EXHIBIT 2007

DOCKET ALARM Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

Trials@uspto.gov
571.272.7822

Paper No. 18
August 23, 2013

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SCENTAIR TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
Petitioner

v.

PROLITEC, INC.
Patent Owner

Case IPR2013-00179
Patent 7,712,683

Before JAMESON LEE, MICHAEL J. FITZPATRICK, and CHRISTOPHER L. CRUMBLEY, *Administrative Patent Judges.*

FITZPATRICK, *Administrative Patent Judge.*

DECISION
Request for Rehearing
37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d)

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

BACKGROUND

Petitioner, ScentAir Technologies, Inc., requests rehearing (Paper 15, "Req. Reh'g") of our Decision instituting *inter partes* review of claims 1 and 2 of Patent No. 7,712,683 (Paper 13, "Dec.").

In the Decision, the Board ordered a trial on the following two grounds of unpatentability asserted in the Petition (Paper 2):

Claims 1 and 2 as anticipated by Benalikhoudja; and

Claims 1 and 2 as obvious over Benalikhoudja and Sakaida.

The Board denied all other grounds in the Petition as redundant in light of the grounds on which the Board instituted review. Dec. 19. ScentAir requests rehearing of the denial of a trial based on those other grounds. Req. Reh'g 1. "Specifically, ScentAir requests that the Board instead authorize, at least conditionally, the grounds the Board found 'redundant.'" *Id.*

For the reasons stated below, the request is denied.

ANALYSIS

When rehearing a decision on petition, the Board reviews the decision for an abuse of discretion. 37 C.F.R. § 42.71(c). The party requesting rehearing bears the burden of showing an abuse of discretion. 37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d).

ScentAir does not identify, let alone demonstrate, any purported abuse of discretion. Instead, ScentAir merely states that "it believes the Board may have overlooked *potential* prejudice to ScentAir." Req. Reh'g 1 (emphasis added). In particular, ScentAir states:

ScentAir will be effectively foreclosed from relying on the

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

> references deemed redundant in an *inter partes* review proceeding with respect to distinctions advanced by Prolitec — for example, through amendments or substitute claims — despite the existence of those distinctions in references deemed redundant, and thus, not applied.

Req. Reh'g 2.

ScentAir, however, is not foreclosed from relying on references it relied on in the non-instituted grounds to account for new claim limitations that Prolitec may seek to add. Although the Board denied certain grounds as redundant in the decision instituting *inter partes* review, the Board did not state that the references involved in those grounds may not be relied upon to address distinctions advanced by Prolitec in a motion to amend or substitute claims.[1]

That ScentAir ultimately may not prevail in challenging the patentability of claims 1 and 2 on at least one of the grounds instituted does not mean it was an abuse of discretion not to have instituted trial on additional grounds.

To avoid a determination that a requested ground of review is redundant of another requested ground, a petitioner must articulate a meaningful distinction in terms of relative strengths and weaknesses with respect to application of the prior art reference disclosures to one or more claim limitations. *See, e.g.*, *Liberty Mutual Ins. Co. v. Progressive Casualty Inc. Co.*, CBM2012-00003, Paper 7 at 2-12. Distinctions based on how

---

[1] Guidance on motions to amend is provided in the *Office Patent Trial Practice Guide*, 77 Fed. Reg. 48756, 48765-66 (Aug. 14, 2012) and recent Board decisions, including *Idle Free Sys., Inc. v. Bergstrom, Inc.*, Case IPR2012-00027, Paper 26 (June 11, 2013) (expanded panel).

DOCKET ALARM Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

Prolitec may amend the claims are speculative and should not be the basis of our decision to institute.

Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 316(b), rules for *inter partes* review were promulgated taking into account their effect on "the economy, the integrity of the patent system, the efficient administration of the Office, and the ability of the Office to timely complete proceedings." The Board's rules provide that they are to be "construed to secure the just, speedy, and inexpensive resolution of every proceeding." 37 C.F.R. § 42.1(b). As a result, in determining whether to institute an *inter partes* review of a patent, the Board may "deny some or all grounds for unpatentability for some or all of the challenged claims." 37 C.F.R. § 42.108(b).

ScentAir has not demonstrated an abuse of discretion in instituting an *inter partes* review of claims 1 and 2 on two, but not all, of the grounds for review sought by the Petition.

ORDER

In consideration of the foregoing, it is hereby:

ORDERED that ScentAir's Request for Rehearing is *denied*.

DOCKET ALARM Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKET ALARM

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.

WHAT WILL YOU BUILD? | sales@docketalarm.com | 1-866-77-FASTCASE

fastcase®
Smarter legal research.