

Filed on behalf of Textron Innovations Inc.

By: Patrick A. Doody (patrick.doody@pillsburylaw.com)

Bryan P. Collins (bryan.collins@pillsburylaw.com)

Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman LLP

1650 Tysons Boulevard

McLean, VA 22102

Tel: (703) 770-7900

Fax: (703) 770-7901

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

WAVELOCK ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY CO., LTD.
Petitioner

v.

TEXTRON INNOVATIONS INC.
Patent Owner

Case IPR2013-00149
Patent 6,455,138

**TEXTRON INNOVATIONS' PATENT OWNER RESPONSE
PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. §42.120**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Contents	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. MATERIAL FACTS	2
III. THE '138 PATENT AND KUWAHARA	5
A. The '138 Patent.....	6
B. Kuwahara.....	8
IV. THE BOARD SHOULD FIND THAT CLAIMS 1-3, 8, 10, 16-19, 21, 25-33, 35, AND 36 ARE PATENTABLE IN VIEW OF WAVELOCK'S CHALLENGE	12
A. Inherency Requires the Inherent Element to Necessarily Result and Cannot be Based on Probabilities	14
B. Wavelock Fails to Carry Its Burden in Proving the Claimed Invention is Inherently Made by Kuwahara's Examples	20
1. Dr. Iezzi impermissibly assumes the copolymer resin of Kuwahara is a liquid.....	22
2. Even if the Copolymer Resin of Kuwahara were a liquid, there is no evidence that the liquid could fill the 500 Angstrom sized voids in Kuwahara's metallized layer	24
3. There is no evidence that Kuwahara roller coats the copolymer resin on "top" of the metallized layer.....	27
4. Kuwahara teaches away from the presence of a copolymer resin between the metal islands	30
5. A person having ordinary skill in the art would not know whether the copolymer resin would flow around the island metal structures.....	32
C. Having Failed to Establish that Kuwahara Inherently Anticipates Claim 1, All of the Proposed Grounds of Rejection Must Be Withdrawn	33
V. CONCLUSION	35

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Akamai Techs., Inc. v. Cable & Wireless Internet Serv., Inc</i>	16
<i>Continental Can Co. USA v. Monsanto Co.</i> , 948 F.2d 1264, 1269 (Fed. Cir. 1991)	16
<i>Electro Med. Sys., S.A. v. Cooper Life Sci., Inc.</i> , 34 F.3d 1048, 1052 (Fed. Cir. 1994).....	17
<i>Ex parte Levy</i> , 17 USPQ2d 1461, 1464 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1990).....	16
<i>Finnigan Corp. v. Int'l Trade Comm'n</i> , 180 F.3d 1354, 1366 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	17
<i>Glaxo, Inc. v. Novopharm Ltd.</i> , 52 F.3d 1043, 1047-48 (Fed. Cir. 1995)	17
<i>In re Oelrich</i> , 666 F.2d 578, 581 (C.C.P.A. 1981)	16
<i>In re Oelrich</i> , 666 F.2d 578, 581-82 (CCPA 1981).....	15
<i>In re Rijckaert</i> , 9 F.3d 1531, 1534 (Fed. Cir. 1993).....	14
<i>In re Robertson</i> , 169 F.3d 743, 745 (Fed. Cir. 1999).....	15
<i>MEHL/Biophile</i> , 192 F.3d at 1365.....	17
<i>Metabolite Labs., Inc. v. Lab. Corp. of Am. Holdings</i> , 370 F.3d 1354, 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	15
<i>Rosco Inc. v. Mirror Lite Co.</i> , 304 F.3d 1373, 1379-81 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	18
<i>Rosco</i> , 304 F.3d at 1380-81	19
<i>Scaltech, Inc. v. Retec/Tetra, L.L.C.</i> , 178 F.3d 1378, 1384 (Fed. Cir. 1999).....	16
<i>Teleflex, Inc. v. Ficosa N. Am. Corp.</i> , 299 F.3d 1313, 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	18
<i>Telemac Cellular Corp. v. Topp Telecom, Inc.</i> , 247 F.3d 1316, 1328 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	18
<i>Transclean Corp. v. Bridgewood Servs., Inc.</i> , 290 F.3d 1364, 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	16
<i>Trintec Indus., Inc. v. Top-U.S.A. Corp.</i> , 295 F.3d 1292, 1297 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	17
 Rules and Regulations	
37 C.F.R. §42.120.....	1
37 C.F.R. §42.23	2

I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §42.120, Patent Owner Textron Innovations Inc. (“Textron”) submits this Patent Owner Response (“Response”) in reply to the Decision to Institute Inter Partes Review dated August 1, 2013 (“Decision”) of Murano, U.S. Patent No. 6,455,138 (the “’138 patent”). Textron also submits this Response to the Petition for Inter Partes Review filed February 15, 2013, (“Petition”) to the extent the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (PTAB) relied on the Petition in rendering its decision to institute.

The Petitioner, Wavelock Advanced Technology Co., Ltd. (“Wavelock”) has failed to carry its burden in proving that the only document relied upon to reject the sole independent claim, Kuwahara, JP 63-286337 (“Kuwahara”) inherently anticipates the claims. Specifically, Wavelock has failed to prove that Kuwahara necessarily produces a discontinuous layer including discrete islands of metal in an adhesive. The entire basis for Wavelock’s position is premised on one sentence in Kuwahara, and one sentence in each of paragraphs 39 and 57 of Dr. Robert Iezzi’s declaration (the “Declaration”). Wavelock has not produced any evidence other than unsupported opinion testimony, which is legally insufficient to carry its burden in proving that the prior art necessarily will produce the claimed invention. In addition, Dr. Iezzi is forced to make assumptions regarding Kuwahara’s disclosure in rendering his conclusion that islands of Sn deposited in Kuwahara are

“in the adhesive.” Wavelock Exhibit 1017, ¶57, pg. 26. Assumptions regarding the prior art disclosure are wholly inadequate to establish inherent anticipation, which requires the alleged inherent claim limitation to be the necessary result of the prior art. A mere probability (which must result when assumptions are made) precludes inherency as a matter of law. Accordingly, the rejections of all of the claims at issue in this proceeding based on Kuwahara are legally erroneous.

II. MATERIAL FACTS

Petitioner did not include a statement of material facts. Textron presents the following material facts pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §42.23¹:

1. The ‘138 patent claims all require the presence of a discontinuous layer including discrete islands of metal in an adhesive (Wavelock Exhibit 1001, pg. 9);
2. Some of the problems the ‘138 patent seeks to minimize or overcome are delamination of metallized polymer composite, corrosion of the metal layer, and popping that can occur when solvents are used and then evaporated during processing of the composite (*Id* at pg. 5);

¹ The list is by no means exhaustive, and more material facts may be established during this proceeding. The list presented in Patent Owner’s response is merely illustrative of the important material facts for the particular issues discussed herein.

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.