian</i> , 661 F.2d 1214 (C.C.P.A. 1981)), 32, 34, 63
In re Rosen, 673 F.2d 388 (C.C.P.A. 1982)	30, 58
Int'l Seaway Trading Corp. v. Walgreens Corp., 589 F.3d 1233 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	passim



DOCKET

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.

