

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

HYDRITE CHEMICAL CO.,
Petitioner,

v.

SOLENIS TECHNOLOGIES, L.P.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2015-01592
Patent No. 8,841,469

DECLARATION OF SCOTT D. KOHL, PH.D

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction and Qualifications	1
II.	Materials Reviewed	2
III.	Background and Qualifications	2
IV.	The Law	6
V.	Overview of the Petition and Rockstraw Declaration	10
	A. Prior Publications	10
	B. Summary of the Proposed Grounds of Rejection.....	11
VI.	Description of the Invention of the 469 Patent.....	12
VII.	Corn-to-Ethanol Processing and the Level of Skill in the Art	13
VIII.	Grounds Based on Bonanno and ICI (Grounds 1-5)	16
	A. Hydrite’s Combination Of Bonanno And ICI Would Not Lead To The Challenged Claims	16
	B. Hydrite’s Argument Regarding Claims 16	21
	C. The Remaining References Do Not Cure The Deficiencies Of Bonanno And ICI	22
IX.	Grounds Based on Winsness (Grounds 6-10)	24
	A. Winsness Is Not Directed To Handling Emulsions	25
	B. Winsness Discloses An Efficient And Effective Oil Recovery Method.....	26
	C. Alther Does Not Suggest The Use Of Polysorbate 80 For Use In Winsness’s Process.....	28
	D. Hydrite’s Reliance On ICI And The Alleged Predictability Of Using HLB Values To Form Or Break An Emulsion Is Misplaced ...	32
	E. The Remaining References	36

X. Objective Considerations.....39

XI. Conclusion40

I. Introduction and Qualifications

I, Dr. Scott D. Kohl, declare as follows:

1. I have been retained by Solenis Technologies, L.P. (“Solenis”) to offer technical opinions regarding U.S. Patent No. 8,841,469 (“469 Patent,” Ex. 1001) and certain references relating to its subject matter. This Declaration contains my opinions on this matter and the reasons and bases therefor. I understand that this Declaration is being submitted together with a Patent Owner’s response to the Petition by Hydrite Chemical Co. (“Hydrite”) seeking *inter partes* review of claims 1-19 of the 469 Patent, and a declaration by Jennifer Bailey, Solenis’s Global Strategic Product Director for Biorefining.

2. I have been asked to testify regarding the views expressed in Hydrite’s Petition and the accompanying declaration of Dr. David A. Rockstraw, Ph.D., P.E. (“Rockstraw Declaration”) (Ex. 1005). This declaration provides a rebuttal of the proposed grounds of rejection set forth in the Petition and Rockstraw Declaration. It further provides an analysis of the 469 Patent and its validity in light of the law of obviousness as it has been explained to me and in light of the references upon which the Petition and Dr. Rockstraw rely and information regarding Solenis products and their use in methods claimed in the 469 Patent.

3. I do not believe that the methods that are claimed in the 469 Patent would have been obvious to those of ordinary skill in the relevant technical field at the time that the 469 Patent was filed. Specifically, I do not believe that the claimed methods would have been obvious in view of the prior publications that Hydrite and Dr. Rockstaw have identified. In my view, the modifications to those publications that Hydrite and Dr. Rockstraw have proposed are ones that a person of ordinary skill either would not have had a reason to make or that would have led such a person to a method that was different than those claimed. This declaration provides the opinions that I have formed to date. I may modify my opinions, if necessary, based on further review and analysis of information provided to me subsequent to the filing of this declaration.

II. Materials Reviewed

4. I have reviewed the Petition, the Rockstraw Declaration (Ex. 1005), the Rockstraw deposition transcript (Ex. 2005), and each exhibit cited therein. I have also reviewed the declaration of Jennifer Bailey (Ex. 2004) and selected exhibits cited therein.

III. Background and Qualifications

5. I hold a Bachelor of Science degree in chemistry from South Dakota State University, which I earned in 1994. I also earned a Ph.D in chemistry

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.