

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

E. I. DU PONT DE NEMOURS AND COMPANY and  
ARCHER-DANIELS-MIDLAND COMPANY,  
Petitioners,

v.

FURANIX TECHNOLOGIES B.V.,  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2015-01838  
Patent 8,865,921

---

**RESPONSE OF PATENT OWNER FURANIX TECHNOLOGIES B.V.**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|  | Page |
|--|------|
| I. TECHNICAL BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT .....                        | 1    |
| II. The '921 Patent, Prosecution History and Claims Construction .....       | 9    |
| A. The '921 Patent's Specification and Claims.....                           | 9    |
| B. Prosecution History of the '921 Patent .....                              | 11   |
| C. "Construction" of the Claims in the '921 Patent .....                     | 12   |
| III. ARGUMENT – PATENTABILITY SHOULD BE AFFIRMED.....                        | 14   |
| A. A Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....                                | 15   |
| B. The Asserted Prior Art and Its Differences from the Claims at Issue ..... | 16   |
| 1. WO 01/72732 ("the '732 Publication, Ex. 1002).....                        | 16   |
| 2. RU 448177 ("RU '177," Ex. 1007) .....                                     | 22   |
| 3. US 2008/0103318 ("the '318 Publication," Ex. 1008).....                   | 23   |
| 4. Lewkowski (Ex. 1005).....   | 25   |
| 5. Oae (Ex. 1006) .....  | 265  |
| 6. Admitted Prior Art .....  | 276  |
| 7. Parenheimer (Ex. 1003).....   | 27   |
| 8. The '841 Publication.....   | 29   |
| C. Objective Indicia of Non-Obviousness.....                                 | 31   |
| D. The Patentability of Claims 1-5 Should be Affirmed.....                   | 51   |
| E. The Patentability of Claims 7-9 Should be Affirmed.....                   | 59   |

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

|  | Page(s) |
|--|---------|
| <b>Cases</b>   |         |
| <i>Alza Corp. v. Mylan Labs, Inc.</i> ,<br>464 F.3d 1286 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....   | 51      |
| <i>Amgen, Inc. v. Hoffman-LaRoche Ltd.</i> ,<br>580 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....  | 52      |
| <i>Ashland Oil, Inc. v. Delta Resins &amp; Refractories, Inc.</i> ,<br>776 F.2d 281 (Fed. Cir. 1985), cert. denied, 475 U.S. 1017 (1986). .... | 48      |
| <i>Crocs, Inc. v. International Trade Com’n</i> ,<br>598 F.3d 1294 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....   | 31      |
| <i>Demaco Corp. v. F. Von Langsdorff Licensing Ltd.</i> ,<br>851 F.2d 1387 (Fed. Cir.), cert. denied, 488 U.S. 956 (1988) .....                | 48      |
| <i>Eisai Co. v. Dr. Reddy’s Labs, Lid.</i> ,<br>533 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....   | 52      |
| <i>Ferring B.V. v. Watson Labs, Inc.</i> ,<br>764 F.3d 1401 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....  | 32      |
| <i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> ,<br>383 U.S. 1 (1966) .....   | 14      |
| <i>Heidelberger Druckmaschinen AG v. Hantscho Commercial Prods., Inc.</i><br>21 F.3d 1068 (Fed. Cir. 1994) .....                               | 32      |
| <i>In re Aller</i> ,<br>220 F.2d 454 (C.C.P.A. 1955).....  | 51      |
| <i>In re Clemens</i> ,<br>622 F.2d 1029; 206 USPQ 289 (CCPA 1980) .....  | 50      |
| <i>In re Corkill</i> ,<br>711 F.2d 1496, 226 USPQ 1005 (Fed. Cir. 1985).....   | 36      |

|  |                |
|--|----------------|
| <i>In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Patent Litig.</i> ,<br>676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012)..... | 15             |
| <i>In re Grasselli</i> ,<br>713 F.2d 731 (Fed. Cir. 1983).....   | 50             |
| <i>In re Translogic Tech., Inc.</i> ,<br>504 F.3d 1249 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....   | 13             |
| <i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> ,<br>550 U.S. 398 (2007) .....   | 51             |
| <i>Leo Pharmaceutical Products, Ltd. v. Rea</i> ,<br>726 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....                                   | 31             |
| <i>McGinley v. Franklin Sports, Inc.</i><br>262 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....  | 32             |
| <i>Medichem, S.A. v. Rolabo, S.L.</i> ,<br>437 F.3d 1157 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....   | 51, 52         |
| <i>Ortho-McNeil Pharmaceutical Inc. v. Mylan Labs</i> ,<br>520 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....                             | 31, 32, 47, 52 |
| <i>Par Pharmaceutical, Inc. v. TWI Pharmaceuticals, Inc.</i> ,<br>773 F.3d 1186 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....                      | 52             |
| <i>Proctor &amp; Gamble Co. v. Teva Pharms. USA, Inc</i> ,<br>566 F.3d 989 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....                           | 51, 52         |
| <i>Titanium Metals Corp., v. Banner</i> ,<br>778 F.2d 775 (Fed Cir. 1985).....   | 51             |
| <i>Transocean Offshore Deepwater Drilling, Inc. v. Maersk Drilling USA, Inc.</i> ,<br>699 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....  | 32             |
| <b>Statutes</b>  |                |
| 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).....  | 1              |
| <b>Other Authorities</b>   |                |
| M.P.E.P. § 716.04.....   | 32             |

M.P.E.P. 716.01(b)..... 48

M.P.E.P. 716.02(d)..... 50

**Rules**

37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b)..... 12

# 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.