

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 IPR2016-01361

U.S. Patent 8,909,094

PATENT OWNER'S SUR-REPLY TO
PETITIONER'S REPLY TO
PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. DISCRETIONARY DENIAL IS WARRANTED PURSUANT
TO 35 U.S.C. § 314(a).....1

II. PETITIONER’S BELATED PRIOR ART SEARCHES DO
NOT JUSTIFY ITS SERIAL FILINGS2

III. PATENT OWNER IS PREJUDICED BY PETITIONER’S
ACTIONS4

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 314(a)	1
35 U.S.C. § 315(b)	4
35 U.S.C. § 325(d)	1

P.T.A.B.

<i>Conopco, Inc. v. Procter & Gamble Co.</i> , IPR2014-00506, Paper 25 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 10, 2014)	2
<i>Great West Cas. Co. v. Intellectual Ventures II LLC</i> , IPR2016-00453, Paper 12 (P.T.A.B. June 9, 2016)	1
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Bradium Techs. LLC</i> , IPR2016-00449, Paper 9 (P.T.A.B. July 27, 2016)	1
<i>NVIDIA Corp. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , IPR2016-00134, Paper 9 (P.T.A.B. May 4, 2016)	1, 2
<i>Toyota Motor Corp. v. Cellport Sys., Inc.</i> , IPR2015-01423, Paper 7 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 28, 2015)	2

Legislative History

157 Cong. Rec. S1375 (daily ed. Mar. 8, 2011)	2
---	---

**I. DISCRETIONARY DENIAL IS WARRANTED
PURSUANT TO 35 U.S.C. § 314(a)**

Petitioner's focus on 35 U.S.C. § 325(d) is a red herring. Here, Patent Owner relies on 35 U.S.C. § 314(a), which is separate and independent from §325(d), and affords the Board discretion to deny institution based on factors beyond the "same or substantially the same prior art or arguments" basis. Pursuant to § 314(a), and independent from § 325(d), the factors outlined in *NVIDIA Corp. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.*, IPR2016-00134, Paper 9 (P.T.A.B. May 4, 2016) can warrant denying institution of a follow-on petition. *See id.* at 6-14 (denying institution on two "alternative" grounds, § 314(a) and § 325(d), each supported by "[s]eparate [r]easoning"); *Great West Cas. Co. v. Intellectual Ventures II LLC*, IPR2016-00453, Paper 12, at 5-14 (P.T.A.B. June 9, 2016) (same). Patent Owner's preliminary response provides ample reason why the Board should deny institution based on the *NVIDIA* factors (all of which cut against Petitioner here), and Patent Owner was not required to make a separate showing under § 325(d).¹ *See* Paper 5, at 5-9.

¹ The decision in *Microsoft Corp. v. Bradium Techs. LLC*, IPR2016-00449, Paper 9 (P.T.A.B. July 27, 2016) upon which Petitioner relies declined to deny institution under § 325(d), and did not address the *NVIDIA* factors.

II. PETITIONER’S BELATED PRIOR ART SEARCHES DO NOT JUSTIFY ITS SERIAL FILINGS

Contrary to Petitioner’s argument, the *NVIDIA* factors weigh in favor of, not against, denying institution. Petitioner asserts it did not know about Yasuda until May 2016, but fails to address whether it “should have known about” that reference earlier. *See NVIDIA*, IPR2016-00134, Paper 9, at 7 (“(4) whether at the time of filing of the first petition the petitioner knew of the prior art asserted in the second petition *or should have known about it*”) (emphasis added). Decisions giving rise to *NVIDIA* factor 4 establish that the “should have known about” language relates to the “availability” of the reference and is akin to the estoppel standard (“reasonably could have raised”). *See NVIDIA*, IPR2016-00134, Paper 9, at 7, n.3; *Conopco, Inc. v. Procter & Gamble Co.*, IPR2014-00506, Paper 25, at 4-5 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 10, 2014) (discussing “known or available” and relationship to the estoppel standard); *Toyota Motor Corp. v. Cellport Sys., Inc.*, IPR2015-01423, Paper 7, at 8 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 28, 2015) (“known or available”). Thus, *NVIDIA* relates to prior art that a “skilled searcher conducting a diligent search reasonably could have been expected to discover.” 157 Cong. Rec. S1375 (daily ed. Mar. 8, 2011) (statement of Sen. Kyl).

Yet Petitioner has not explained what steps, if any, it took to identify prior art before filing its first petition or why the applied reference was not available

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.