

Filed: July 21, 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*

**REPLY TO PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE  
UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 311-319 AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.100 *et seq.***

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Patent Owner’s Admissions Have Narrowed the Parties’ Dispute to a Minute Issue.....	2
II.	The Minute Issue Remaining Is Whether the Creativity Exercised by a Person of Ordinary Skill Would Be Limited to the Combinations Proposed by Petitioner.....	6
A.	The Law of Obviousness Does Not Constrain a Person of Skill to Bodily Incorporate Features of One Reference into Another .....	7
B.	The Law of Obviousness Does Not Constrain the Creativity of a Person of Ordinary Skill to “Preserving as Much of Raith” as Possible.....	11
C.	Dix Confirmed that a Person of Ordinary Skill Would Readily Be Able to Come Up with Combinations that Meet Every Limitation of Claim 1 .....	12
D.	Beaman Disagrees with Dix’s Artificially Limited View of a Person of Skill .....	14
III.	Patent Owner’s Claim Construction Arguments Should Be Rejected .....	15
IV.	Patent Owner’s Additional Argument Regarding Claim 5 Lacks Merit.....	19
V.	Patent Owner’s Secondary Considerations Evidence Should Be Given No Weight.....	20

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
<b>FEDERAL CASES</b>	
<i>Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee</i> , 136 S. Ct. 2131 (2016).....	18, 19
<i>E.I. du Pont de Nemours &amp; Co. v. Phillips Petroleum Co.</i> , 849 F.2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1988).....	19
<i>Hauser, Inc. v. Hawk Measurement Sys. Pty. Ltd.</i> , 122 F.3d 1040 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....	12
<i>In re DBC</i> , 545 F.3d 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	22
<i>In re GPAC Inc.</i> , 57 F.3d 1573 (Fed. Cir. 1995).....	23
<i>In re Huang</i> , 100 F.3d 135 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....	21
<i>In re Keller</i> , 642 F.2d 413 (CCPA 1981).....	2, 7, 8
<i>In re Mouttet</i> , 686 F.3d 1322 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	7
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398, 421, 82 USPQ2d at 1397.....	12
<i>Ormco Corp. v. Align Tech.</i> , 463 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	22
<i>Orthopedic Equip. Co. v. United States</i> , 702 F.2d 1005 (Fed. Cir. 1983).....	7
<i>Renishaw PLC v. Marposs Societa’ per Azioni</i> , 158 F.3d 1243 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....	19

*Tokai Corp. v. Easton Enters., Inc.*,  
632 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....22

**FEDERAL STATUTES**

35 U.S.C. § 103 ..... 11, 12

**REGULATIONS**

35 C.F.R. § 42.23(a).....2

**OTHER AUTHORITIES**

*Apple Inc. v. DSS Tech. Mgmt., Inc.*,  
IPR2015-00369, 2016 WL 3382361 (June 17, 2016).....2

*B/E Aerospace, Inc. v. MAG Aerospace Indus., LLC*,  
IPR2014-01510, 2016 WL 1082726 (Mar. 18, 2016).....2

*Terumo Bct, Inc. v. Noble House Grp. Party Ltd.*,  
IPR2015-00379, 2016 WL 3476906 (June 24, 2016).....2

In response to the Board's decision to grant *inter partes* review of Claim 1 of the '901 patent on three separate grounds, Patent Owner concedes that the prior art teaches the very point of novelty (the beaded connection of Claim 1) that Patent Owner added and argued in the face of repeated obviousness rejections. This concession alone speaks volumes about the fragility of Patent Owner's non-obviousness arguments. And Patent Owner concedes much more. Patent Owner does not argue that **any** limitation of Claim 1 is missing from **any** of the obviousness grounds. And Patent Owner admits that a person of skill would be motivated to combine the references, just not in ways that result in a wall systems that meet all elements of claim 1 based on Patent Owner's claim construction.

Despite conceding that all elements of claim 1 are met in Petitioner's proposed combinations and making affirmative arguments about how a person of skill would combine these references, Patent Owner continues to argue for the patentability of claim 1 by focusing on two arguments, neither of which have a basis in law: (1) a claim construction argument that "stringers" must not contact the ground to be "stringers" and (2) obviousness arguments that a person of ordinary skill would be limited to bodily incorporating references into one another, even though obviousness is based on, "what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to a person of ordinary skill in the art, not whether one reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of another

# 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.