

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

JOHNSON MATTHEY INC., and JOHNSON MATTHEY PLC,

Petitioners,

v.

BASF CORPORATION,

Patent Owner

Case IPR2015-01266

Patent 9,039,982

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE
TO PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW
OF U.S. PATENT NO. 9,039,982**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iii
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. BACKGROUND	5
A. The '982 Patent	5
B. Prosecution History and Related Reexaminations	12
C. Overview of the References Cited in the Petition.....	15
1. Hüthwohl.....	15
2. Hashimoto	16
3. Speronello	18
4. Teraoka.....	19
III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	20
IV. THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED PURSUANT TO 35 USC § 325(d) BECAUSE IT RELIES ON ART ALREADY CONSIDERED EXTENSIVELY BY THE PATENT OFFICE	20
V. <i>INTER PARTES</i> REVIEW SHOULD NOT BE INSTITUTED	25
A. Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated A Prima Facie Case of Obviousness Based On The Combination Of Hüthwohl, Speronello, Hashimoto, and Teraoka	25
1. Hüthwohl Would Not Have Guided The Skilled Artisan To The Claimed Invention	26
a. There Is No Basis To Rely On Hüthwohl As A Primary Reference Because It Omits All Key Details Of The Claims	27

b.	The Limited Teachings Of Hüthwohl Are Contrary To The Claimed Invention And Thus Demonstrate Nonobviousness.....	32
2.	An Ordinarily Skilled Artisan Would Not Have Combined Hashimoto And Speronello In Hüthwohl's System.....	34
3.	The Reliance On Teraoka Confirms That Petitioner's Case Is A Hindsight Reconstruction.....	44
B.	Secondary Considerations Confirm That The '982 Patent Is Nonobvious	47
1.	Long Felt Need For The Claimed Invention After Announcement Of The EU Emissions Standards Demonstrates Nonobviousness.....	48
2.	Skepticism For The Approach Followed In The '982 Patent Followed By Unexpected Results Demonstrates Nonobviousness	51
3.	Industry Praise For The Claimed Invention Demonstrates Nonobviousness	55
C.	There Is No Evidence That Others Achieved The Invention Claimed In The '982 Patent	56
VI.	CONCLUSION.....	60

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases

<i>Apple, Inc. et al. v. Memory Integrity, LLC</i> , IPR2015-00172, Paper No. 16 (May 11, 2015).....	43
<i>Continental Auto. Sys., Inc. v. Wasica Finance GmbH</i> , IPR/2014-01454, Paper No. 14 (Feb. 13, 2015).....	22
<i>Daifuku Co., Ltd. et al., v. Murata Machinery, Ltd.</i> , IPR2015-00084, Paper No. 10 (May 4, 2015).....	43
<i>Grain Processing Corp. v. Am.-Maize Prods. Co.</i> , 840 F.2d 902 (Fed. Cir. 1988)	30
<i>In re Fritch</i> , 972 F.2d 1260 (Fed. Cir. 1992)	31
<i>In re Gorman</i> , 933 F.2d 982 (Fed. Cir. 1991)	30, 31
<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	26
<i>In re NTP, Inc.</i> , 654 F.3d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	30
<i>In re Ratti</i> , 270 F.2d 810 (C.C.P.A. 1959)	33
<i>Innogenetics, N.V. v. Abbott Labs.</i> , 512 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	25
<i>InTouch Techs., Inc. v. VGO Commc'ns, Inc.</i> , 751 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	43
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	5, 26, 43, 47

<i>Leo Pharm. Prods., Ltd. v. Rea</i> , 726 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	29, 30, 42, 51
<i>Masterimage 3D, Inc., v. Reald, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00036, Paper No. 16 (April 22, 2015).....	44
<i>Nanoco Techs., Ltd. v. MIT</i> , Case IPR2015-00532, Paper 8 (PTAB Jul. 27, 2015)	41
<i>Prism Pharma Co., Ltd. v. Choongwae Pharma Corp.</i> , IPR2014-00315, Paper 14 (July 8, 2014)	20
<i>Rambus Inc. v. Rea</i> , 731 F.3d 1248 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	47
<i>Stratoflex, Inc. v. Aeroquip Corp.</i> , 713 F.2d 1530 (Fed. Cir. 1983)	48
<i>Zimmer Holdings, Inc. v. Bonutti Skeletal Innovations LLC</i> , IPR2014-01080, Paper No. 17 (Oct. 31, 2014)	23
<i>ZTE Corp. v. ContentGuard Holdings, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00454, Paper No. 12 (Sep. 25, 2013)	23

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 103	12, 13, 21, 43
35 U.S.C. § 313	1
35 U.S.C. § 325(d)	14, 20, 23, 24
37 C.F.R. § 1.132	13
37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b)	20
37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(3).....	20
37 C.F.R. § 42.107	1
37 C.F.R. § 42.65(a).....	31

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.