

Paper No. \_\_\_\_\_

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

TEMPUR SEALY INTERNATIONAL, INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

SELECT COMFORT CORPORATION,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2014-01419  
Patent 5,904,172

---

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

<b>I.</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	1
<b>II.</b>	<b>IPR SHOULD NOT BE INSTITUTED BECAUSE, CONTRARY TO THE RULES, THE PETITION FAILS TO ARTICULATE A REASON WITH RATIONAL UNDERPINNING FOR COMBINING THE CITED REFERENCES</b>	4
<b>III.</b>	<b>SUMMARY OF THE PATENTED TECHNOLOGY</b>	12
<b>IV.</b>	<b>THE '172 PATENT'S IMPROVEMENTS OVER CONVENTIONAL SYSTEMS</b>	14
<b>V.</b>	<b>CLAIM CONSTRUCTION</b>	18
	A. The Preamble of the Claims is Legally Limiting	20
	B. Broadest Reasonable Interpretation of “Pressure Monitor Means”	20
	C. Broadest Reasonable Interpretation of the “Monitoring Terms” [Claims 2-3, 6, 9, 12, 13, 16 and 20]	26
<b>VI.</b>	<b>OVERVIEW OF THE PRIOR ART RELIED UPON BY PETITIONER</b>	31
	A. U.S. Pat. No. 5,509,154 to Schafer et al. ("Schafer et al.") (Pet. Ex. 1009)	32
	B. U.S. Pat. No. 3,784,994 to Kery ("Kery") (Pet. Ex. 1006)	34
	C. U.S. Pat. No. 5,235,713 to Guthrie et al. ("Guthrie et al.") (Pet. Ex. 1008)	37
	D. U.S. Pat. No. 4,527,298 to Moulton ("Moulton") (Petitioner Ex. 1007)	43
<b>VII.</b>	<b>THE PETITIONER HAS NOT MET ITS BURDEN OF PROVING A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT IT WOULD PREVAIL IN SHOWING UNPATENTABILITY OF AT LEAST ONE CLAIM</b>	44
	A. Anticipation	44
	B. Obviousness	44

C.	Preliminary Response to Challenge No. 1 .....	46
1.	Claim 6 .....	47
2.	Claim 16 .....	51
3.	Claims 20 and 21 .....	52
D.	Preliminary Response to Challenge No. 2 .....	53
1.	Claims 2 and 3 .....	54
2.	Claims 12 and 13 .....	55
3.	Claims 22, 23, 24 and 25 .....	55
E.	Preliminary Response to Challenge No. 3 .....	56
F.	Preliminary Response to Challenge No. 4 .....	58
<b>VIII.</b>	<b>CONCLUSION</b> .....	<b>60</b>

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>CASES AND BOARD DECISIONS</b>	
<i>Cardiac Pacemakers, Inc. v. St. Jude Med., Inc.</i> , 296 F.3d 1106 (Fed. Cir. 2002) .....	20
<i>Cisco v. C-Cation Technologies</i> , IPR2014-00454, Paper 12 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 29, 2014).....	7
<i>Fidelity National v. DataTreasury</i> , IPR 2014-00491, Paper 9 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 12, 2014).....	6, 7
<i>Generation II Orthotics Inc. v. Med. Tech. Inc.</i> , 263 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2001) .....	22
<i>Golight, Inc. v. Wal-Mart Stores Inc.</i> , 355 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2004) .....	24
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	45
<i>In re Fine</i> , 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988) .....	46, 54
<i>In re Fulton</i> , 391 F.3d 1195 (Fed. Cir. 2004) .....	45
<i>In re Grasselli</i> , 713 F.2d 731 (Fed. Cir. 1983) .....	45
<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006) .....	5
<i>In re Translogic Tech.</i> , 504 F. 3d 1249 (Fed. Cir. 2007) .....	19
<i>InTouch Technologies, Inc. v. VGO Commc'ns, Inc.</i> , 751 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2014) .....	8

<i>JVW Enterprises, Inc. v. Interact Accessories, Inc.</i> , 424 F.3d 1324 (Fed. Cir. 2005) .....	22, 24
<i>Kemco Sales, Inc. v. Control Papers Co.</i> , 208 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2000) .....	44
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	passim
<i>Medical Instrumentation &amp; Diagnostics Corp. v. Elekta AB</i> , 344 F3d. 1205 (Fed. Cir. 2003) .....	20
<i>Micro Chem., Inc. v. Great Plains Chem. Co.</i> , 194 F. 3d 1250 (Fed. Cir. 1999) .....	22
<i>Micro Motion, Inc. v. Invensys Systems, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-0393, Paper 16 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 4, 2014).....	7
<i>Odetics Inc. v. Storage Tech. Corp.</i> 185 F. 3d 1259 (Fed. Cir. 1999) .....	44
<i>O.I. Corp. v. Tekmar Co.</i> , 115 F.3d 1576 (Fed. Cir. 1997) .....	30
<i>Omega Eng'g, Inc, v. Raytek Corp.</i> , 334 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2003) .....	22
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) .....	28
<i>Pitney Bowes, Inc. v. Hewlett-Packard Co.</i> , 182 F.3d 1298 (Fed. Cir. 1999) .....	20, 29
<i>Power-One, Inc. v. Artesyn Techs., Inc.</i> , 599 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2010) .....	32, 45
<i>Seachange Int'l, Inc. v. C-COR, Inc.</i> , 413 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2005) .....	30
<i>Shaw Industries Group, Inc. v. Automated Creel Sys., Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00584, Paper 16 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 21, 2013) .....	7

# 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.