

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

**CONOPCO, INC. d/b/a UNILEVER**  
**Petitioner**

**v.**

**THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY**  
**Patent Owner**

---

**Case IPR2014-00507**  
**Patent 6,451,300**

---

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**  
**PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.107**

**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

|   | Page |
|---|------|
| I. INTRODUCTION .....   | 1    |
| II. BACKGROUND OF THE '300 PATENT .....   | 3    |
| III. THE BOARD SHOULD DECLINE TO CONSIDER MOST, IF NOT ALL, OF THE GROUNDS AND REFERENCES IN THE INSTANT PETITION BECAUSE THEY ARE REDUNDANT AND CUMULATIVE ..... | 5    |
| A. Many Grounds Are Cumulative Of A Prior Office Proceeding .....   | 5    |
| B. Unilever Presents Redundant Grounds In The Instant Petition .....  | 10   |
| 1. Many Of Unilever's Asserted Grounds Are Horizontally Redundant .....   | 12   |
| 2. Grounds 2 And 4 Proposed For Claim 6 Suffer From Vertical Redundancy .....   | 15   |
| IV. THE BOARD SHOULD REJECT THE INSTANT PETITION BECAUSE UNILEVER FAILS TO ESTABLISH A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT THE CLAIMS CHALLENGED ARE UNPATENTABLE .....    | 21   |
| A. Claim Construction .....   | 22   |
| B. The Board Should Deny Each Ground Because A POSA Would Have No Motivation To Modify Kanebo Or Evans .....  | 24   |
| 1. Kanebo And Evans Focus On Solving Different Problems .....   | 24   |
| 2. Unilever Does Not Identify Any Flaws In Kanebo And Evans .....   | 26   |
| C. The Board Should Deny Grounds 1, 4, And 7 Because Unilever's References Teach Away From Making The Claimed Compositions .....                                  | 27   |
| 1. The Board Should Deny Ground 4 Because Sime Teaches Away From The Claimed Invention .....  | 28   |
| 2. The Board Should Deny Grounds 1 And 7 Because Cothran Conflicts With Kanebo And Evans .....  | 29   |

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**  
(continued)

|  | <b>Page</b> |
|--|-------------|
| D. The Board Should Deny Grounds 2, 4, 5, And 8 Because Unilever Has Failed To Present Sufficient Evidence Of A Motivation To Combine The Asserted References .....  | 32          |
| 1. The Board Should Deny Ground 2, 4, And 8 Because Cseh Is Not Directed To An Anti-Dandruff Shampoo .....   | 32          |
| 2. The Board Should Deny Ground 5 Because Kalla Is Not Directed To Conditioning .....  | 34          |
| E. The Board Should Deny Grounds 2, 3, 4, And 8 Because Unilever’s Asserted References Are Insufficient To Prove The Molecular Weight Ranges Of The Challenged Claims.....   | 36          |
| 1. Unilever Provides No Evidence Of The Authenticity Of C261SPEC .....   | 37          |
| 2. Unilever Fails To Prove That The Molecular Weights Of The Cited Products Have Not Changed.....  | 39          |
| 3. Cosmedia® Guar C261 And Jaguar® C15 Do Not Meet The Claimed Guar Derivative Molecular Weight Limitation.....  | 40          |
| 4. The Board Should Reject Ground 8 As To Claims 8 And 9 Because Cseh And C261SPEC Do Not Relate To The Molecular Weight Of A Cationic Cellulose Derivative .....  | 43          |
| F. The Board Should Deny Grounds 1, 4, 7, And 8 Because The Ranges Recited In The Challenged Claims Would Not Have Been Obvious To A POSA In Light Of The Broadly Disclosed Ranges Of The Asserted References..... | 44          |
| 1. Cothran’s Broadly Disclosed Ranges Do Not Render Obvious The Ranges In Claims 6-10.....   | 44          |
| 2. The Ranges Disclosed In Evans Are Also Too Broad To Invalidate Claims 6-10.....   | 47          |
| 3. The Board Should Deny Ground 4 Because The Claimed Range Would Not Have Been Obvious To A POSA In Light Of The Broadly Disclosed Ranges In Sime .....   | 47          |

..

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**  
(continued)

|   | <b>Page</b> |
|---|-------------|
| 4. The Nandagiri Declaration Is Conclusory And Does Not Support Unilever’s Obviousness Assertions.....  | 49          |
| G. The Board Should Deny Ground 6 Because A POSA Would Have No Motivation To Combine Kanebo And Bar-Shalom With A Reasonable Expectation Of Success ..... | 50          |
| V. OBJECTIVE INDICIA OF NON-OBVIOUSNESS.....  | 52          |
| VI. CONCLUSION.....   | 52          |

...

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

|  | Page       |
|--|------------|
| <b>CASES</b>   |            |
| <i>Amgen Inc. v. F. Hoffmann-La Roche Ltd.</i> ,<br>580 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2009) .....   | 22         |
| <i>Amkor Tech., Inc. v. Tessera, Inc.</i> ,<br>No. IPR2013-00242, Paper No. 37, Decision Institution of <i>Inter Partes</i><br>Review (P.T.A.B. Oct. 11, 2013) .....         | 11         |
| <i>Berk-Tek LLC v. Belden Techs. Inc.</i> ,<br>No. IPR2013-00057, Paper No. 21, Decision on Request for Rehearing<br>(P.T.A.B. May 14, 2013) .....                           | 11         |
| <i>Broadcom Corp. v. Emulex Corp.</i> ,<br>732 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....  | 26         |
| <i>Genetics Institute, LLC v. Novartis Vaccines and Diagnostics, Inc.</i> ,<br>655 F.3d 1291 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....  | 46, 47, 48 |
| <i>Hewlett-Packard Co. v. MCM Portfolio, LLC</i> ,<br>No. IPR2013-00217, Paper No. 10, Decision Institution of <i>Inter Partes</i><br>Review (P.T.A.B. Sept. 10, 2013) ..... | 49         |
| <i>In re Am. Acad. of Sci. Tech Ctr.</i> ,<br>367 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2004) .....   | 23         |
| <i>In re Ochiai</i> ,<br>71 F.3d 1565 (Fed. Cir. 1995) .....   | 21         |
| <i>Karsten Mfg. Corp. v. Cleveland Golf Co.</i> ,<br>242 F.3d 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2001) .....  | 27         |
| <i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> ,<br>550 U.S. 398 (2007) .....   | 21         |
| <i>Leo Pharm. Prods., Ltd. v. Rea</i> ,<br>726 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....  | 26         |

# 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.