

Filed on behalf of The Green Pet Shop Enterprises, LLC

By: Howard N. Shipley
Reid E. Dammann
Gordon & Rees LLP
1300 I Street, NW
Suite 825
Washington, DC 20007
Telephone: (202) 399-1009
Facsimile: (619) 696-7124

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MAZE INNOVATIONS, INC.
Petitioner

v.

THE GREEN PET SHOP ENTERPRISES, LLC
Patent Owner

Case IPR2016-00117
Patent 8,720,218 B2

PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	THE ‘218 PATENT	2
III.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	6
	A. “Pressure” should be construed consistent with the specification to have its ordinary meaning	6
	B. “Pressure activated recharging cooling composition”	8
	C. “Endothermically activated” and “endothermically deactivated”	10
	D. “Channel”	12
IV.	ALLEGATIONS REGARDING NON-ENABLEMENT ARE UNSUPPORTED AND IMPROPER	12
V.	PROPOSED GROUNDS OF REJECTION	15
	A. Fan does not anticipate the challenged claims	15
	1. There is no evidence that Fan discloses a “pressure activated cooling composition”	15
	2. There is no evidence that Fan discloses an “angled segment”	19
	B. Fan does not render the challenged claims obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103	22
	1. There is No Evidence to Support Ground 2	22
	2. Ground 2 is Redundant	23
	C. Claims 15 and 16 are not anticipated by Xiong	24
	1. Xiong does not disclose “a pressure activated recharging cooling composition.”	24

2.	Xiong does not disclose “a temperature regulation layer having an angled segment.”	25
D.	The Combination of Xiong in view of Fan does not render the challenged claims obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103	26
1.	Neither Xiong nor Fan discloses a “pressure activated recharging cooling composition.”	27
2.	Neither Xiong nor Fan discloses an “angled segment”	27
3.	There is no evidence of a motivation for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Xiong with Fan.....	28
VI.	CONCLUSION.....	32

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Allen Engineering Corp. v. Bartell Industries,
299 F. 3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2002)4

Aro Mfg. Co. v. Convertible Top Replacement Co.,
365 U.S. 336 (1961).....4

Cias, Inc. v. Alliance Gaming Corp.,
504 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2007)9

Diamond v. Diehr,
450 US 175 (1981).....4

Elcommerce.com, Inc. v. SAP AG,
745 F.3d 490 (Fed. Cir. 2014)6, 13

EMC Corp. v. Personal Web Technologies,
IPR2013-00082, Paper No. 33 Decision on EMC Request for
Rehearing at 4 (PTAB June 5, 2013).....24

Gemtron Corp. v. Saint-Gobain Corp.,
572 F.3d 1371 (Fed.Cir.2009) 18, 22, 30, 31

In re Kahn,
441 F.3d, 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006) 22, 31

Innogenetics, N.V. v. Abbott Labs.,
512 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2008)29

K/S HIMPP v. Hear-Wear Technologies, LLC,
751 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2014)6

KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.,
550 U.S. 298 (2007).....31

Lam Research Corp. v. Schunk Semiconductor,
65 F. Supp. 863 (N. D. Cal. 2014).....21

Liberty Mutual Ins. Co. v. Progressive Casualty Inc. Co.,
CBM2012-00003, Paper No. 7 Order (Redundant Grounds)(PTAB,
Oct. 25, 2012)24

Norman Noble, Inc. v. Nutech Ventures,
IPR2013-00101, Paper No. 14, Decision Denying *Inter Partes*
Review at p. 10, (PTAB June 20, 2013)..... 19, 22

IPR2016-00117
Patent No. 8,720,218

Panduit Corp. v. Dennison Mfg. Co.,
774 F.2d 1082 (Fed. Cir. 1985)5

Rosemount, Inc. v. Beckman Instruments, Inc.,
727 F.2d 1540 (Fed. Cir. 1984)5

TRW Automotive US LLC, v. Magna Electronics, Inc.,
IPR2014-00258, Decision Denying Petitioner’s Request for
Rehearing, Paper No. 18, August 27, 201431

Unigene Labs., Inc. v. Apotex, Inc.,
655 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2011) 23, 31

Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar,
935 F.2d 1555 (Fed.Cir.1991)4

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 10223

35 U.S.C. § 103 22, 23, 26

35 U.S.C. § 11212

35 U.S.C. § 31113

35 U.S.C. § 312 22, 31

35 U.S.C. § 3131

35 U.S.C. § 3141

37 C.F.R. § 42.1071

Regulations

Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. at 487632

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.