

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

EASTMAN KODAK COMPANY, AGFA CORPORATION,
ESKO SOFTWARE BVBA, and HEIDELBERG, USA
Petitioners

v.

CTP INNOVATIONS, LLC
Patent Owner

Case IPR2014-00788
Patent 6,738,155

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.120

Filed on behalf of CTP Innovations, LLC

By: W. Edward Ramage (Lead Counsel)
Reg No. 50,810
Samuel F. Miller (Back-up Counsel)
(pending pro hac vice admission)
BAKER, DONELSON, BEARMAN,
CALDWELL & BERKOWITZ, P.C.
Baker Donelson Center
211 Commerce Street, Suite 800
Nashville, Tennessee 37201
Tel: (615) 726-5771
Fax: (615) 744-5771
Email: eramage@bakerdonelson.com
smiller@bakerdonelson.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iii
I. INTRODUCTION	1
A. Background	1
B. Relief Requested.....	2
C. Related Proceedings	2
D. The '155 Patent	2
E. Summary of Argument.....	5
F. Statement of Material Facts in Dispute.....	7
II. RELEVANT LAW.....	7
III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.....	10
A. “plate-ready file”	10
B. “communication network”	12
IV. ART CITED IN THE PETITION.....	13
A. Jebens	13
B. Apogee.....	16
C. Dorfman.....	18
D. OPI White Paper.....	20
E. Andersson.....	20
V. ARGUMENT.....	20
A. Claims 10-13 and 15-20 Are Not Rendered Obvious by Jebens and Apogee.....	21

B.	Claim 14 Is Not Rendered Obvious by Jebens, Apogee and Andersson.	32
C.	Claims 10-13 Are Not Rendered Obvious by Dorfman and Apogee.....	34
1.	Dorfman is a “Response On Demand” Digital Printing System.	34
2.	Dorfman and Apogee Do Not Disclose or Teach All Claim Limitations.	40
D.	Claims 14-15 Are Not Rendered Obvious by Dorfman, Apogee and Andersson.	42
1.	Dorfman is a “Response On Demand” Digital Printing System.	43
2.	Dorfman, Apogee, and Andersson Do Not Disclose or Teach All Claim Limitations of Claims 14-15.	45
E.	Claims 16-20 Are Not Rendered Obvious by Dorfman, Apogee and OPI White Paper.....	46
1.	Dorfman is a “Response On Demand” Digital Printing System.	47
2.	Dorfman, Apogee, and OPI White Paper Do Not Disclose or Teach All Claim Limitations.	49
F.	Petitioners Have Failed to Provide A Sufficient Basis For Combining the References.	52
G.	Apogee Is Not A Valid Prior Art Reference.	53
VI.	CONCLUSION	60
	PATENT OWNER EXHIBIT LIST	61
	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	62

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
<i>CA, Inc. v. Simple.com, Inc.</i> , 780 F. Supp. 2d 196 (E.D.N.Y. 2009)	58
<i>Ex parte Research and Manufacturing Co., Inc.</i> , No. 88-3277, 10 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1657, 1989 Pat. App. LEXIS 2 (Bd. Pat. App. & Interf., Jan. 31, 1989).....	58, 59
<i>Grain Processing Corp. v. Am. Maize-Prods. Co.</i> , 840 F.2d 902 (Fed. Cir. 1988)	9
<i>In re Cronyn</i> , 890 F.2d 1158 (Fed. Cir. 1989)	53
<i>In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended Release Capsule Patent Litig.</i> , 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	8
<i>In re Fine</i> , 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988)	9
<i>In re Gordon</i> , 733 F.2d 900 (Fed. Cir. 1984)	10
<i>In re ICON Health & Fitness, Inc.</i> , 496 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	10
<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	10, 52
<i>In re Ratti</i> , 270 F.2d 810 (CCPA 1959).....	53
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	8, 9, 52, 53
<i>Panduit Corp. v. Dennison Mfg. Co.</i> , 810 F.2d 1561 (Fed. Cir. 1987)	9

<i>PharmaStem Therapeutics, Inc. v. ViaCell, Inc.</i> , 491 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	8
<i>Ricoh Co., Ltd. v. Quanta Computer Inc.</i> , 550 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	10
<i>Unigene Labs, Inc. v. Apotex, Inc.</i> , 655 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	8, 9
<i>Wyers v. Master Lock Co.</i> , 616 F.3d 1231 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	8, 9

STATUTES

17 U.S.C. § 410(c)	58, 59
35 U.S.C. § 103(a)	7

OTHER AUTHORITIES

MPEP 2128(II)(A)	57
MPEP 2128(II)(B).....	57
MPEP 2141.02	9
MPEP 2143.01(V).....	10
MPEP 2143.01(VI)	10

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.