

Paper No. 16
Filed: February 16, 2016

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ALLSTEEL INC.
Petitioner

v.

DIRTT ENVIRONMENTAL SOLUTIONS LTD.
Patent Owner

Case IPR2015-01691
Patent No. 8,024,901

Before SALLY C. MEDLEY, SCOTT A. DANIELS, and
JACQUELINE T. HARLOW, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

**PETITIONER'S MOTION FOR REHEARING
PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d)**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF RELIEF REQUESTED 1

II. THE PANEL’S DECISION ON CLAIM 8..... 3

III. BASES FOR REHEARING AND REVERSAL AS TO CLAIM 8..... 6

 A. The Standard for Rehearing 6

 B. Relevant Claim Construction Principles 6

 C. The Sole Embodiment of Claim 8..... 8

 D. The Panel’s Construction Excludes the “Generally L-Shaped Slot” of the Sole Embodiment..... 9

 E. The Panel’s Construction Overlooks that the “Generally L-Shaped Slot” of the Sole Embodiment Is Configured Such that Not All Surfaces “Engage a Substantially L-Shaped Hook.” 13

 F. Petitioner Has Demonstrated a Reasonable Likelihood of Success on Claim 8. 15

IV. CONCLUSION..... 15

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
FEDERAL CASES	
<i>Anchor Wall Systems, Inc. v. Rockwood Retaining Walls, Inc.</i> , 340 F.3d 1298 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	12
<i>Broadcom Corp. v. Emulex Corp.</i> , 732 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	8
<i>Epos Technologies Ltd. v. Pegasus Technologies Ltd.</i> , 766 F.3d 1338 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	8
<i>Facebook, Inc. v. Pragmatus AV, LLC</i> , 582 F. App'x 864 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	1, 7
<i>In re Cuozzo Speed Tech., LLC</i> , 793 F.3d 1268 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	1, 6
<i>Johns Hopkins Univ. v. CellPro, Inc.</i> , 152 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....	7
<i>Kaneka Corp. v. Xiamen Kingdomway Group Co.</i> , 790 F.3d 1298 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	passim
<i>Trivascular, Inc. v. Samuels</i> , No. 2015-1631, 2016 WL 463539 (Fed. Cir. Feb. 5, 2016)	2
FEDERAL STATUTES	
35 U.S.C. § 103	3
RULES	
Rule 42.71(c).....	6, 15
REGULATIONS	
37 C.F.R. § 42.71(c).....	6
37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d).....	2
37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b).....	2

OTHER AUTHORITIES

AVX Corp. v. Greatbatch Ltd.,
IPR2015-00710, paper 13, slip op. (PTAB Jan. 13, 2016)2, 11, 13

Merial Ltd. v. Virbac, IPR2014-01279, Paper 18, slip op. (PTAB Apr. 15,
2015)6

Yamaha Corp. of Am. v. Black Hills Media, LLC, IPR2014-00766, paper 16,
slip op. (PTAB Feb. 23, 2015)6

I. INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF RELIEF REQUESTED

The Panel’s decision not to institute *inter partes* review (“IPR”) of claim 8 of the ’901 patent represents an abuse of discretion because it depends upon constructions of two claim terms that ignore the sole embodiment of claim 8 disclosed in the ’901 patent—indeed, the Panel’s constructions exclude this sole embodiment. This oversight is fatal to the Panel’s analysis under Federal Circuit law, which has repeatedly emphasized that under the *Phillips* standard “a claim construction that excludes a preferred embodiment is ‘rarely, if ever, correct’” and “a construction that excludes *all* disclosed embodiments . . . is especially disfavored.” *See, e.g., Kaneka Corp. v. Xiamen Kingdomway Group Co.*, 790 F.3d 1298, 1304 (Fed. Cir. 2015) (internal citation omitted). Ignoring this intrinsic evidence results in the Panel’s analysis being inconsistent with the broadest reasonable interpretation standard that it is required to apply here, *In re Cuozzo Speed Tech., LLC*, 793 F.3d 1268, 1275-79 (Fed. Cir. 2015)—a standard that can never result in a construction that is **narrower** than what a court would provide under the *Phillips* standard. *Facebook, Inc. v. Pragmatus AV, LLC*, 582 F. App’x 864, 869 (Fed. Cir. 2014). Here, if the Panel’s improperly narrow constructions are corrected, the Petitioner’s evidence and arguments show that claim 8 is invalid, or, at the very least, that there is a “reasonable likelihood” that Petitioner will prevail for claim 8—especially because the “reasonable likelihood of success”

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.