

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

DEXCOM, INC.
Petitioner,

v.

AGAMATRIX, INC.
Patent Owner

IPR2016-01679
Patent 7,146,202

Before Steven M. Amitrani, *Trial Paralegal*

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

Table of Contents

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT	1
II. STATEMENT OF FACTS.....	3
A. Overview of AgaMatrix’s ’202 Patent.....	3
B. The Challenged Claims of the ’202 Patent	6
C. The Prior Art Relied Upon in the Petition	8
1. Hagiwara.....	8
2. Wilson.....	8
3. Gross	9
4. Rosenblatt	10
III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	10
A. Claim Construction Standard in <i>Inter Partes</i> Review	10
B. Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	12
C. “Structurally Flexible”	12
IV. STANDARD FOR GRANTING <i>INTER PARTES</i> REVIEW	16
V. DEXCOM’S GROUNDS BASED UPON ANTICIPATION SHOULD BE DENIED.....	16
A. The Petition Includes Redundant Grounds	16
B. The Petition Fails to Establish a Reasonable Likelihood That Hagiwara Anticipates the Claims of the ’202 Patent	17
1. Overview of Hagiwara.....	17
2. Hagiwara does not anticipate because it fails to disclose a “structurally flexible core”.....	20

- 3. Hagiwara does not anticipate because it fails to disclose a “layer of electrochemically active metal surrounding, covering and in contact with said outer surface of said core”23
- C. The Petition Fails to Establish a Reasonable Likelihood of Anticipation by Gross At Least Because Gross Lacks a Structurally Flexible Core.....27
- VI. DEXCOM’S GROUNDS BASED UPON OBVIOUSNESS SHOULD BE DENIED33
 - A. The Petition Includes Redundant Grounds33
 - B. The Petition Fails to Identify the Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art34
 - C. The Petition Fails to Establish a Reasonable Likelihood that Claim 5 is Obvious over Hagiwara in View of Rosenblatt.....35
 - 1. Overview of Rosenblatt36
 - 2. Hagiwara and Rosenblatt do not combine to produce the invention of claim 5.37
 - 3. Rosenblatt’s teaching away from “an electrochemically active metal . . . contacting said [tantalum] core” defeats Dexcom’s Hagiwara-Rosenblatt combination.41
 - D. The Wilson–Rosenblatt Combination Also Fails to Show a Reasonable Likelihood of Obviousness43
 - 1. Overview of the Wilson article.....44
 - 2. Wilson does not disclose a sensing region45
 - 3. Wilson-Rosenblatt fail to teach or suggest the element of “contact” between the electrochemically active metal and a core material.....46

E. The Petition Fails to Provide Particularized Rationales for Why The Person of Ordinary Skill Would Have Been Motivated to Modify the Prior Art to Achieve the Claimed Invention.....46

1. Obviousness Factors46

2. The Petition Fails to Articulate a Credible Rationale for Making the Wilson-Rosenblatt Combination48

3. The Petition Fails to Articulate a Credible Rationale for the Hagiwara-Rosenblatt Combination52

F. Tertiary References Not of Record Must Not Be Considered in the Obviousness Analysis.....54

VII. CONCLUSION55

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Akzo Nobel Coatings, Inc. v. Dow Chemical Co.</i> , 811 F.3d 1334 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	15
<i>Bettcher Indus. v. Bunzl USA, Inc.</i> , 661 F.3d 629 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	22, 32
<i>Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Ben Venue Labs., Inc.</i> , 246 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	24
<i>Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee</i> , 579 U.S. ___, 136 S. Ct. 2131 (June 20, 2016)	10, 11
<i>DePuy Spine, Inc. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc.</i> , 567 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	42
<i>Eon Corp. IP Holdings LLC v. Silver Spring Networks, Inc.</i> , 815 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	11
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	2, 34, 47
<i>In re Gurley</i> , 27 F.3d 551 (Fed. Cir. 1994)	43
<i>In re ICON Health & Fitness, Inc.</i> , 496 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	42, 43
<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	47
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	47
<i>Liberty Mutual Ins. Co. v. Progressive Casualty Ins. Co.</i> , CBM2012–00003, Paper No. 7 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 25, 2012).....	17, 34
<i>Motorola Mobility, LLC v. ITC</i> , 737 F.3d 1345 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	22

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.