

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

J SQUARED, INC. d/b/a UNIVERSITY LOFT COMPANY,

Petitioner,

v.

SAUDER MANUFACTURING COMPANY,

Patent Owner

Case IPR2015-00958

Patent 8,585,136

PETITIONER'S REPLY TO PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	ii
I. Patentee Improperly Conflates Its Claims & Specification.....	1
II. Specification Features Imported Into the Claims	3
A. Improperly Interpreted Claim Terms:	5
1. “Combination”	5
2. “User”	5
3. “Stool Base”	6
4. “Saddle”	6
5. “Assembly”	7
6. “or, alternatively”	8
B. Dependent Claims	8
III. Patentee Sweeps Unnecessary Structure Into Claim 12.....	9
IV. Yu & Clark Render Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 9 and 11 Obvious.....	12
A. A Latch is a Fundamental Mechanical Structure	14
V. Yu/Clark & Kassai Render Claims 6-10 and 12-14 Obvious	14
VI. Alleged Secondary Indicia Lack Objectivity & Required Nexus	16
A. A Proper Nexus Cannot Embrace Prior Art Features	17
B. Patentee’s Sales Evidence is Directed to a One-Party Market	18
C. Record Shows Unclaimed Features Driving Trey® Chair Sales.....	20
D. Patentee Offers No Praise of One Skilled in the Art.....	23
E. Patentee’s Copying Allegations Are Unsupported	24
VII. Not Even Qualifying Secondary Indicia Could Overcome the Record	25
VIII. Conclusion	25

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Asyst Techs., Inc. v. Empak, Inc.</i> , 268 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	11
<i>Bayer Healthcare Pharms., Inc. v. Watson Pharms., Inc.</i> , 713 F.3d 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	24
<i>Ex parte Masham</i> , 2 USPQ2d 1647 (BPAI 1987).....	2, 5
<i>Galderma Labs., L.P. v. Tolmar, Inc.</i> , 737 F.3d 731 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	20
<i>Golight Inc. v. Wal-Mart Stores Inc.</i> , 355 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	9
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	23
<i>In re Applied Materials, Inc.</i> , 692 F.3d 1289 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	19
<i>In re Huai-Hung Kao</i> , 639 F.3d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	17
<i>In re Huang</i> , 100 F.3d 135 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....	19
<i>In re Paulsen</i> , 30 F.3d 1475 (Fed. Cir. 1994).....	17
<i>Info-Hold, Inc. v. Applied Media Techs. Corp.</i> , 783 F.3d 1262 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	8
<i>Institut Pasteur v. Focarino</i> , 738 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	23

<i>J.T. Eaton & Co. v. Atlantic Paste & Glue Co.</i> , 106 F.3d 1563 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....	18
<i>KSR Int'l Co., v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	12
<i>Liebel-Flarsheim Co. v. Medrad, Inc.</i> , 358 F.3d 898 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	8
<i>Merck & Co. v. Teva Pharms. USA, Inc.</i> , 395 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	18
<i>Optivus Tech., Inc. v. Ion Beam Applications S.A.</i> , 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 44535 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 13, 2005).....	24
<i>Ormco Corp. v. Align Tech., Inc.</i> , 463 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	20
<i>Superguide Corp. v. DirecTV Enterprises, Inc.</i> , 358 F.3d 870 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	2
<i>Tempo Lighting, v. Tivoli, LLC</i> , 742 F. 3d 973 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	1
<i>Wyers v. Master Lock Co.</i> , 616 F.3d 1231 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	2, 17, 25
Statutes	
35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 6.....	9, 11

I. Patentee Improperly Conflates Its Claims & Specification

Patentee's Response completely disregards the proper tenets of claim construction. Patentee argues for so many features to be incorporated from the specification into its broadly drafted claims that even its employee-witnesses lose track. Each one of Patentee's employee-witnesses offers up different specification limitations for importation to the claims. (Ex. 1025 49:3-67:8; Ex. 1027 30:15 - 45:9; and Ex. 1028 46:10-67:7, all discussing Ex.1022).

This jumble of inconsistent testimony is not surprising given that Patentee failed to instruct any of its employee-witnesses on proper claim construction practices. None of Patentee's witnesses reviewed the intrinsic record (prosecution history) of the '136 patent before construing the claims. (Ex. 1025 31:9-32:6; Ex.1027 30:7-14; and Ex. 1028, 18:19-19:5, all discussing Ex. 1013).

“Prosecution history, while not literally within the patent document, serves as intrinsic evidence for purposes of claim construction. This remains true in construing patent claims before the PTO.” *Tempo Lighting, v. Tivoli, LLC*, 742 F.3d 973, 977 (Fed. Cir. 2014). The Board should not accord any weight to this conflicting and incomplete claim construction testimony.

Even if the incomplete claim analysis could be excused, which it cannot, Patentee provides no cogent explanation as to why its proposed mishmash of unclaimed specification features must be imported to its claims. This is because

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.