

Filed on behalf of: Canon Kabushiki Kaisha

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

General Plastic Industrial Co., Ltd.

Petitioner,

v.

Canon Kabushiki Kaisha

Patent Owner.

Case IPR2016-01360

U.S. Patent 8,909,094

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 314(a).....	4
III.	TECHNOLOGICAL BACKGROUND	11
	A. The '094 Patent	11
	B. Yoshiki	22
	C. Koide	24
	D. Kato	25
	E. Matsuoka	26
	F. Ikesue.....	28
IV.	PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL	30
V.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	30
	A. “A toner supply container”	31
	B. “a rotational force receiving portion ...”	32
	C. “displacing force receiving portion ...” and “projecting portion ...”	35
	D. “configured and positioned to receive a rotational drive force ...”	37
VI.	LEGAL STANDARDS	41
VII.	YOSHIKI AND KOIDE IN VIEW OF KATO, MATSUOKA, AND IKESUE DO NOT RENDER OBVIOUS ANY OF CLAIMS 1 AND 7-9	42
	A. Petitioner Fails to Show that Yoshiki and Koide, In View of Kato, Matsuoka, and Ikesue, Disclose or Suggest a	

Coupling Portion “Configured and Positioned to Receive a Rotational Drive Force”	42
B. Petitioner Fails to Show that Yoshiki and Koide, In View of Kato, Matsuoka, and Ikesue, Disclose or Suggest the “Rotational Force Receiving Portion” Required by Claim 1	49
C. Petitioner Fails to Show that Yoshiki and Koide, In View of Kato, Matsuoka, and Ikesue, Disclose or Suggest an “Engaging Portion” or “Displacing Force Receiving Portion” Displaceable with the Alleged “Supporting Portion”	52
D. Petitioner Fails to Show the Asserted References Teach All the Limitations of Claims that Depend from Claim 1.....	56
VIII. YOSHIKI AND KOIDE, IN VIEW OF IKESUE, DO NOT RENDER OBVIOUS CLAIM 29.....	58
IX. CONCLUSION.....	60

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Aspex Eyewear, Inc. v. Marchon Eyewear, Inc.</i> , 672 F.3d 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	39
<i>Cuozzo Speed. Techs., LLC v. Lee</i> , 136 S. Ct. 2131 (2016).....	4, 30
<i>Ex parte Icon Health & Fitness, Inc.</i> , 496 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	35
<i>Gardner v. TEC Sys., Inc.</i> , 725 F.2d 1338 (Fed. Cir. 1984)	58
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co. of Kansas City</i> , 383 U.S. 1, 17-18 (1966)	41
<i>Hartness Int’l Inc. v. Simplimatic Eng’g Co.</i> , 819 F.2d 1100 (Fed. Cir. 1987)	56
<i>In re Geisler</i> , 116 F.3d 1465 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	46
<i>In re Giannelli</i> , 739 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	35, 39, 44
<i>In re Gordon</i> , 733 F.2d 900 (Fed. Cir. 1984)	47
<i>In re Haruna</i> , 249 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	47
<i>In re Malagari</i> , 499 F.2d 1297 (CCPA 1974).....	46
<i>In re Man Machine Interface Techs. LLC</i> , 822 F.3d 1282 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	30, 39
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	41, 46

<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Proxyconn, Inc.</i> , 789 F.3d 1292 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	30
<i>Straight Path IP Grp., Inc. v. Sipnet EU S.R.O.</i> , 806 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	38
<i>Tec Air, Inc. v. Denso Mfg. Mich. Inc.</i> , 192 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	47
<i>Trivascular, Inc. v. Samuels</i> , 812 F.3d 1056 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	38

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 314(a)	2, 3, 4, 9, 41
35 U.S.C. § 316(a)(11).....	5
35 U.S.C. § 325(d)	4

Regulations

37 C.F.R. § 42.65(a).....	41, 56, 57
37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b)	30
37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(4).....	41
37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(5).....	41
37 C.F.R. § 42.108(a).....	4
37 C.F.R. § 42.108(b)	4
37 C.F.R. § 42.108(c).....	3, 41

P.T.A.B.

<i>Conopco, Inc. v. Procter & Gamble Co.</i> , IPR2014-00506, Paper 25 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 10, 2014)	6
<i>Conopco, Inc. v. Procter & Gamble Co.</i> , IPR2014-00628, Paper 21 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 20, 2014).....	9

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.