

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

JOHN CRANE, INC., JOHN CRANE
PRODUCTION SOLUTIONS, INC. &
JOHN CRANE GROUP CORP.,
Petitioner,

v.

FINALROD IP, LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2016-00521
TITLE: SUCKER ROD APPARATUS AND METHOD
Patent 8,851,162 B2

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	OVERVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 8,851,162.....	2
III.	THE ASSERTED GROUNDS	8
IV.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.....	8
A.	Definition of A Person Having Ordinary Skill In the Art.....	10
B.	<i>“the compressive forces create a force differential along the wedge system greater at the closed end of the fitting and decreasing toward the open end of the fitting”</i>	11
C.	<i>“the maximum thickness is substantially constant and the minimum thickness is substantially constant”</i>	14
D.	<i>“apex”</i>	16
E.	<i>“an angle associated with the apex between the leading edge and the trailing edge”</i>	18
V.	TRIAL SHOULD NOT BE INSTITUTED BECAUSE PETITIONER FAILED TO SHOW A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THE PETITIONER WOULD PREVAIL...20	
A.	The Petition Should Be Denied Because the Same Prior Art Asserted in the Petition Were Previously Presented to the USPTO.....	21
B.	The Rutledge ‘431 Patent Discloses the Structural Antithesis of the Subject Matter Described and Claimed in the ‘162 Patent.....	24
C.	The Rutledge ‘431 Patent Discloses the Functional Antithesis of the End Fitting Described and Claimed in the ‘162 Patent	26
D.	Petitioner Fails to Provide a Rationale to Combine the Asserted References.....	29

1.	<u>Petitioner Fails to Identify Any Differences Between the Asserted Prior Art and the Claimed Invention of the ‘162 Patent</u>	30
2.	<u>Petitioner Failed to Provide a Substantive Analysis of Why or How a Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art Would Have Modified the Asserted Prior Art to Render the Claims of the ‘162 Patent Obvious</u>	31
E.	Claims 1, 6-11, 16-20, 25-28, 30 and 31 Are Not Rendered Obvious Over The Rutledge ‘431 Patent In View Of The Strandberg ‘839 Patent As Asserted In Ground 1	43
1.	<u>The Combination of Rutledge ‘431 and Strandberg ‘839 Fail to Disclose, Suggest, or Teach At Least the Following Claim Limitations:</u>	43
a.	“Apex”	43
b.	“the trailing edge is shorter at the closed end and increases progressively from the closed end to the open end”	47
c.	“each apex forming a perimeter of equal dimension within the cavity that is the narrowest part of the cavity associated with each wedge shaped portion”	48
d.	“the compressive forces create a force differential along the wedge system greater at the closed end of the end fitting and decreasing toward the open end of the fitting”	50
F.	Claims 2-5, 12-15, 21-24, and 32-38 Are Not Rendered Obvious Over The ‘431 Patent In View Of The ‘839 Patent and The ‘774 Patent As Asserted In Ground 2	52
G.	Claims 29 and 39 Are Not Rendered Obvious Over The ‘431 Patent In View Of The ‘839 Patent and The ‘201 Patent As Asserted In Ground 3	55
H.	Claim 40 Is Not Rendered Obvious Over The ‘431 Patent In View Of The ‘839 Patent and The ‘560 Patent As Asserted In Ground 4	56

F. Rutledge ‘431 Teaches Away From the Claim Invention of the ‘162 Patent	58
VI. CONCLUSION AND RELIEF REQUESTED	60

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Agilent Tech., Inc v. Affymetrix, Inc.</i> , 567 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	51
<i>Becton, Dickinson, and Co. v. One StockDug Holdings, LLC</i> , IPR2013-00235, Paper No. 10.....	51
<i>Bettcher Indus., Inc. v. Bunzl USA, Inc.</i> , 661 F.3d 629 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	51
<i>Cisco Systems, Inc. v. C-Cation Technologies, LLC</i> , IPR2014-00454, Paper No. 12	32
<i>Depuy Spine, Inc. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danel, Inc.</i> , 567 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	58
<i>Front Row Technologies, LLC v. MLB Advanced Media, L.P.</i> , IPR2015-01932, Paper No. 7.....	21
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966)	29
<i>Hitzeman v. Rutter</i> , 243 F.3d 1345 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	51
<i>In re Cuozzo Speed Techs.</i> , 793 F.3d 1268 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	9
<i>In re Fulton</i> , 391 F.3d 1195 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	58
<i>In re Gurley</i> , 27 F.3d 551 (Fed. Cir. 1994).....	59
<i>In re Robertson</i> , 169 F.3d 743 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	48
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007)	29
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Proxyconn, Inc.</i> , 789 F.3d 1292 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	9
<i>Runway Safe LLC v. Engineered Arresting Systems</i> , IPR2015-01921, Paper No. 9	33
<i>Unigene Labs., Inc. v. Apotex, Inc.</i> , 655 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	30

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.