

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

PETITIONER'S REPLY TO PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iii
PETITIONER’S EXHIBIT LIST.....	v
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. BROADEST REASONABLE	1
A. “Fingerprint”	2
B. “Latent Print”	2
C. “Vaporization”	3
III. UNDERLYING CONSIDERATIONS REBUTTING PATENTABILITY	3
A. Inherency Renders Claims Obvious	3
B. Lipase-Associated Substrates and Coatings Inherently “Facilitate” Removal of Bioorganic Stains by Evaporation	6
C. Stain Removal by Catalytic Action and Evaporation Were Well-Known.....	9
D. “Facilitating” Limitation Construction Clarifies Relevancy of Other Prior Art Considered During Prosecution	10
E. Overcoming Inherency Requires Improper Importation of Claim Limitations	11
IV. GROUNDS OF UNPATENTABILITY DO NOT REST UPON BUCHANAN.....	16
A. Obviousness is not Predicated on Buchanan	16
B. Patent Owner Mischaracterizes Relevancy of Buchanan.....	18
C. Other Prior Art of Record Discloses Same Relevant	

Subject Matter as Buchanan	20
V. BUCHANAN IS ANALOGOUS AND CREDIBLE PRIOR ART.....	22
A. Buchanan is Analogous Prior Art.....	22
B. Buchanan Data is Reliable.....	23
C. Buchanan is a Printed Publication.....	25
VI. ‘FACILITATING’ LIMITATION NOT PATENTABLY DISTINGUISHING	25
A. “Facilitating” Limitation is a Manipulative Step	26
B. Prior Art Recognized ‘Facilitating’ Limitation.....	27
VII. CONCLUSION.....	27

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

37 C.F.R. §42.100(b)	15
<i>Connell v. Sears Roebuck & Co.,</i> 722 F.2d 1542 (Fed. Cir. 1983).....	12
<i>Griffin v. Bertina,</i> 285 F.3d 1029 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	12
<i>In re Bigio,</i> 381 F.3d 1320, (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	1, 28
<i>In re Deminski,</i> 796 F.2d 436 (Fed. Cir. 1986)	10, 13
<i>In re Fracalossi, 681 F.2d 792 (CCPA 1982)</i>	7
<i>In re Keller,</i> 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981)	20
<i>In re King,</i> 801 F.2d 1324, 231 USPQ 136 (Fed. Cir. 1986)	24
<i>Liebel-Flarsheim Co. v. Medrad, Inc.,</i> 358 F.3d 898 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	24
<i>In re McDaniel,</i> 293 F.3d 1379 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	15, 16

In re Spada,
15 USPQ 2d 1655 (1990) 9

Superguide Corp. v. DirecTV Enterprises, Inc.,
358 F.3d 870, 875, 69 USPQ2d 1865, 1868 (Fed. Cir. 2004)..... 5

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.