

Filed on behalf of: Canon Inc.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

General Plastic Industrial Co., Ltd.  
Petitioner,  
v.  
Canon Inc.  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2015-01954  
U.S. Patent 8,909,094

---

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE  
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.107

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION .....	1
II.	BACKGROUND .....	3
	A.    The '094 Patent .....	3
	B.    Matsuoka .....	12
III.	PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL .....	17
IV.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	18
	A.    “toner” .....	19
	B.    “the sealing member being movable relative to the container body in an axial direction of the container body” and “a sealing portion ... configured to seal the opening when the sealing member and the container body are in a first position relative to one another, the opening becoming unsealed by relative movement of the sealing member and the container body away from one another from the first position to a second position relative to one another” .....	20
	C.    “displacing force receiving portion ...” and “projecting portion ...” .....	25
V.	LEGAL STANDARDS .....	31
VI.	MATSUOKA DOES NOT ANTICIPATE ANY OF THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS .....	33
	A.    Petitioner Has Failed to Show that Matsuoka’s Cartridge Includes Each of the Container Elements Recited in the Challenged Claims .....	33
	B.    Matsuoka Would Not Anticipate Independent Claims 1, 11, 29, and 38 Even If Rotary Power Transmitting Member 44 Could Be Considered Part of the Claimed Toner Supply Container .....	37

C.	Petitioner Fails to Show that Matsuoka Teaches All the Limitations of Claims that Depend from Claims 1 and 11 .....	40
VII.	MATSUOKA DOES NOT RENDER OBVIOUS ANY OF THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS .....	41
A.	Removing Matsuoka’s Cartridge With the Rotary Power Transmitting Member Still Attached Would Not Change the Fact that the Latter Is Part of the Apparatus and Not the Cartridge .....	41
B.	Petitioner’s Conclusory Argument Regarding Claims 7 and 16 Is Insufficient to Establish that Those Claims Are Obvious .....	45
VIII.	CONCLUSION.....	47

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>Chef Am., Inc. v. Lamb-Weston, Inc.</i> , 358 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2004) .....	23
<i>Gardner v. TEC Sys., Inc.</i> , 722 F.2d 1338 (Fed. Cir. 1984) .....	46
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co. of Kansas City</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	32
<i>Hartness Int’l Inc. v. Simplimatic Eng’g Co.</i> , 819 F.2d 1100 (Fed. Cir. 1987) .....	41, 45
<i>In re Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC</i> , 793 F.3d 1268 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....	18
<i>In re Giannelli</i> , 739 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2014) .....	24, 43
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	32
<i>Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. Am. Hoist &amp; Derrick Co.</i> , 730 F.2d 1452 (Fed. Cir. 1984) .....	32
<i>Net MoneyIN, Inc. v. VeriSign, Inc.</i> , 545 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....	31, 32, 36

### Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 102 .....	31
35 U.S.C. § 314(a) .....	3, 31

### Regulations

37 C.F.R. § 42.65(a).....	32, 46
37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b) .....	18

37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(4).....	32
37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(5).....	32
37 C.F.R. § 42.108(c).....	3, 31

**P.T.A.B.**

<i>Ex parte Goodrich</i> , Appeal 2009-009437, 2010 WL 3441066 (B.P.A.I. Aug. 30, 2010) .....	46
<i>Ex parte Icon Health &amp; Fitness, Inc.</i> , Appeal No. 2006-0790, 2006 WL 1665623 (B.P.A.I. May 16, 2006).....	25
<i>Ex parte Murata</i> , Appeal 2013-007289, 2015 WL 4628749 (P.T.A.B. Jul. 31, 2015) .....	46
<i>General Elec. Co. v. TAS Energy Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00163, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. May 13, 2014) .....	32, 46
<i>Kinetic Techs., Inc. v. Skyworks Solutions, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00529, Paper 8 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 23, 2014) .....	44
<i>Synopsys, Inc. v. Mentor Graphics Corp.</i> , IPR2012-00041, Paper 16 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 22, 2013) .....	32

# 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.