

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

CARL ZEISS SMT GMBH  
Petitioner

v.

NIKON CORPORATION  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2013-00362 (Patent 7,348,575 B2)  
Case IPR2013-00363 (Patent 7,348,575 B2)<sup>1</sup>

---

Before HOWARD B. BLANKENSHIP, SALLY C. MEDLEY, and  
MATTHEW R. CLEMENTS, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

CLEMENTS, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

ORDER  
Conduct of the Proceeding  
37 C.F.R. § 42.5

---

<sup>1</sup> This Order addresses an issue pertaining to both cases. Therefore, we exercise our discretion to issue one Order to be filed in each case. The parties are not authorized to use this style heading for any subsequent papers.

Case IPR2013-00362 and Case IPR2013-00363  
Patent 7,348,575 B2

An initial conference call in the above proceeding was held on January 8, 2014, between respective counsel for Petitioner and Patent Owner, and Judges Medley, Blankenship, and Clements. The purpose of the call was to discuss any proposed changes to the Scheduling Order (IPR2013-00362, Paper 11; IPR2013-00363, Paper 8) and any motions that the parties intend to file. Prior to the call, Patent Owner filed a proposed motions list. IPR2013-00362, Paper 13; IPR2013-00363, Paper 11. The following issues were discussed.

Patent Owner's counsel requested that Due Date 1 be extended by one month to, *inter alia*, allow time to obtain evidence from its foreign client. Petitioner's counsel did not oppose on the condition that Due Date 2 be similarly extended. Based on the facts of this case, the Board agrees that there is good cause for extending Due Dates 4, 5, and 6. 37 C.F.R. § 42.5(c)(2). Due Date 7 remains unchanged. Attached to this Order is a revised Scheduling Order with new Due Dates 4, 5, and 6. The parties agreed to confer regarding Due Dates 1, 2, and 3, and to stipulate to new dates for those Due Dates (but none later than Due Date 4). A notice of the stipulation must be promptly filed.

Petitioner indicated that it does not presently contemplate filing any motion.

Patent Owner stated that it is contemplating filing a motion to amend. For further guidance regarding these requirements, the Board directed Patent Owner to two decisions available on the Board's website under "Representative Orders, Decisions, and Notices": (1) IPR2012-00005, Paper

27 (June 3, 2013); and (2) IPR2012-00027, Paper 26 (June 11, 2013). The Board also directed Patent Owner to IPR2013-00136, Paper 33 (Nov. 7, 2013) and IPR2012-00027, Paper 66 (Jan. 7, 2014). As the Board explained recently:

A motion to amend claims in an *inter partes* review is not itself an amendment. Unlike a claim amendment in patent prosecution, amendments proposed by a motion to amend are not entered as a matter of right. The applicable presumption is that only one substitute claim would be needed to replace each challenged claim, although the presumption may be rebutted by a demonstration of need. 37 C.F.R. § 42.121(a)(3). Absent special circumstances, a challenged claim can be replaced by only one claim, and a motion to amend should, for each proposed substitute claim, specifically identify the challenged claim that it is intended to replace. A proposed claim should be traceable to an original challenged claim as a proposed substitute claim for the challenged claim. A desire to obtain a new set of claims having a hierarchy of different scope typically would not constitute sufficient special circumstances because an *inter partes* review is an adjudicatory proceeding, rather than an examination. *See, Abbott Labs v. Cordis Corp.*, 710 F.3d 1318, 1326 (Fed. Cir. 2013). If the patent owner desires to remodel its claim structure according to a different strategy, it may consider pursuing another type of proceeding before the Office.

A motion to amend may be denied where (i) the amendment does not respond to a ground of unpatentability involved in the trial or (ii) the amendment seeks to enlarge the scope of the claims of the patent or introduce new subject matter. 37 C.F.R. § 42.121(a)(2). These conditions are evaluated for each substitute claim traceable to a challenged claim that the substitute claim is intended to replace. A proper substitute claim under 37 C.F.R. § 42.121(a)(2) must only narrow the scope of the challenged claim it replaces and may

not enlarge the scope of the challenged claim by eliminating any feature or limitation. A proposed substitute claim is not responsive to an alleged ground of patentability if it does not either include or narrow each feature of the challenged claim being replaced. *See, Idle Free Systems, Inc. v. Bergstrom, Inc.*, IPR2012-00027, Paper No. 26.

Unlike patent application proceedings, in an *inter partes* review a proposed amendment to the claims is not authorized unless the movant has shown that the proposed substitute claims are patentable. In all circumstances the patent owner must make a showing of patentable distinction over the prior art. A patent owner should identify specifically the feature or features added to each substitute claim, as compared to the challenged claim it replaces, and come forward with technical facts and reasoning about those features including construction of new claim terms, sufficient to persuade the Board that the proposed substitute claim is patentable over the prior art of record, and over prior art not of record but known to the patent owner. The burden is not on the petitioner to show unpatentability, but on the patent owner, as the moving party, to show patentable distinction over the prior art of record and other prior art known to the patent owner. 37 C.F.R. § 42.20(c). A showing of patentable distinction may rely on the declaration testimony of a technical expert about the level of ordinary skill in the art and about the significance and usefulness of features added by the proposed claim.

A mere conclusory statement by counsel in the motion to amend that one or more added features are not described in any prior art or would not have been suggested or rendered obvious by the prior art is facially inadequate. *Id.* It also is insufficient for the movant simply to explain why the proposed substitute claims are patentable in consideration of the challenges on which the Board instituted review. Limiting the discussion either to the references already in the proceeding, or to the narrow combination specifically recited in the claim, does not

provide a meaningful analysis. *See, Corning Gilbert, Inc. V. PPC Broadband, Inc.*, IPR2013-00347, Paper No. 20. In explaining why it believes the claimed subject matter is patentable, the movant must address issues of nonobviousness, meaningfully. The movant should discuss the level of ordinary skill in the art, explaining the basic knowledge and skill set already possessed by one of ordinary skill in the art, especially with respect to the particular feature or features the patent owner has added to the original patent claims. The movant should identify in what context the added feature, or something close to it, was already known, albeit not in the specific combination recited in the claims at issue. *Id.*

A motion to amend claims must clearly identify the written description support for the proposed substitute claims. The written description test is whether the original disclosure of the application relied upon reasonably conveys to a person of ordinary skill in the art that the inventor had possession of the claimed subject matter as of the filing date. *Ariad Pharms., Inc. v. Eli Lilly & Co.*, 598 F.3d 1336, 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (*en banc*). 37 C.F.R. § 42.121(b)(1) requires the patent owner to set forth the support in the *original disclosure* of the patent for each proposed substitute claim i.e., the patent owner must clearly identify the written description support in the disclosure corresponding to the earliest date upon which the patent owner seeks to rely.

Merely indicating where each claim limitation individually is described in the original disclosure may be insufficient to demonstrate support for the claimed subject matter as a whole. While the proposed substitute claims need not be described verbatim in the original disclosure in order to satisfy the written description requirement, should the claim language not appear in the same words in the original disclosure, a mere citation to the original disclosure without any explanation as to why a person of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the inventor possessed the claimed subject

# 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.