

PATENT OWNER  
EXHIBIT 2025



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.        | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|----------------------------|------------------|
| 12/872,350   | 08/31/2010  | Peter Kritzer        | 8470G-000088/US/COA        | 3401             |
| 27572  | 7590        | 06/04/2015           | EXAMINER                   |                  |
| HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.<br>P.O. BOX 828<br>BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303 |             |                      | EGGERDING, ALIX ECHELMEYER |                  |
|  |             |                      | ART UNIT                   | PAPER NUMBER     |
|  |             |                      | 1729                       |                  |
|  |             |                      | NOTIFICATION DATE          | DELIVERY MODE    |
|  |             |                      | 06/04/2015                 | ELECTRONIC       |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

troydocketing@hdp.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

*Ex parte* PETER KRITZER

---

Appeal 2013-007728  
Application 12/872,350  
Technology Center 1700

---

Before PETER F. KRATZ, MARK NAGUMO, and GEORGE C. BEST,  
*Administrative Patent Judges.*

BEST, *Administrative Patent Judge.*

DECISION ON APPEAL

The Examiner finally rejected claims 1–4 and 6–26 of Application 12/872,350 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious. Final Act. (October 4, 2012). Appellant<sup>1</sup> seeks reversal of these rejections pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 134(a). We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

For the reasons set forth below, we REVERSE. We, however, newly reject claim 4 as indefinite. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 41.50(b) (2012).

---

<sup>1</sup> Carl Freudenberg KG is identified as the real party in interest. App. Br. 2.

## BACKGROUND

The '350 Application describes a sealing frame for use in a battery or battery stack. Spec. ¶ 2. Claim 1 is the '350 Application's only independent claim and is reproduced below:

1. A sealing frame (1) for utilization in a battery having a plurality of cells, comprising:

a base body (2) having an opening (3), whereby the base body (2) includes a first sealing surface (4) and a facing second sealing surface (5) and wherein at least one of the first sealing surface (4) and the second sealing surface (5) are elastically compressible,

wherein cooling means (22) are integrated in the base body (2) and which penetrate the base body (2) at least partially along the lengthwise expansion of the sealing surfaces (4, 5); and

a porous and compressible element disposed in the opening in said base body and external to the plurality of cells and between adjacent ones of the plurality of cells.

App. Br. 11 (Claims App. 11).

## REJECTIONS

On appeal, the Examiner maintains the following rejections:

1. Claims 1–4, 6–15, and 21–25<sup>2</sup> are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Weber,<sup>3</sup> Watanabe,<sup>4</sup> and Gehring.<sup>5</sup> Final Act. 2.

---

<sup>2</sup> Although claim 26 is listed in the summary statement of this rejection, claim 26 is not discussed in the body of the rejection. Final Act. 2–6. We, therefore, assume that the inclusion of claim 26 in the summary statement is an inadvertent error, which we have corrected.

<sup>3</sup> US 2009/0258288 A1, published October 15, 2009.

2. Claims 12 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Weber, Watanabe, Gehring, and Doring.<sup>6</sup> Final Act. 6.
3. Claims 15–20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Weber, Watanabe, Gehring, and Choi.<sup>7</sup> Final Act. 7.

## DISCUSSION

**Rejection 1.** The Examiner rejected claims 1–4, 6–15, and 21–25 as obvious over the combination of Weber, Watanabe, and Gehring. Final Act. 2; Ans. 5. For reasons that will become apparent, we will discuss the claims subject to this rejection in three groups: (1) claims 1, 6–15, and 21–25; (2) claims 2 and 3; and (3) claim 4.

*Claims 1, 6–15, and 21–25.* A determination that a claim is obvious requires a comparison of the properly construed claim with the prior art. *Oakley, Inc. v. Sunglass Hut Int’l*, 316 F.3d 1331, 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2003). Thus, we must begin by interpreting claim 1’s language.

We note that claim 1 states that the claimed sealing frame includes “cooling means” that are integrated into the frame’s base body. *See* claim 1. As the Federal Circuit has explained:

Use of the word “means” in claim language creates a presumption that § 112 ¶ 6 applies. *See Greenberg v. Ethicon*

---

<sup>4</sup> US 2007/0269714 A1, published November 22, 2007.

<sup>5</sup> US 2008/0118821 A1, published May 22, 2008.

<sup>6</sup> US 2003/0031925 A1, published February 13, 2003.

<sup>7</sup> US 2006/0063066 A1, published March 23, 2006.

# 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.