

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

NORMAN INTERNATIONAL, INC.  
Petitioner

v.

HUNTER DOUGLAS INC.  
Patent Owner

---

CASE IPR2014-01175  
Patent No. 6,968,884

---

**PETITIONER'S REPLY TO PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE**

Paper 10

July 23, 2015

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. RESPONSE TO PATENT OWNER’S ARGUMENTS .....	2
A. Only Limited Construction Is Required .....	3
B. Claim 7 Is Invalid as Obvious Over Cohn in view of Strahm .....	4
1. It Would Have Been Obvious to Combine Cohn and Strahm .....	4
2. Patent Owner’s Perceived Complexity In Combining Cohn and Strahm is Irrelevant, Incorrect, and Lacks Legal Basis .....	8
3. Adding Strahm’s One-Way Friction Brake to Cohn’s Assembly is Consistent with the Purposes and Disclosures of Strahm and Cohn .....	15
4. Patent Owner Failed to Establish Objective Indicia .....	19
C. Declaration of Lawrence E. Carlson (Ex. 1009) Is Relevant and Merits Full Weight and Consideration .....	21
D. Declaration of Patrick E. Foley (Ex. 1010) Is Relevant and Merits Full Weight and Consideration .....	23
E. The Petition and this Trial Present New Prior Art and Arguments Not Before the Office in Prior Proceedings .....	23
F. The Board Should Give No Weight to Declaration of John Corey .....	24
III. CONCLUSION .....	25

### EXHIBIT LIST

<b>Norman Exhibit #</b>	<b>Brief Description</b>
1001	U.S. Patent No. 6,968,884 B2 ("the 884 Patent")
1002	Japanese Patent Application Publication S54-38648 ("Tachikawa")  Pages 1-4: English Translation  Pages 5-8: Original Japanese Publication  Page 9: Translator Certification
1003	U.S. Patent No. 3,327,765 ("Strahm")
1004	Great Britain Patent No. 1,174,127 ("Skidmore")
1005	U.S. Patent No. 1,870,532 ("Schuetz")
1006	U.S. Patent No. 2,390,826 ("Cohn")
1007	U.S. Patent No. 6,056,036 ("Todd")
1008	U.S. Patent No. 6,293,329 ("Toti")
1009	Declaration of Lawrence E. Carlson in Support of Petition for Inter Partes Review of U.S. Patent No. 6,968,884B2 ("Carlson Declaration on 884 Patent")

CASE IPR2014-01175 (Patent 6,968,884)  
Petitioner's Reply To Patent Owner's Response

<b>Norman Exhibit #</b>	<b>Brief Description</b>
1010	Declaration of Patrick E. Foley in Support of Petition for Inter Partes Review of U.S. Patent No. 6,968,884B2 ("Foley Declaration on 884 Patent")
1011	Proof Of Service on July 16, 2013 of Summons in Civil Action No. 1:13-cv-01412-MSK-MJW (D. COLO.) ("Proof of Service")
1012	Declaration Of Sara Hare ("Hare Declaration")
1013	Declaration of Lawrence E. Carlson in Support of Petitioner's Reply to Patent Owner's Response of May 4, 2015

## I. INTRODUCTION

The Board instituted *inter partes* review of the 884 patent on the ground of obviousness of claim 7 over Cohn (Ex. 1006) in view of Strahm (Ex. 1003). (Paper 7, at 2) (“we determine Petitioner established a reasonable likelihood that it would prevail in showing the unpatentability of claim 7.”) Patent Owner filed its Response to the Petition on May 4, 2015. (Paper 9). Petitioner timely submits this reply under 37 C.F.R. § 42.23 pursuant to the February 10, 2015 Scheduling Order to rebut Patent Owner's arguments. (Paper 8, at 6). With this reply, Petitioner also submits a rebuttal declaration by Professor Lawrence Carlson (Ex. 1013) that supports Petitioner's position that claim 7 is obvious and not patentable.

In view of all the evidence and analysis in the record of this proceeding, Petitioners have shown, by a preponderance of the evidence, that claim 7 is invalid under § 103 and thus must be canceled. Specifically, the Petition and all the evidence on record demonstrate that the teachings of Cohn and Strahm would motivate and provide ample reasons for a POSITA to combine the references, that every element of claim 7 was disclosed by the combination, and that the subject matter of the combination as claimed in claim 7 as a whole is a predictable and obvious combination. Patent Owner's Response has failed to overcome this demonstration or otherwise rebut the unpatentability of claim 7. And Patent Owner's reliance on secondary considerations to allege that claim 7 satisfies some

# 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.