IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Command Web Offset Company, Inc., Worzalla Publishing Company, Sandy Alexander, Inc., Publication Printers Corp., Specialty Promotions, Inc., and Trend Offset Printing Services Inc.,

Petitioners.

v.

CTP Innovations, LLC,

Patent Owner.

Case IPR2016-00008 Patent 6,611,349

CTP INNOVATIONS, LLC'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO PETITION

Filed on behalf of CTP Innovations, LLC

By:

W. Edward Ramage (Lead Counsel)

Reg. No. 50,810

BAKER, DONELSON, BEARMAN,

CALDWELL & BERKOWITZ, P.C.

Baker Donelson Center

211 Commerce Street, Suite 800

Nashville, Tennessee 37201

Telephone: (615) 726-5771

Facsimile: (615) 744-5771

Email: eramage@bakerdonelson.com Email: ccrosby@bakerdonelson.com

L. Clint Crosby (Back-up Counsel)

Reg. No. 47,508

BAKER, DONELSON, BEARMAN,

CALDWELL & BERKOWITZ, P.C.

Monarch Plaza, Suite 1600

3414 Peachtree Ave., N.E.

Atlanta, Georgia 30326

Telephone: (678) 406-8702

Facsimile: (678) 406-8802



TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTROD	UCTION	1	
II. APPLIC	ABLE LEGAL STANDARDS	2	
A.	Institution of Inter Partes Review	2	
В.	Obviousness under § 103(a).	2	
III. CLAIM	CONSTRUCTION	4	
A.	"plate-ready filebeing provided in real time"	4	
В.	"plate-ready file"	6	
C.	"thin PostScript file"	9	
D.	"fat PostScript file"	9	
E.	"communication network"	9	
IV. ARGUN	MENT1	0	
A.	The Board Has Already Rejected Similar Arguments1	0	
В.	Petitioners Fail to Demonstrate a Reasonable Likelihood of Prevailing		
	1. The Petition Fails to Establish A Reasonable Likelihood That Claims 4-5 and 7-9 Of The '349 Patent Would Have Been Obvious Based on FullPress and WebNative	3	
	2. The Petition Fails to Establish A Reasonable Likelihood That Claim 6 Of The '349 Patent Would Have Been Obvious Based on FullPress, WebNative and Andersson1	6	
	3. The Petition Fails to Establish A Reasonable Likelihood That Claims 4-7 Of The '349 Patent Would Have Been Obvious Based on I-Media and Andersson	6	
	4. The Petition Fails to Establish A Reasonable Likelihood That Claims 8-9 Of The '349 Patent Would Have Been Obvious Based on I-Media, Anderson and Seybold	8	
V. CONCL	USION1	9	



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

~	Page(s)
CASES	
CCS Fitness, Inc. v. Brunswick Corp., 288 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	2
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966)	3
<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	3, 4
Inline Connection Corp. v. Earthlink, Inc., 684 F. Supp. 2d 496 (D. Del. 2010)	3
KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. 398 (2007)	3, 4
Ortho-McNeil Pharm., Inc. v. Mylan Labs., Inc., 520 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	3, 4
Oxford Gene Tech., Ltd. v. Mergen Ltd., 345 F. Supp. 2d 431 (D. Del. 2004)	3
Perfect Web Technologies, Inc. v. InfoUSA, Inc., 587 F.3d 1324 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	4
Unigene Labs., Inc. v. Apotex, Inc., 655 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	3
STATUTES	
35 U.S.C. § 103	2
35 U.S.C. § 313	1
35 U.S.C. § 314	2, 12
OTHER AUTHORITIES	
37 C.F.R. § 42.100	2
37 C F R 8 42 107	



77 Fed. Reg. 48756, 48766	2
---------------------------	---



Patent Owner, CTP Innovations, LLC ("Patent Owner"), pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 313 and 37 C.F.R. § 42.107, submits its Preliminary Response to Command Web Offset Company's, Worzalla Publishing Company's, Sandy Alexander, Inc.'s, Publication Printers Corp.'s, Specialty Promotions, Inc.'s and Trend Offset Printing Services, Inc.'s (collectively, the "Petitioners") Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 6,611,349 ("the '349 Patent").

I. INTRODUCTION

This Petition is the third round of petitions filed against the '349 Patent and a related patent (U.S. 6,738,155) on behalf of a group of printing service providers who have been sued for infringement in a number of cases. *See* Ex. 1002. The Petitioners in this matter are participants in some of those cases. In this Petition, Petitioners assert that claims 4-14 of the '349 Patent should be invalidated on the basis of obviousness.

This Petition follows the Board's determinations to reject similar petitions filed against this same set of claims over the past two years. *See* Exs. 1004 (Decision Denying Petition to Institute in IPR2013-00474), 1005 (Decision Instituting IPR in IPR 2014-00791), 1013 (Decision Regarding Request for Rehearing in IPR 2014-00791). Patent Owner intends to vigorously contest Petitioners' assertions in this Petition if the Board initiates an *Inter Partes* Review. However, for purposes of its preliminary response, Patent Owner submits that



DOCKET

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.

