

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

HP INC.

Petitioner,

v.

MEMJET TECHNOLOGY LIMITED,

Listed Patent Owner.

---

U.S. Patent No. 7,156,492

“Modular Printhead Assembly With A Carrier Of A Metal Alloy”

---

**PATENT OWNER MEMJET TECHNOLOGY LIMITED’S  
PRELIMINARY RESPONSE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.107**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
A. Background .....	1
B. Institution Should Be Denied .....	4
II. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	8
A. “carrier” (all challenged claims, in the phrase “an elongate carrier of a metal alloy”) .....	9
B. “an elongate fluid transporter ... that can each transport a respective type of fluid” (all challenged claims).....	11
1. The Claimed Channels Must Be Capable of Transporting Different Types of Fluid .....	12
2. Memjet’s Construction Should be Adopted.....	13
C. “the carrier, in the form of a channel member” (claim 4 only).....	16
III. GROUNDS 3 AND 4 SHOULD NOT BE INSTITUTED BECAUSE SILVERBROOK 142 IS EXCLUDED AS PRIOR ART UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(c).....	17
IV. GROUNDS 1 AND 2 SHOULD NOT BE INSTITUTED BECAUSE NEITHER COWGER NOR SILVERBROOK 2172 TEACH OR SUGGEST THE “ELONGATE CARRIER OF A METAL ALLOY” OR THE “ELONGATE FLUID TRANSPORTER ...” LIMITATIONS.....	21
A. Cowger Does Not Teach or Suggest the Claimed “elongate carrier of a metal alloy” Limitation.....	21
B. Cowger Does Not Teach or Suggest the “elongate fluid transporter ...” Limitation.....	23
C. Cowger Also Does Not Teach “printing modules” Limitation.....	26
D. A POSITA Would Not Have Been Motivated To Combine the Teachings of Cowger and Silverbrook 2172.....	27
1. The Pond Declaration is Conclusory and Simply Repeats the Petition Nearly Verbatim and Should Be Given No Weight.....	31
E. Grounds 2-4 Fail For The Same Reasons As Ground 1.....	33

V. ALL GROUNDS SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE SILVERBROOK 2172 WAS PREVIOUSLY CONSIDERED BY THE PATENT OFFICE .....33

VI. CONCLUSION.....35

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>Biodelivery Sci. Int'l, Inc. v. Monosol Rx, LLC</i> , IPR2015-00167, Paper 6 (P.T.A.B. May 20, 2015) .....	28
<i>Bio-Rad Labs., Inc. v. Cal. Inst. of Tech.</i> , IPR2015-00009, Paper No. 16 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 24, 2015) .....	13
<i>Corning Inc. v. DSM IP Assets B.V.</i> , IPR2013-00045, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 24, 2013) .....	9, 19
<i>Dominion Dealer Sol'ns, LLC v. AutoAlert, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00220, Paper 8 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 15, 2013).....	29, 32
<i>Elektra Instrument S.A. v. O.U.R. Scientific Int'l, Inc.</i> , 214 F.3d 1302 (Fed. Cir. 2000) .....	16
<i>Estee Lauder, Inc. v. L'Oreal, S.A.</i> , 129 F.3d 588 (Fed. Cir. 1997) .....	31
<i>Ex parte GM Global Technology Operations LLC</i> , 2012 WL 5474209 (P.T.A.B. 2012) .....	13
<i>Ex parte Thibault</i> , 164 U.S.P.Q. 666 (Bd. App. 1969).....	12
<i>Global Tel*Link</i> , IPR2014-00825, Paper No. 36 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 2, 2015) .....	20
<i>Heart Failure Techs., LLC v. Cardiokinetix, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00183, Paper 12 (P.T.A.B. Jul. 31, 2013).....	27, 29
<i>Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Bausch &amp; Lomb Inc.</i> , 909 F.2d 1464 (Fed. Cir. 1990) .....	12
<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006) .....	28
<i>In re Kubin</i> , 561 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2009) .....	22

<i>In re Suitco Surface, Inc.</i> , 603 F.3d 1255 (Fed. Cir. 2010) .....	8, 9
<i>Kara Tech. Inc. v. Stamps.com Inc.</i> , 582 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2009) .....	17
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	27, 28, 29
<i>Memjet Tech. Ltd. v. Hewlett-Packard Co.</i> , Case No. 3:15-cv-01769-BEN-BLM (S.D. Cal.) .....	1
<i>Moses Lake Indus. v. Enthone, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00243, Paper 6 (P.T.A.B. June 18, 2014) .....	28
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) .....	8
<i>Shire, LLC v. Amneal Pharms., LLC</i> , 802 F.3d 1301 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....	34
<i>Synopsys, Inc. v. Mentor Graphics Corp.</i> , IPR2012-00041, Paper 16 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 25, 2013).....	8
<i>TRW Auto. US LLC v. Magna Elecs. Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00293, Paper 19 (P.T.A.B. July 1, 2014).....	28, 32
<i>Wowza Media Sys., LLC v. Adobe Sys. Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00054, Paper 12 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 8, 2013) .....	32

### Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 102(a) .....	18
35 U.S.C. § 102(b) .....	18
35 U.S.C. § 102(e) .....	5, 18, 19, 32
35 U.S.C. § 103 .....	17
35 U.S.C. § 103(a) .....	1, 19, 20, 32
35 U.S.C. § 103(c) .....	passim

# 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.