

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

EURAMAX INTERNATIONAL, INC.
Petitioner

v.

INVISAFLOW, LLC
Patent Owner

Case No. IPR 2016-00423
Patent 8,556,195

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO PETITION
PURSUANT TO 35 U.S.C. § 313 AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.107.**

Filed: April 6, 2016

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iii
TABLE OF EXHIBITS	v
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. BACKGROUND FACTS.....	1
A. The '195 Patent	1
B. Prosecution of the Related '327 Application	2
C. Related District Court Litigation Involving the '195 Patent	5
III. PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR <i>INTER PARTES</i> REVIEW	6
A. Overview of the Challenged Claims	6
B. Petitioner's Asserted Prior Art Combinations and Grounds for Invalidity	8
IV. LEGAL STANDARDS	9
A. Threshold Standards for <i>Inter Partes</i> Review.....	9
B. Obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).....	10
C. The Entirety of the Claims, Including the Preamble, Should be Given Patentable Weight.	11
V. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	13
A. Petitioner's Asserted Claim Constructions	13
B. Patent Owner's Proposed Constructions	13
1. Claim 1 Preamble – “A drainage attachment for directing water from an elevated water source”	13
2. Claim 1 – “an outlet end comprising a top portion, a bottom portion, and first and second side portions”	15
3. Claim 1 – “the longitudinal axis extends in a first plane that is parallel to a second plane that is located between the top and bottom portions of the outlet end and bisects the first and second side portions of the outlet end”	17
4. Claim 1 – “outlet opening top portion”	18

5.	Claim 1 – “thereby reducing the effects of erosion adjacent the outlet opening”	21
6.	Claim 7 – “attachment member”	23
7.	Claim 11 – “at least a major portion of the outlet opening”	24
VI.	THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE THE APPLIED REFERENCES FAIL TO TEACH OR SUGGEST EVERY CLAIM ELEMENT.....	24
A.	Ground 1: Claims 1-11 are Patentable over Francis	24
B.	Ground 2: Claims 8 and 9 are Patentable over Francis in view of Sweers	30
C.	Ground 3: Claims 1-11 are Patentable over Farmer	31
D.	Ground 4: Claim 9 over Farmer and Hicks	34
E.	Ground 5: Claims 1-11 over Francis in view of Farmer	34
F.	Ground 6: Claims 8-9 over Francis in view of Farmer and Sweers.....	37
	CONCLUSION	39
	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	40

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Catalina Mktg. Int'l, Inc. v. Coolsavings.com, Inc.</i> , 289 F.3d 801 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	12
<i>CCS Fitness, Inc. v. Brunswick Corp.</i> , 288 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	10
<i>Corning Glass Works v. Sumitomo Elec. U.S.A., Inc.</i> , 868 F.2d 1251 (Fed. Cir. 1989).....	12
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966)	10
<i>Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Bausch & Lomb Inc.</i> , 909 F.2d 1464 (Fed. Cir. 1990).....	22
<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	11
<i>Inline Connection Corp. v. Earthlink, Inc.</i> , 684 F. Supp. 2d 496 (D. Del. 2010)	11
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007)	10, 11
<i>Omega Eng'g, Inc., v. Raytek Corp.</i> , 334 F.3d 1314 (Fed.Cir.2003)	19
<i>Ortho-McNeil Pharm., Inc. v. Mylan Labs., Inc.</i> , 520 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	11
<i>Oxford Gene Tech., Ltd. v. Mergen Ltd.</i> , 345 F. Supp. 2d 431 (D. Del. 2004)	11
<i>Perfect Web Techs., Inc. v. InfoUSA, Inc.</i> , 587 F.3d 1324 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	11
<i>Pitney Bowes, Inc. v. Hewlett-Packard Co.</i> , 182 F.3d 1298 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	12
<i>Rowe v. Dror</i> , 112 F.3d 473 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....	12, 15

<i>Symantec Corp. v. Computer Assoc. Int'l, Inc.</i> , 522 F.3d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	12, 14, 21, 23
<i>Textron Innovations, Inc. v. American Eurocopter Corp.</i> , 498 Fed. Appx. 23 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	12, 33
<i>Toro Co. v. Textron, Inc.</i> , 502 F. Supp. 2d 904 (D. Minn. 2007).....	12
<i>Unigene Labs., Inc. v. Apotex, Inc.</i> , 655 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	11
<i>Vizio, Inc. v. International Trade Com'n</i> , 605 F.3d 1330 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	13
<i>Wilson Sporting Goods Co. v. Hillerich & Bradsby Co.</i> , 442 F.3d 1322 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	20
<i>Z4 Techs., Inc. v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , 507 F.3d 1340, 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	6, 18, 19

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 103(a)	10
35 U.S.C. § 313	1
35 U.S.C. § 314(a)	9, 24
37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b)	10

Other Authorities

M.P.E.P. §§ 2141, 2142, 2143	11
Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48756 (Aug. 14, 2012)	10

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.