UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

YOTRIO CORPORATION, Petitioner

V.

LAKESOUTH HOLDINGS, LLC, Patent Owner.

U.S. Patent No. 8,794,781 Title: Umbrella Apparatus

Case No. IPR2017-00299

PATENT OWNER LAKESOUTH HOLDINGS, LLC'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.107(a)



TABLE OF CONTENTS

TAB	LE OF	CONTENTS	ii	
TAB	LE OF	AUTHORITIES	V	
TAB	LE OF	EXHIBITS	ix	
STA	ГЕМЕ	NT OF MATERIAL FACTS IN DISPUTE	1	
I.	INTE	RODUCTION	2	
II.	BACKGROUND			
	A.	LAKESOUTH	2	
	B.	SUMMARY OF THE INVENTIONS	4	
	C.	CLAIMS AT ISSUE	5	
III.	SUM	MARY OF ARGUMENTS	6	
IV.	LEGAL STANDARDS			
	A.	STANDARD FOR GRANTING AN INTER PARTES REVIEW	. 10	
	B.	OBVIOUSNESS STANDARD	. 11	
V.	THE BOARD SHOULD DECLINE TO INSTITUTE REVIEW BECAUSE THE PRIOR ART ASSERTED HAS ALREADY BEEN CONSIDERED			
	A.	FOUR PRIOR ART REFERENCES HAVE ALREADY BEEN CONSIDERED.	. 15	
	B.	THE TWO REFERENCES NOT PREVIOUSLY CONSIDERED ARE NON-ANALOGOUS ART AND ARE CUMULATIVE OF PREVIOUSLY CONSIDERED REFERENCES	23	



VI.	THE BOARD SHOULD DECLINE TO INSTITUTE REVIEW BECAUSE PETITIONERS CANNOT DEMONSTRATE A LIKELIHOOD OF SUCCESS ON THE MERITS						
	A.	LAKESOUTH'S PROPOSED CLAIM CONSTRUCTIONS					
		1.	"recessed"	. 29			
		2.	"enhancing"	. 30			
	B.	Levi	EL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	. 30			
	C.	Scor	PE AND CONTENT OF THE PRIOR ART	. 31			
		1.	U.S. Patent No. 2,960,094 ("Small")	. 31			
		2.	U.S. Patent No. 6,089,797 ("Wu I")	. 32			
		3.	U.S. Patent No. 5,222,799 ("Sears")	. 34			
		4.	U.S. Patent No. 5,758,948 ("Hale")	. 35			
		5.	U.S. Patent No. 6,439,249 ("Pan")	. 37			
		6.	U.S. Patent No. 727,495 ("Todd")	. 39			
	D.	SUM	JMMARY OF PETITIONERS' PROPOSED GROUNDS FOR REJECTION 4				
	E.	DIFF	ERENCES BETWEEN THE PRIOR ART AND THE CLAIMS	. 42			
		1.	Ground 1 – Small and Wu I, with Sears and the knowledge of a person of ordinary skill in the art (as taught by Todd)	. 45			
			a. Motivation to Combine	. 45			
			b. Missing Elements	. 46			
		2.	Ground 2 – Small and Hale, and the knowledge of a person of ordinary skill in the art (as taught by Wu I, Sears, and Todd)	. 47			



			a.	Motivation to Combine	47
			b.	Missing Elements	. 48
		3.		nd 3 – Small and Pan, with Hale and the knowledge erson of ordinary skill in the art (as taught by Todd)	. 49
			a.	Motivation to Combine	. 49
			b.	Missing Elements	. 50
		4.		nd 4 – Small and Pan, with Sears and the knowledge erson of ordinary skill in the art (as taught by Todd)	. 50
			a.	Motivation to Combine	. 51
			b.	Missing Elements	. 51
	F.	SECO	NDARY	CONSIDERATIONS OF NON-OBVIOUSNESS	. 51
		2.	Comr	mercial Success	. 52
		3.	Accep	otance by Others	. 54
VII.	BECA	AUSE	PETIT	OULD DECLINE TO INSTITUTE REVIEW 'IONERS' PROPOSED GROUNDS ARE ' REDUNDANT	. 58
VIII.					
CERT	ΓΙFIC	ATE O	F WO	RD COUNT	. 62
CERT	ΓΙFIC	ATE O	F SER	VICE	. 63



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Ace Evert, Inc. v. LakeSouth Holdings, LLC Case No. IPR2015-00987, Paper 1 (P.T.A.B. April 1, 2015)	41
Ace Evert, Inc. v. LakeSouth Holdings, LLC Case No. IPR2015-00987, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. July 8, 2015)	41
Cable Elec. Prods., Inc. v. Genmark, Inc. 770 F.2d 1015 (Fed. Cir. 1985)	52
CFMT, Inc. v. YieldUP Int'l Corp. 349 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	13
Conopco, Inc. v. The Procter & Gamble Co. Case No. IPR2014-00628, Paper 21 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 20, 2014)	10
Demaco Corp. v. F. Von Langsdorff Licensing Ltd. 851 F.2d 1387 (Fed. Cir. 1988)	53
Ecolochem, Inc. v. S. Cal. Edison Co. 227 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	52
EMC Corp. v. Personal Web Techs., LLC Case No. IPR2013-00087, Paper 25 (P.T.A.B. June 5, 2013)	59
Ex parte Amazon Techs., Inc. 2017 Pat. App. LEXIS 800 (Feb. 2, 2017)	43
Gambro Lundia AB v. Baxter Healthcare Corp. 110 F.3d 1573 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	53
Graham v. John Deere Co. 383 U.S. 1 (1966)	13
Heart Failure Techs., LLC v. Cardiokinetix, Inc. Case No. IPR2013-00183, Paper 12 (P.T.A.B. July 31, 2013)	12



DOCKET

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.

