

Filed: June 2, 2017

Filed on behalf of:

One-E-Way

By: Douglas G. Muehlhauser (Reg. No. 179,495)
KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP
2040 Main Street, 14th Floor
Irvine, CA 92614
Telephone: 949-760-0404
Facsimile: 949-760-9502
Email: 2dgm@knobbe.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SONY CORPORATION,
Petitioner,

v.

ONE-E-WAY, INC.
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2016-01638
Patent 9,282,396

PATENT OWNER RESPONSE

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	PETITIONER’S FACTUAL BACKGROUND.....	3
III.	PETITIONER’S DISCUSSION OF THE CHALLENGED '396 PATENT.....	5
IV.	THE SOLE GROUND FOR INVALIDITY FAILS BECAUSE THE '396 PATENT CLAIMS HAVE A 2001 PRIORITY DATE	5
A.	Petitioner Does Not Dispute that the '396 Patent Properly Claims Priority to December 21, 2001—the Filing Date of the 2001 Parent Application—Nor Does Petitioner Dispute that as of that Same Date, Mr. Woolfork Was in Possession of the Inventions Claimed in the '396 Patent	7
1.	The '396 Patent Properly Claims Priority to the 2001 Application.....	7
a.	Petitioner Does Not Dispute that Each Application in the '396 Patent Family Claims Priority to the Prior Applications in the Chain.....	7
2.	Mr. Woolfork was in Possession of the Inventions Claimed in the '396 Patent as of Its Effective Filing Date of December 21, 2001	7
a.	The '396 Patent Complies, as it Must, With the Written Description Requirement as of the Filing Date Sought	7
b.	There is No Dispute that Mr. Woolfork was in Possession of the Inventions Claimed in the '396 Patent as of December 21, 2001	9
B.	It is Undisputed that Mr. Woolfork Amended his 2003 CIP Application to Disclose Subject Matter that He	

Had Already Disclosed in His Original 2001 Application, and that the Patent Office Allowed Each Such Amendment Without Objection10

1. The Patent Examiners Reviewed Numerous Amendments and Plainly Understood that Subject Matter Already Disclosed in the 2001 Parent Application was Not New Matter10

a. The Patent Examiners Reviewed and Rejected Mr. Woolfork’s Request to Add New Figures 2 and 3 to the 2003 CIP Because the Subject Matter Was Not Supported by the 2003 CIP or by the 2001 Parent Application11

b. The Patent Examiners Reviewed and Approved Adding Figures 2 and 3 from the 2001 Parent Application11

c. The Patent Examiners Reviewed and Rejected Mr. Woolfork’s Request to Disclose Frequency Shift Keying in his 2003 CIP Application Because The Subject Matter Was Not Supported by the CIP or by the Parent 2001 Application12

d. The Patent Examiners Reviewed and Approved Mr. Woolfork’s Request to Disclose Differential Phase Shift Keying in his 2003 CIP Application12

e. Supervisory Patent Examiner Sinh Tran Reviewed and Approved Mr. Woolfork’s Request to Incorporate By Reference the Entirety of the 2001 Parent Application.....13

2. The Determinations Made by the Patent Examiners that Mr. Woolfork’s Amendments

Did Not Introduce New Matter are Entitled to Deference	15
C. The Great Weight of Authority is in Accord with the Understanding and Practice of the Patent Examiners: No New Matter was Introduced by Amending the 2003 CIP Application to Disclose Subject Matter that had Already Been Disclosed in the 2001 Parent Application	16
1. <i>In re Reiffin</i>	20
2. <i>Litton v. Whirlpool</i>	21
3. <i>Harari v. Hollmer</i>	24
4. <i>G.E. v. Wabash</i>	25
5. <i>Hanft v. Harry F. Manbeck, Jr.</i>	27
6. <i>O’Hara Manufacturing v. Eli Lilly</i>	28
7. <i>Ex parte Tianping Huang</i>	31
8. <i>Ex parte Dae-Ho Choo and Sang-Uk Jung</i>	32
D. The Cases Cited in the Petition Fail to Address the Present Facts and do Not Support Petitioner’s Argument that Continuity of Disclosure was not Maintained During the Prosecution of the 2003 CIP Application	33
1. The <i>Zenon</i> Case Does Not Address the Present Facts	34
2. The <i>Lockwood</i> Case Does Not Address the Present Facts	35
3. The <i>Anascape</i> Case Does Not Address the Present Facts	36

4.	The <i>Purdue Pharma</i> Case Does Not Address the Present Facts.....	37
5.	The <i>Dart Industries, Inc. v. Banner</i> Case Does Not Address the Present Facts	38
6.	MPEP § 201.06(c)(IV) Does Not Apply in the Limited Context of Incorporating by Reference Subject Matter from an Earlier Co-Pending Application.....	40
a.	The MPEP Does Not have the Force of Law	42
E.	The Petition Fails.....	43
V.	CONCLUSION.....	44

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.