

Filed on behalf of: Gold Standard Instruments, LLC

Paper No. _____

By: Joseph A. Hynds, Lead Counsel
R. Elizabeth Brenner-Leifer, Back-up Counsel
Jason M. Nolan, Back-up Counsel
Steven Lieberman, *Pro Hac Vice*
Derek F. Dahlgren, *Pro Hac Vice*
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
jnolan@rothwellfigg.com
ddahlgren@rothwellfigg.com

Date filed: July 30, 2015

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 IPR2015-01476
Patent 8,727,773 B2

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE
TO PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW**

Case IPR2015-01476
Patent 8,727,773

Mail Stop PATENT BOARD
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent & Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	ii
TABLE OF ABBREVIATIONS	vi
EXHIBIT LIST	vii
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THE '773 PATENT	3
A. The patent claims.....	3
B. Background	5
C. Claim Construction	10
1. “Heat-treating” and “heat-treated”.....	10
2. The “permanent deformation” wherein clause.....	10
III. PETITIONER’S ARGUMENT THAT THE '773 PATENT CLAIMS ARE NOT ENTITLED TO THE FILING DATE OF PCT/US2005/019947 IS AN IMPROPER REPLY TO SUPPORT ITS FIRST IPR PETITION AND, MOREOVER, IS WRONG.....	18
IV. GROUNDS 1 AND 2 ARE WITHOUT MERIT AND SHOULD NOT BE INSTITUTED	21
A. Legal standards for obviousness	21
B. Ground 1 (Endo, in combination with Tripi and McSpadden) should not be instituted.	24
C. Ground 2 (Endo, in combination with Tripi, McSpadden, and the 1992 ISO) should not be instituted.....	31
D. Petitioner fails to explain why grounds 1 and 2 are not redundant with grounds raised in its first IPR petition.	31
V. CONCLUSION.....	33

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

AIA Eng’g Ltd. v. Magotteaux Int’l S/A,
657 F.3d 1264 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....16

Ariad Pharms., Inc. v. Eli Lilly & Co.,
598 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2010)..... 20, 21

Berk-Tek LLC v. Belden Techs Inc.,
IPR2013-00057, slip op. (PTAB May 14, 2013) (Paper 21)3

Butamax Advanced Biofuels LLC v. Gevo, Inc.,
IPR2014-00581, slip op. (PTAB Oct. 14, 2014) (Paper 8).....33

Circuit Check Inc. v. QXQ, Inc.,
C.A. No. 2015-115, slip op. (Fed. Cir. July 28, 2015) 2, 22, 25

Dawson v. Dawson,
Interference No. 105,719, slip op. (BPAI Nov. 25, 2011) (Paper 196), *aff’d-in-*
part, 710 F.3d 1347 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....16

Falkner v. Inglis,
448 F.3d 1357 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....19

Graham v. John Deere Co.,
383 U.S. 1 (1966).....21

Griffin v. Bertina,
285 F.3d 1029 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....17

Heart Failure Techs., LLC v. Cardiokinetix, Inc.,
IPR2013-00183, slip op. (PTAB July 31, 2013) (Paper 12).....22

Hoffer v. Microsoft Corp.,
405 F.3d 1326 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....17

In re Berger,
279 F.3d 975 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....14

<i>In re Clay</i> , 966 F.2d 656 (Fed. Cir. 1992).....	25
<i>In re Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC</i> , 778 F.3d 1271 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	10
<i>In re Gurley</i> , 27 F.3d 551 (Fed. Cir. 1994).....	23
<i>Innogenetics, N.V., v. Abbott Labs.</i> , 512 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	31
<i>InTouch Techs., Inc. v. VGo Commc'ns.</i> , 751 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	24
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	22, 23
<i>LG Elecs., Inc. v. Cypress Semiconductor Corp.</i> , IPR 2014-01343, slip op. (PTAB Feb. 9, 2015) (Paper 7)	10
<i>Liberty Mut. Ins. Co. v. Progressive Cas. Ins. Co.</i> , CBM2012-00003, slip op. (PTAB Oct. 25, 2012) (Paper 7).....	32, 33
<i>LizardTech, Inc. v. Earth Res. Mapping, Inc.</i> , 424 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	19, 20, 21
<i>Minton v. NASD, Inc.</i> , 336 F.3d 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	16, 17
<i>Oracle Corp. v. Clouding IP, LLC</i> , IPR2013-00088, slip op. (PTAB June 13, 2013) (Paper 13).....	32
<i>Par Pharm., Inc. v. TWi Pharms., Inc.</i> , 773 F.3d 1186 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	27
<i>Parks v. Fine</i> , 773 F.2d 1577 (Fed. Cir. 1985).....	15
<i>Perfect Web Techs., Inc. v. Infousa, Inc.</i> , 587 F.3d 1324 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	28, 29

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.