

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

NU MARK LLC,

Petitioner,

v.

FONTEM HOLDINGS 1 B.V.,

Patent Owner.

Case **IPR2016-01303**

Patent No. **8,365,742**

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO PETITION FOR
INTER PARTES REVIEW**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. BACKGROUND	3
A. The '742 Patent	3
B. The Prosecution History of the '742 Patent	6
C. The Prior IPR Petitions on the '742 Patent	7
D. A Person of Ordinary Skill in The Art	8
III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	8
A. Atomizer Assembly	8
B. Other claim terms	10
IV. GROUND 1: TAKEUCHI MODIFIED IN VIEW OF WHITTEMORE	11
A. Claim 2: Limitations missing from the combination of Takeuchi and Whittemore	12
1. The combination of Takeuchi and Whittemore does not disclose a porous component supported by a frame	12
2. The combination of Takeuchi and Whittemore does not disclose a atomizer assembly including a porous component supported by a frame having a run-through hole	22
B. Claim 3: Limitations missing from the combination of Takeuchi and Whittemore	23
1. The combination of Takeuchi and Whittemore does not disclose a porous component between the frame and the outlet	23
2. The combination of Takeuchi and Whittemore does not disclose a heating wire wound on a part of the porous component which is substantially aligned with the run- through hole	25
C. The Petition Fails to Provide Any Credible Reason to Modify Takeuchi in view of Whittemore	26

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
1. Takeuchi teaches away from a wire coil.....	26
2. The Ground 1 modification changes the principle of operation of Takeuchi contrary to M.P.E.P. § 2143.VI.....	33
V. GROUND 2: BROOKS IN VIEW OF TAKEUCHI	35
A. Limitations missing from the combination of Brooks and Takeuchi	35
1. The combination of Brooks and Takeuchi does not disclose a heating wire wound on a part of the porous component.....	35
B. The Petition Fails to Provide Any Credible Reasons to Modify Brooks in view of Takeuchi	39
1. A person of skill in the art would not be motivated to modify Brooks in light of Takeuchi in accordance with Petitioner’s proposed combination	39
2. Takeuchi teaches away from a replaceable atomizer assembly	42
3. The reasoning in the petition for modifying Brooks in view of Takeuchi is illusory.....	43
4. Takeuchi is not reasonably pertinent to Brooks	45
5. The Ground 2 modification changes the principle of operation of Brooks contrary to M.P.E.P. § 2143.VI	48
C. The Petition provides no motivation for the Ground 2 modification.....	49
VI. SUBSEQUENT USPTO EXAMINATION RELEVANT TO GROUNDS 1 AND 2	50
VII. CONCLUSION.....	52
CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE.....	54

CASES

Arendi S.A.R.L v. Apple Inc., Google Inc., Motorola Mobility LLC,
___ F.3d ___, No. 2015-2073, 2016 WL 4205964 (Fed. Cir. Aug. 10,
2016)37

In re Kahn,
441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006)32

In re Ratti,
270 F. 2d 810 (CCPA 1959)34

KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.,
550 U.S. 398 (2007)32

Leo Pharm. Prod, Ltd. v. Rea,
726 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2013)49

STATUTES

35 U.S.C. § 314(a)1, 52

OTHER AUTHORITIES

37 CFR § 42.2454

M.P.E.P. § 212127

M.P.E.P. § 2141.01(a)I47

M.P.E.P. § 2143.VI33, 48

M.P.E.P. § 2143.01 I, V, VI34

LIST OF EXHIBITS

Petitioner's Exhibits	
Exhibit	Description
Ex. 1001	U.S. Patent No. 8,365,742 (“the 742 Patent”)
Ex. 1002	Excerpts from the prosecution history of U.S. Patent No. 8,365,742
Ex. 1003	Declaration of John M. Collins (“Collins Decl.”)
Ex. 1004	U.S. Patent No. 6,155,268 (“Takeuchi”)
Ex. 1005	U.S. Patent No. 2,057,353 (“Whittemore”)
Ex. 1006	U.S. Patent No. 4,947,874 (“Brooks”)
Ex. 1007	Docket entry #65 from <i>Fontem Ventures, B.V., et al. v. NJOY, Inc., et al.</i> , 2:14-cv-01645 (C.D. Cal.) (“Rulings on Claim Construction”)
Ex. 1008	U.S. Patent Application No. 2006/0093977 A1 (“Pellizzari I”)
Ex. 1009	U.S. Patent No. 7,059,307 (“Pellizzari II”)
Ex. 1010	U.S. Patent No. 5,894,841 (“Voges”)
Ex. 1011	U.S. Patent No. 5,743,251 (“Howell”)
Ex. 1012	U.S. Patent No. 2,461,664 (“Smith”)
Ex. 1013	U.S. Patent No. 3,234,357 (“Eberhard”)
Ex. 1014	U.S. Patent No. 5,745,985 (“Ghosh”)
Ex. 1015	U.S. Patent No. 4,676,237 (“Wood”)
Ex. 1016	U.S. Patent No. 4,945,448 (“Bremenour”)
Ex. 1017	U.S. Patent No. 2,442,004 (“Hayward-Butt”)
Ex. 1018	U.S. Patent No. 3,200,819 (“Gilbert”)

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.