

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 PRELIMINARY RESPONSE
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.107**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THE '901 PATENT	3
A. Overview of the '901 Patent.....	3
B. How the Claims of the '901 Patent Are to be Construed.....	7
1. A “horizontal stringer” is a horizontal structural support that connects opposing vertical end frames of a module and that is not a horizontal base for the module.	7
III. STANDARD FOR GRANTING <i>INTER PARTES</i> REVIEW	9
IV. PETITIONER’S PRIMARY PRIOR ART REFERENCE	10
A. Overview of Raith	10
1. Solid panels in Raith	10
2. Glass panels in Raith.....	12
V. PETITIONER HAS FAILED TO SHOW THAT IT IS LIKELY TO SUCCEED IN SHOWING THAT ANY OF THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS IN LIGHT OF THE PRIOR ART.....	13
A. Statutory Ground 1: Claims 1, 6, 7, 11, 13 and 15-18 Would Not Have Been Obvious over Raith in View of EVH	14
1. Claim 1 would not have been obvious over Raith in view of EVH because it would not have been obvious to combine EVH with Raith to arrive at the claimed system.....	14
a) 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”	15
	b) Raith teaches away from using the horizontal structures disclosed in EVH	23
2.	Claim 11 would not have been obvious over Raith in view of EVH because neither Raith nor EVH teaches the claimed structural extrusion to engage the module	28
3.	Claim 17 would not have been obvious over Raith in view of EVH because neither Raith nor EVH teaches the claimed curved horizontal stringers	29
B.	Statutory Ground 2: Claims 1, 4, 5, 8 and 9 Would Not Have Been Obvious over Raith in View of Yu	32
1.	Claim 1 would not have been obvious over Raith in view of Yu because a person of skill would not have added the cross rails of Yu to Raith	32
	a) The systems of Raith and Yu would not have been combined because Raith teaches away and because the two systems use fundamentally different approaches	34
	b) A person of skill would not have been motivated to modify Raith in view of Yu because Raith is already configured to support separate coverings and hanging furniture components	37
2.	Claim 8 would not have been obvious over Raith in view of Yu because neither Raith nor Yu teaches a cantilever channel	39
C.	Statutory Ground 3: Claims 1, 4, 10 and 19-23 Would Not Have Been Obvious over Raith in view of MacGregor	46
1.	Claim 1 would not have been obvious over Raith in view of MacGregor because a person of skill would not have added the horizontal frame members of MacGregor to	

Raith46

a) The systems of Raith and MacGregor would not have been combined because Raith teaches away and because the two systems use fundamentally different approaches48

b) A person of skill would not have been motivated to modify Raith in view of MacGregor because Raith is already configured to support separate coverings and hanging furniture components50

2. Claims 21-23 would not have been obvious over Raith in view of MacGregor because neither Raith nor MacGregor teaches an extended frame depth.....51

D. Statutory Ground 4: Claim 25 Would Not Have Been Obvious over Raith in view of MacGregor and Rozier.....55

E. Statutory Ground 5: Claim 14 Would Not Have Been Obvious over Raith in view of EVH and Dixon.....55

VI. THE BOARD SHOULD EXERCISE ITS DISCRETION TO DENY THE PETITION IN LIGHT OF REISSUE PROCEEDING 14/032,93156

VII. PETITIONER’S REDUNDANT CHALLENGES TO CLAIMS 1 AND 4 SHOULD BE DENIED58

VIII. CONCLUSION.....60

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**Page(s)****CASES**

<i>Liberty Mut. Ins. Co. v. Progressive Cas. Ins. Co.</i> , CBM2012-00003, Papers 7 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 25, 2012)	58, 59
<i>Olympus Am., Inc. v. Perfect Surgical Techniques, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-2033, Paper 16 (P.T.A.B. June 16, 2014)	59
<i>Ultratec, Inc. v. Sorenson Commc'ns, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00288, Paper 23 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 10, 2014)	58

OTHER AUTHORITIES

MPEP § 1442.03	57
Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48,756 (Aug. 14, 2012).....	10

REGULATIONS

37 C.F.R. § 42.100	7
37 C.F.R. § 42.107	1
37 C.F.R. § 42.108	9, 58

RULES AND STATUTES

35 U.S.C. § 313	1
35 U.S.C. § 314	9
35 U.S.C. § 325	57

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.