

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

HNI CORPORATION and ALLSTEEL INC.
Petitioners,

v.

DIRTT ENVIRONMENTAL SOLUTIONS LTD.
Patent Owner.

Case No. IPR2015-01691
Patent No. 8,024,901
Issue Date: September 27, 2011

Title: INTEGRATED RECONFIGURABLE WALL SYSTEM

**PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.120**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. THE '901 PATENT.....	2
A. Overview of the '901 Patent.....	2
B. Claim Construction.....	5
1. A “horizontal stringer” is “a horizontal member that is supported above the ground by opposing vertical members and that provides structural support to the vertical members”	6
III. PETITIONER’S PRIMARY PRIOR ART REFERENCE	10
A. Overview of Raith	10
1. Raith’s solid panels	11
2. Raith’s glass panels	13
IV. PETITIONER HAS FAILED TO SHOW THAT ANY OF THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS IN LIGHT OF THE PRIOR ART	14
A. The Level Of Ordinary Skill in the Art	15
B. Statutory Ground 1: Claims 1, 6, 7, and 15-18 Would Not Have Been Obvious over Raith in View of EVH.....	17
1. Raith does not teach “a plurality of horizontal stringers affixed between said vertical end frames” nor an aesthetic surface that is “affixed to said stringers”	17
2. Petitioner has failed to show that it would have been obvious to import EVH’s horizontal distance channels into Raith.....	25

a)	The disclosure of EVH	26
b)	Neither the Petition nor Dr. Beaman provide a reason for going so far as to import EVH’s horizontal distance channels into Raith	27
c)	Raith’s reference to “head and base assemblies” is not a reason to import EVH’s horizontal distance channels into Raith	30
d)	At his deposition, Dr. Beaman expressed doubt that even he, an expert, would import EVH’s horizontal distance channels into Raith	31
e)	Raith teaches away from importing EVH’s horizontal distance channels into Raith	33
f)	The new theory of obviousness proffered by Dr. Beaman for the first time at his deposition should be rejected for procedural and substantive reasons	35
C.	Statutory Ground 2: Claims 1, 4, 5, and 9 Would Not Have Been Obvious over Raith in View of Yu	38
1.	Petitioner has failed to show that it would have been obvious to import Yu’s horizontal cross rails into Raith	38
a)	Disclosure of Yu	39
b)	Neither the Petition nor Dr. Beaman provide a reason for going so far as to import Yu’s horizontal cross rails into Raith	40
c)	At his deposition, Dr. Beaman repudiated the obviousness theory set forth in the Petition and in his declaration	43
d)	The new theory of obviousness proffered by Dr. Beaman for the first time at his deposition should be rejected for procedural and substantive reasons	45
2.	Even If Petitioner Has Proven Claim 1 Unpatentable for	

	Obviousness, It Has Not Done So for Claim 5	47
D.	Statutory Ground 3: Claims 1, 4, 10, 19, and 20 Would Not Have Been Obvious over Raith in view of MacGregor	49
1.	Petitioner has failed to show that it would have been obvious to import MacGregor’s horizontal cross members into Raith	49
a)	Disclosure of MacGregor.....	50
b)	Neither the Petition nor Dr. Beaman provide a reason for going so far as to import MacGregor’s horizontal cross members into Raith.....	50
c)	At his deposition, Dr. Beaman repudiated the obviousness theory set forth in the Petition and in his declaration.....	53
d)	The new theory of obviousness proffered by Dr. Beaman for the first time at his deposition should be rejected for procedural and substantive reasons	55
E.	Statutory Ground 4: Claim 25 Would Not Have Been Obvious over Raith in view of MacGregor and Rozier	58
F.	Statutory Ground 5: Claim 14 Would Not Have Been Obvious over Raith in view of EVH and Dixon	59
G.	Objective Indicia of Nonobviousness.....	59
1.	Meeting A Long-Felt Need For Greater Flexibility and Customization.....	59
2.	Commercial Success	63
3.	Praise By Others	64
V.	PETITIONER’S ATTACK ON THE ’901 PATENT IN THIS PROCEEDING IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL.....	65
VI.	CONCLUSION.....	65

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Cooper v. Lee</i> (U.S. 15-955)	65
<i>Cuozzo Speed Technologies, LLC v. Lee</i> (U.S. 15-446)	10
<i>InTouch Technologies, Inc. v. VGO Communications</i> , 751 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	36, 57
<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	27, 38, 47, 58
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007)	27, 37, 46, 57
<i>Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc.</i> , 517 U.S. 370 (1996)	10
<i>MCM Portfolio LLC v. Hewlett Packard</i> , 812 F.3d 1284 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	65
<i>PPC Broadband, Inc. v. Corning Optical Communications RF LLC</i> , 815 F.3d 734 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	64
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	10
<i>Runway Safe LLC v. Engineered Arresting Systems</i> , IPR2015-01921, Paper 9 (PTAB Feb. 29, 2016)	42
<i>In re Suitco Surface</i> , 603 F.3d 1255 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	6
<i>Trivascular, Inc. v. Samuels</i> , 812 F.3d 1056 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	1

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.