

Filed: December 13, 2016

Filed on behalf of

Patent Owner Fisher & Paykel Healthcare Limited

By: Brenton R. Babcock

Joseph F. Jennings

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

2040 Main Street, 14th Floor

Irvine, CA 92614

Telephone: 949-760-0404

Facsimile: 949-760-9502

Email: BoxFPH771@knobbe.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

RESMED LIMITED, RESMED INC., and RESMED CORP.
Petitioners,

v.

FISHER & PAYKEL HEALTHCARE LIMITED,
Patent Owner.

Case No. IPR2016-01726
U.S. Patent No. 8,443,807

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No.
I. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.....	1
II. THE STATUTE BARS INSTITUTION OF AN INTER PARTES REVIEW	9
A. Petitioners’ Contrary Construction of Section 315 Is Meritless	10
B. Petitioners’ Cited Authorities Are Contrary to Two Lines of Supreme Court Precedents	11
C. Petitioners’ Cited Authorities Are Also Contrary to the Rules Enabling Act.....	14
III. BACKGROUND	16
A. Overview of the ’807 Patent.....	16
B. Overview of the Alleged Prior Art.....	20
1. U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2004/0226566 (“Gunaratnam”)	20
2. U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2003/0196658 (“Ging”).....	23
3. PCT Pub. No. 2005/079726 (“McAuley”).....	25
4. U.S. Patent No. 7,219,669 (“Lovell”).....	26
C. Overview of the Prosecution History of the ’807 Patent	28
IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	32
A. Legal Standard.....	32
B. Identification of a Person of Ordinary Skill In the Art	32
C. Construction of “Ring”	33

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(cont'd)

	Page No.
V. ARGUMENT.....	38
A. Legal Standard.....	38
B. Institution Should Be Denied Because Both Gunaratnam and Lovell Were Expressly Considered by the PTO During Prosecution of the '807 Patent	40
C. The Claim Charts in the Declaration of Petitioners' Declarant, Dr. Izuchukwu, Should Be Given Little or No Weight	42
D. Petitioners Have Not Established a Reasonable Likelihood of Prevailing on Ground 1 (Alleged Obviousness of Claims 1-7, 17-19, 24, and 25 over Gunaratnam and Ging)	43
1. Gunaratnam and Ging Do Not Teach or Make Obvious "a ring" as Required by Claim 1	44
2. Petitioners Have Not Shown that it Would Have Been Obvious to Modify the Nasal Cushion Mask of Gunaratnam Figure 135 to Include a Nasal Pillow Assembly.....	47
a. Gunaratnam Does Not Teach or Suggest that Nasal Cushions May Be Replaced with Nasal Pillows	47
b. The Nozzle Embodiments of Gunaratnam Do Not Teach or Make Obvious the Interchangeability of Nozzles and Nasal Cushions	48

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(cont'd)

	Page No.
i. The Mask Design Shown in Figure 135 Is Fundamentally Different from and Incompatible with the Other Embodiments of Gunaratnam Relied Upon by Petitioners	48
ii. Petitioners Have Not Shown that Nasal Pillows Could Be Incorporated into Gunaratnam Figure 135 with a Reasonable Expectation of Success	51
iii. Gunaratnam Teaches Against Petitioners' Proposed Modification.....	55
iv. Petitioners' Reliance on Ging Shows It Would Not Have Been Obvious to Incorporate Nasal Pillows into Gunaratnam Figure 135.....	57
c. The Other Reasons Identified By Dr. Izuchukwu Do Not Provide a Reason to Replace the Nasal Cushion of Gunaratnam Figure 135 with Nasal Pillows.....	57
3. Gunaratnam and Ging Do Not Teach or Make Obvious "wherein the two side straps are configured to connect and disconnect with the mask assembly" as Required by Claim 1	58
E. Petitioners Have Not Established a Reasonable Likelihood of Prevailing on Ground 2 (Alleged Obviousness of Claims 1-7, 17-19, 24, and 25 over Gunaratnam, Ging, and McAuley).....	60
1. Ground 2 Should Not Be Instituted for at Least the Reasons Provided for Ground 1	60

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(cont'd)

	Page No.
2. It Would Not Have Been Obvious to Further Modify Gunaratnam Figure 135 to Include a “Ring” as Required by Claim 1	60
F. Petitioners Have Not Established a Reasonable Likelihood of Prevailing on Ground 3 (Alleged Obviousness of Claims 1-7, 17-19, 24, and 25 over Lovell and Gunaratnam).....	68
1. Petitioners’ Proposed Replacement of the “Four Point Restraining System” of Lovell with the Headgear Described in Gunaratnam Would Change the Basic Principle of the Restraining System and Would Not Have Been Obvious	68
2. The Reasons Identified by Petitioners for Replacing the Four Point Restraining System of Lovell with the Headgear Designs of Gunaratnam Are Conclusory and Insufficient	71
VI. CONCLUSION.....	74

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.