

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

JOHN CRANE, INC., JOHN CRANE  
PRODUCTION SOLUTIONS, INC. &  
JOHN CRANE GROUP CORP.,  
Petitioners,

v.

FINALROD IP, LLC,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2016-01786  
TITLE: SUCKER ROD APPARATUS AND METHOD  
Patent 9,045,951

---

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

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>I.</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>II.</b>	<b>Overview of U.S. Patent No. 9,045,951 .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>III.</b>	<b>THE ASSERTED GROUNDS.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>IV.</b>	<b>Overview of the Asserted Prior Art.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>A.</b>	<b>Rutledge '431.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>B.</b>	<b>Iwasaki.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>C.</b>	<b>McKay.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>D.</b>	<b>Anderson.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>V.</b>	<b>CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>A.</b>	<b>Definition of A Person Having Ordinary Skill In the Art .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>B.</b>	<b>Disputed Claim Terms .....</b>	<b>18</b>
1.	<i>“define a ...distribution of force” .....</i>	<i>18</i>
2.	<i>“such that” .....</i>	<i>20</i>
<b>VI.</b>	<b>Petitioner Failed to Show A Reasonable Likelihood The Petitioner Would Prevail .....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>A.</b>	<b>Petitioner is Attempting to Shift the Burden to Patent Owner to Prove Patentability .....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>B.</b>	<b>Petitioner Fails to Provide a Rationale to Combine the Asserted References.....</b>	<b>24</b>
1.	<u>Petitioner Fails to Identify the Differences Between the Asserted Prior Art and the Claimed Invention of the '951 Patent .....</u>	<u>27</u>
2.	<u>Petitioner Has Not Provided Motivation to Modify Rutledge '431 .....</u>	<u>28</u>
3.	<u>The Problem Petitioner Relies on as Motivation to Look to Iwasaki and McKay is Addressed by Rutledge '431.....</u>	<u>32</u>
<b>C.</b>	<b>Rutledge '431 Teaches Away From the Claim Invention of the '951 Patent .....</b>	<b>35</b>

<b>D.</b>	<b>The Petition Should Be Denied Because the Same Prior Art Asserted in the Petition Was Previously Presented to the USPTO .....</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>E.</b>	<b>Claims 4, 6-8, 14-15, 17, 21-22, 35, 47, 52, and 65-68 are not Unpatentable as obvious over Rutledge '431 in view of Iwasaki and McKay.....</b>	<b>39</b>
	1. <u>All Claim Limitations Should Be Given Full Weight.....</u>	39
	2. <u>The Combination of Rutledge '431, Iwasaki, and McKay Fail to Disclose, Suggest, or Teach At Least the Following Claim Limitations:</u>	43
<b>F.</b>	<b>Claims 50, 57, and 59 are not Unpatentable as obvious over Rutledge '431 in view of Iwasaki, McKay, and Anderson .....</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>VII.</b>	<b>CONCLUSION AND RELIEF REQUESTED.....</b>	<b>53</b>

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>Agilent Tech., Inc v. Affymetrix, Inc.</i> , 567 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2009) .....	47, 48, 53
<i>Becton, Dickinson, and Co. v. One StockDuq Holdings, LLC</i> , IPR2013-00235, Paper No. 10 .....	47
<i>Belden Inc. v. Berk-Tek LLC</i> , 6 10 Fed.Appx. 997 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	19
<i>Bettcher Indus., Inc. v. Bunzl USA, Inc.</i> , 661 F.3d 629 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....	47
<i>Boehringer Ingelheim Vetmedica, Inc. v. Schering-Plough Corp.</i> , 320 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2003) .....	40
<i>Cisco Systems, Inc. v. C-Cation Technologies, LLC</i> , IPR2014-00454, Paper No. 12.....	33
<i>Compressor Products Intern. LLC v. Graco, Inc.</i> , 2013 WL 6865541 (S.D. Tex. November 19, 2013) .....	43
<i>Depuy Spine, Inc. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danel, Inc.</i> , 567 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2009) .....	35
<i>Front Row Technologies, LLC v. MLB Advanced Media, L.P.</i> , IPR2015-01932, Paper No. 7 .....	37
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	25

<i>Hitzeman v. Rutter</i> , 243 F.3d 1345 (Fed. Cir. 2001) .....	47
<i>In re Cuozzo Speed Techs.</i> , 793 F.3d 1268 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....	15
<i>In re Fulton</i> , 391 F.3d 1195 (Fed. Cir. 2004) .....	35
<i>In re Gordon</i> , 733 F.2d 900 (Fed. Cir. 1984) .....	31
<i>In re Hiok Nam Tay</i> , 579 Fed.Appx. 999 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	19
<i>In re Janski</i> , 508 Fed.Appx. 950 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	42
<i>In Re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006) .....	25
<i>In re Magnum Oil Tools Int’l, Ltd.</i> , 829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	23
<i>In re Nuvasive, Inc.</i> , – F.3d – (Fed. Cir. December 7, 2016), 2016 WL 7118526 .....	28
<i>In re Ratti</i> , 270 F.2d 810, 123 USPQ 349 (CCPA 1959).....	31
<i>In re Robertson</i> , 169 F.3d 743 (Fed. Cir. 1999) .....	46

# 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.