

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

PRIME FOCUS CREATIVE SERVICES CANADA INC.,
Petitioner

v.

LEGEND 3D, INC.,
Patent Owner

IPR2016-01243

U.S. Patent No. 7,907,793

**PATENT OWNER'S OPPOSITION
TO PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR REHEARING**

Mail Stop: PATENT BOARD
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent & Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. PRIME’S SUGGESTION THAT THE BOARD EXCEEDED ITS AUTHORITY IS FATALLY FLAWED	2
A. The Board Has Authority to Decide If the Petitioner Failed to Meet Its Burden – That Is the Board’s Primary Role	2
B. The Board’s Finding That Petitioner Failed to Meet Its Burden Is Not a “New Theory”	5
C. The Board Is Not Boxed into Its Preliminary Findings at the Institution Decision Phase, as Prime Suggests.....	8
D. Prime Would Have the Board Moot Prime’s Burden of Persuasion Requirement or Shift It to Patent Owner	9
E. Prime Misapplies the Concept of Due Process	10
F. Prime Was Not Unjustly Prejudiced	11
III. THE BOARD DID NOT MISAPPREHEND OR OVERLOOK ANY ARGUMENTS AND EVIDENCE BECAUSE THOSE ARGUMENTS WERE NOT TIMELY	12
A. The Board Fully Addressed the Only Combinability Arguments and Evidence Prime Presented During Trial.....	12
B. Section III of Prime’s Request is Replete with New Argument Never Before Raised	13
IV. CONCLUSION.....	15

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
<u>Cases</u>	
<i>Dell Inc. v. Accelaron, LLC</i> 818 F.3d 1293 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	5
<i>EmeraChem Holdings LLC v. Volkswagen Grp. of Am., Inc.</i> 859 F.3d 1341 (2017), 1351-52 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	6
<i>Global Tel*link Corp. v. Securus Techs., Inc.</i> 2017 WL 2983402	2
<i>In re Kahn</i> 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	4
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	4
<i>In re Magnum Oil Tools Int’l, Ltd.</i> 829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	2, 3, 4, 8, 9, 10, 11
<i>In re Nuvasive, Inc.</i> 841 F.3d 966 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	5, 15
<i>Rovalma, S.A. v. Bohler-Edelstahl GmbH & Co. KG</i> 856 F.3d 1019 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	6
<i>SAS Inst., Inc. v. ComplementSoft, LLC</i> 825 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	7
<u>Statutes</u>	
Title 5 of the United States Code section 554(b)(3)	6
Title 5 of the United States Code section 554(c)	6
Title 5 of the United States Code section 556(d).....	6
Title 35 of the United States Code section 103	10

Title 35 of the United States Code section 316(e).....2, 9

Other Authorities

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations section 42.104.....10

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations section 42.107.....2

Pursuant to the Board’s authorization and in response to Petitioner’s Request for Rehearing (the “Request,” Paper 55), Patent Owner submits this Opposition to Petitioner’s Request and respectfully submits that Petitioner’s Request should be denied.

I. INTRODUCTION

Prime’s Request is about one thing: Prime’s failure to meet its burden to show the alleged combinability of Sullivan with the ‘670 and ‘081 patents, and its belated and improper attempt to get a second bite at the apple after the trial has concluded. Prime attempts to blame its failure on the Board (e.g., for allegedly raising a “new theory”) and Patent Owner (e.g., for choosing not to rebut the alleged combinability). Yet, the Board raised no new theories – rather, it merely rendered judgment on the record; and Patent Owner was not required to respond to each and every argument in Prime’s Petition no matter how half-baked such arguments were. Nevertheless, Prime would have the Board excuse Prime’s failure to meet its burden, despite the fact that this burden begins and ends with Prime.

If Prime had its way, the Board would be boxed into its Institution Decision and unable to rule differently at the end of trial to the extent that a patent owner chooses to not respond to each and every argument in a petition. This ignores, *inter alia*, the fact that the Institution Decision is based on a “reasonable

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.