

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

REACTIVE SURFACES LTD. LLP,

Petitioner,

v.

TOYOTA MOTOR CORPORATION,

Patent Owner.

Case IPR2016-01914

Patent No. 8,394,618 B2

PATENT OWNER RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES ii

I. INTRODUCTION2

II. BACKGROUND6

 A. The Invention6

 B. The Asserted Prior Art8

 C. The Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....10

III. PETITIONER HAS NOT SHOWN THAT CLAIMS 1-11
WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS.....11

 A. Petitioner Must Show That It Would Have Been Obvious
to Employ Lipase Specifically for the Purpose of
Facilitating Removal of Fingerprints by Vaporization.11

 1. Federal Circuit Law Allows A Method Claim to
Be Limited to a Particular Purpose14

 2. The “Facilitating” Language of Claim 1 Is
Limiting and Requires the Claimed Method to Be
Performed for the Specific Purpose of Facilitating
the Removal of Fingerprints.20

 3. Petitioner’s Case as to Why It Would Have Been
Obvious to Use Lipase to Facilitate Evaporative
Fingerprint Removal Rests Entirely on Buchanan.22

 B. Petitioner Has Not Shown That It Would Have Been
Obvious to Use Lipase for the Purpose of Facilitating the
Removal of Fingerprints by Vaporization.....23

 1. Petitioner Has Not Shown That Buchanan Is a
“Printed Publication.”23

 2. A POSITA Would Have Had No Reason or
Motivation to Consult Buchanan Even if It Were a
“Printed Publication” Because Buchanan Is Non-
Analogous Art.....27

3. The Use of Lipase for the Claimed Purpose Would Not Have Been Obvious Even if Buchanan Were Analogous Art.....35

a. The Flaws in Buchanan’s Data and Conclusions Would Have Been Apparent Even to Non-Experts in Forensics Science.38

b. The Buchanan Data on the Chemical Characterization of Fingerprints Was Not Obtained Using a Reliable Method..41

c. Even Taken at Face Value, the Buchanan Data Does Not Support the Inference That Fingerprints Can Disappear From a Surface Through Vaporization.....44

III. CONCLUSION.....49

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

In re Bigio,
381 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2004)28, 29

Bruckelmyer v. Ground Heaters, Inc.,
445 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2006)24

Catalina Mktg. Int’l v. Coolsavings.com, Inc.,
289 F.3d 801 (Fed. Cir. 2002)20, 21

Coalition for Affordable Drugs IV LLC v. Pharmacyclics, Inc.,
IPR2015-01076, Paper 33 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 19, 2015).....24

Dell, Inc. v. Selene Commc’n Techs.,
IPR2014-01411, Paper 23 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 26, 2015)26, 27

Dynamic Drinkware, LLC v. Nat’l Graphics, Inc.,
800 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2015)23

Griffin v. Bertina,
285 F.3d 1029 (Fed. Cir. 2002) 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 22

In re Clay,
966 F.2d 656 (1992)30

In re Jasinski,
508 Fed. Appx. 950 (Fed. Circ. 2013).....19, 20

In re Klein,
647 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2011)3, 27, 33

In re Oetiker,
977 F.2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992)28

K/S HIMPP v. Hear-Wear Techs., LLC,
751 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2014)37

*L.A. Biomedical Research Inst. at Harbor-UCLA Med. Ctr. v. Eli Lilly
& Co.*, 849 F.3d 1049 (Fed. Cir. 2017)38

Monarch Knitting Mach. Corp. v. Sulzer Morat GmbH,
139 F.3d 877 (Fed. Cir. 1998)35

Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. v. Boehringer Ingelheim Int’l GmbH,
IPR2016-01566, Paper 15 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 3, 2017)24

Nat’l Steel Car, Ltd. v. Canadian Pac. Ry., Ltd.,
357 F.3d 1319 (Fed. Cir. 2004)12

Pentec, Inc. v. Graphic Controls Corp.,
776 F.2d 309 (Fed. Cir. 1985)34

Rapoport v. Dement,
254 F.3d 1053 (Fed. Cir. 2001)2, 17, 18, 22

SCHOTT Gemtron Corp., v. SSW Holding Company, Inc.,
IPR2014-00367, Paper 62 (P.T.A.B. May 26, 2015)33

Star Scientific, Inc. v. R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.,
655 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2011)

Statutes and Regulations

35 U.S.C. § 10321, 27

37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b)12

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.