

Filed on behalf of: Gold Standard Instruments, LLC

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

By: Joseph A. Hynds, Lead Counsel  
R. Elizabeth Brenner-Leifer, Back-up Counsel  
Steven Lieberman, *Pro Hac Vice*  
Derek F. Dahlgren, *Pro Hac Vice*  
Jason M. Nolan, Back-up Counsel  
ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK, P.C.  
607 14th Street, N.W., Suite 800  
Washington, DC 20005  
Phone: 202-783-6040  
Facsimile: 202-783-6031  
Emails: jhynds@rothwellfigg.com  
ebrenner@rothwellfigg.com  
slieberman@rothwellfigg.com  
ddahlgren@rothwellfigg.com  
jnolan@rothwellfigg.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

US ENDODONTICS, LLC,  
Petitioner,

v.

GOLD STANDARD INSTRUMENTS, LLC,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2015-00632  
Patent 8,727,773 B2

---

**PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	v
TABLE OF ABBREVIATIONS .....	vii
EXHIBIT LIST .....	ix
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. THE '773 PATENT .....	3
A. General Background of the '773 Patent .....	3
1. How Endodontic Files are Used .....	3
2. Dr. Luebke's Invention .....	6
B. The Claims of the '773 Patent.....	8
C. The field of invention and the person of ordinary skill in the art. ....	9
III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	10
A. The Board correctly determined that the limitation requiring that the heat-treated instrument exhibit at least 10 degrees of permanent deformation after the ISO Standard 3630-1 bend test should not be read out of the claims.....	10
B. The Board correctly construed the claims as atmosphere-neutral. ....	14
IV. KUHN DOES NOT ANTICIPATE CLAIMS 1, 2 OR 9-12. ....	15
A. Kuhn does not teach or suggest making a permanently deformable file and does not show the specific level of deformation required by the claims.....	15
B. Kuhn nowhere teaches or suggests heat-treating the entire shank.....	17
C. None of Kuhn's heat-treated shank pieces demonstrate at least 10 degrees of permanent deformation in the ISO test.....	20
1. Kuhn does not identify the bend test used. ....	20
2. Kuhn also explicitly states that the heat-treated shank pieces recovered their original shape.....	22
3. The Figure 6A bending curves show heat-treated shanks that maintained their superelasticity. ....	24

4.	Kuhn’s 2001 companion article—which Dr. Goldberg admits he never reviewed—confirms that the heat-treated shanks discussed in Kuhn are superelastic. ....	27
5.	The Fig. 4A DSC thermograms do not show that the heat-treated shanks would have at least 10 degrees of permanent deformation in the ISO test. ....	28
6.	Kuhn affirmatively teaches that superelasticity of NiTi files is a good thing and thus expressly teaches away from the claimed invention. ....	33
V.	CLAIMS 8, 13, 15 AND 17 ARE NOT PRIMA FACIE OBVIOUS OVER KUHN AND THE 1992 ISO. ....	34
A.	The 1992 ISO describes the recited bend test but nowhere discusses NiTi files or heat-treatments. ....	34
B.	The 1992 ISO does not bridge gaps between Kuhn and the claims. ....	35
VI.	CLAIMS 1-17 ARE NOT PRIMA FACIE OBVIOUS OVER KUHN, THE 1992 ISO, MCSPADDEN, AND PELTON ....	36
A.	McSpadden seeks to make a <i>stiffer</i> NiTi file, not a permanently deformable file. ....	37
B.	Pelton seeks to optimize superelasticity and nowhere teaches or suggests making a permanently deformable file. ....	42
C.	The Cited References Do Not Teach or Suggest the Particular Time and Temperature Combinations of the ’773 Patent ....	42
D.	McSpadden, Pelton, and the 1992 ISO do not bridge the critical gaps between Kuhn and the claimed invention. ....	43
VII.	CLAIMS 1-17 ARE NOT PRIMA FACIE OBVIOUS OVER MATSUTANI, PELTON AND THE 1992 ISO ....	47
A.	Matsutani is interested in making a NiTi endodontic file that is superelastic everywhere except for the very tip, and he discourages heat-treating the entire file shank. ....	47
B.	Pelton and the 1992 ISO cannot compensate for the fact that Matsutani’s file is superelastic everywhere except for the tip. ....	52
C.	The Combination of Matsutani, Pelton, and the 1992 ISO Does Not Result in Permanent Deformation as Required. ....	52

VIII. OBJECTIVE EVIDENCE CONFIRMS THE NOVELTY AND NON-OBVIOUSNESS OF THE CLAIMED INVENTION .....	54
A. Dr. Luebke’s invention met a long-felt need for an endodontic file that navigates the canal better and fractures less—problems others failed to solve.....	56
B. Skepticism by Experts confirms the patentability of the invention.....	58
C. The invention has enjoyed commercial success.....	58
D. The invention has been copied by others, including Petitioner.....	58
E. Praise by others .....	59
IX. CONCLUSION.....	60

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>Apple Inc. v. ITC</i> , 725 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	54
<i>Depuy Spine, Inc. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc.</i> , 567 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	42
<i>Ecolochem, Inc. v. S. Cal. Edison Co.</i> , 227 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	55
<i>In re Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC.</i> , 778 F.3d 1271 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	15
<i>In re Gurley</i> , 27 F.3d 551 (Fed. Cir. 1994).....	48
<i>In re Rosenberger</i> , 386 F.2d 1015 (C.C.P.A. 1967) .....	40
<i>InTouch Techs., Inc. v. VGo Commc'ns., Inc.</i> , 751 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	49
<i>Leo Pharm. Prods. v. Rea</i> , 726 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	54
<i>Plantronics, Inc. v. Aliph, Inc.</i> , 724 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	54
<i>Transocean Offshore Deepwater Drilling, Inc. v. Maersk Drilling USA, Inc.</i> , 699 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	54
<i>W.L. Gore &amp; Assocs., Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.</i> , 721 F.2d 1540 (Fed. Cir. 1983).....	49

### Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 102(b) .....	1
35 U.S.C. § 103(a) .....	1

# 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.