

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

RF CONTROLS, LLC,
Petitioner

v.

A-1 PACKAGING SOLUTIONS, INC.,
Patent Owner

Patent 8,690,057
Issue Date: April 8, 2014

Title: RADIO FREQUENCY IDENTIFICATION SYSTEM FOR TRACKING
AND MANAGING MATERIALS IN A MANUFACTURING PROCESS

Cases: IPR2014-01536
IPR2015-00119

**PATENT OWNER RESPONSE
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.120**

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.120, please consider the following Patent Owner Response to the Decision of Institution of *Inter Partes* Review 37 C.F.R. § 42.108, issued March 30, 2015, for IPR2014-01536, and the Decision of Institution of *Inter Partes* Review 37 C.F.R. § 42.108, issued April 29, 2015, for IPR2015-00119, in the above-identified matter.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction	1
	A. Statement of Relief Requested	1
	B. Grounds for Review	1
II.	Legal Authority.....	2
	A. Burden of Proof.....	2
	B. Anticipation.....	2
	C. A Limitation is Not Intended Use if Closely Tied to Structure in the Claim and Therefore Entitled to Patentable Weight	3
	D. Limitations Reciting Unobvious Functions are not Merely Descriptive and Therefore Entitled to Patentable Weight	4
III.	Claims 1, 17, and 27 are not Anticipated by Hofer/Bloy	4
	A. “Inventory tracking” and “inventory item information” limitations should be entitled to patentable weight.....	4
	1. The “inventory tracking” aspects of the claims are more than intended use; they are closely tied to structure giving them patentable weight.....	6
	2. The “inventory item information” limitations are more than descriptive; they provide an unobvious functional relationship giving them patentable weight.....	9
	B. Hofer/Bloy does not include an enabling disclosure for applying RFID tags in the application of inventory management	11
IV.	Conclusion	13

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

<i>Elan Pharm., Inc. v. Mayo Found. For Med. Educ. & Research</i> , 346 F.3d 1051 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	2, 11
<i>Impax Labs. Inc. v. Aventis Pharm, Inc.</i> , 468 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	3, 11
<i>In re Hoeksema</i> , 399 F.2d 269 (CCPA 1968).....	2
<i>In re Lowry</i> , 32 F.3d 1579 (Fed. Cir. 1994).....	4
<i>In re Ngai</i> , 367 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	4
<i>K-2 Corp. v. Solomon S.A. et al</i> , 191 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 1999).....	3
<i>Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.</i> , 868 F.2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1989).....	2
<i>Typhoon Touch Technologies, Inc. v. Dell, Inc.</i> , 659 F.3d 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	3
<i>Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California</i> , 814 F.2d 628 (Fed. Cir. 1987).....	2

STATUTES

35 U.S.C. § 316.....	2
----------------------	---

OTHER AUTHORITIES

MPEP § 2121	2
MPEP § 2122	3

I. Introduction

Patent Owner A-1 Packaging, Inc. (hereinafter “Patent Owner”) respectfully submits its Response under 35 U.S.C. §§311–319 and 37 C.F.R. §42.120. It is timely filed by June 26, 2015 (the deadline listed in the IPR2014-01536 Scheduling Order entered on March 3, 2015).

A. Statement of Relief Requested

Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §316, Patent Owner respectfully requests that the Patent Trial And Appeal Board (“the Board”) find that originally issued claims 1, 17, and 27 of U.S. Patent No. 8,690,057 (“the ‘057 Patent,” Exh. 1001) are not invalid and, specifically, that these claims are patentable in view of the grounds under consideration.

B. Grounds for Review

The present *inter partes* review is a consolidation of IPR2014-01536 and IPR2015-00119. The Board instituted the present consolidated *inter partes* review on the following grounds:

- (1) Independent claim 1 as anticipated by Hofer/Bloy (Exh. 1008) (IPR2014-01536); and
- (2) Independent claims 17 and 27 as anticipated by Hofer/Bloy (IPR2015-00119).

II. Legal Authority

A. Burden of Proof

In an *inter partes* review, “the petitioner shall have the burden of proving a proposition of unpatentability by a preponderance of the evidence.” 35 U.S.C. § 316(e) (2011).

B. Anticipation

To invalidate a patent as anticipated, a petitioner must demonstrate that “each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987). “The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

To determine the amount of a prior art disclosure necessary to find a patented invention ‘not novel’ or ‘anticipated,’ the test is whether a reference contains an ‘enabling disclosure’... .” *In re Hoeksema*, 399 F.2d 269 (CCPA 1968). Merely reciting the subject matter is insufficient if it cannot be produced without undue experimentation. *Elan Pharm., Inc. v. Mayo Found. For Med. Educ. & Research*, 346 F.3d 1051, 1054 (Fed. Cir. 2003); *see also* MPEP § 2121. A prior art reference provides an enabling disclosure and thus anticipates a claimed invention if the reference describes the claimed invention in sufficient detail to enable a person of ordinary skill in the art to carry out the claimed invention. *See*

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.