

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

DYNACRAFT BSC, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

MATTEL, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2018-00042
Patent 7,621,543

PETITION FOR
***INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,621,543**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page No.

| | |
|---|-----|
| TABLE OF AUTHORITIES | iii |
| LIST OF EXHIBITS..... | v |
| I. INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| II. MANDATORY NOTICES UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(a)(1)..... | 1 |
| A. Real Party-In-Interest Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1) | 1 |
| B. Related Matters Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2)..... | 1 |
| C. Lead and Back-Up Counsel and Service Information Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3), (4)..... | 1 |
| III. GROUNDS FOR STANDING UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a)..... | 2 |
| IV. THE '543 PATENT..... | 2 |
| A. Subject Matter of the '543 Patent..... | 2 |
| B. Prosecution History of the '543 Patent..... | 7 |
| C. The Challenged Claims | 8 |
| D. How the Challenged Claims Are To Be Construed | 9 |
| V. THE RELEVANT PRIOR ART | 14 |
| A. Damon (Ex. 1003) | 14 |
| B. Perego (Ex. 1004)..... | 16 |
| C. DeGraaf (Ex. 1005) | 18 |
| D. <u>Plastic Blow Molding Handbook</u> (Ex. 1006) | 19 |
| E. Felker (Ex. 1007)..... | 22 |
| VI. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART | 24 |
| VII. GROUNDS OF UNPATENTABILITY..... | 24 |
| A. Summary of Grounds | 25 |
| B. Specific Grounds of Unpatentability of the Challenged Claims | 26 |
| 1. Ground 1: Claims 1, 5-8 and 10 Are Obvious Over the Combination of Damon, Perego, and the Plastic Blow Molding Handbook..... | 26 |

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page No. |
|---|-----------------|
| a. Independent Claim 1 Is Unpatentable..... | 26 |
| b. Dependent Claim 5 Is Unpatentable. | 44 |
| c. Dependent Claim 6 Is Unpatentable. | 46 |
| d. Dependent Claim 7 Is Unpatentable. | 48 |
| e. Dependent Claim 8 Is Unpatentable. | 49 |
| f. Dependent Claim 10 Is Unpatentable. | 51 |
| 2. Ground 2: Claims 1, 5-8, and 10 are Obvious Over the Combination of Damon and Felker..... | 53 |
| a. Independent Claim 1 Is Unpatentable..... | 53 |
| b. Dependent Claim 5 Is Unpatentable. | 67 |
| c. Dependent Claim 6 Is Unpatentable. | 70 |
| d. Dependent Claim 7 Is Unpatentable. | 72 |
| e. Dependent Claim 8 Is Unpatentable. | 73 |
| f. Dependent Claim 10 Is Unpatentable. | 74 |
| VIII. PAYMENT OF FEES UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.103..... | 75 |
| IX. CONCLUSION..... | 76 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page No.

CASES

| | |
|---|---------------|
| <i>Abbvie Inc. v. Matilda & Terence Kennedy Inst. of Rheumatology Trust</i> , 764 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2014)..... | 27 |
| <i>Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee</i> , 136 S. Ct. 2131 (2016)..... | 9 |
| <i>In re Baxter Travenol Labs.</i> , 952 F.2d 388 (Fed. Cir. 1991) | 27 |
| <i>In re Bigio</i> , 381 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2004) | 14 |
| <i>L&P Property Management Co. v. National Products, Inc.</i> , IPR2016-00475, Paper 27 (PTAB July 19, 2017) | 11, 13, 54 |
| <i>Lemelson v. Gen. Mills, Inc.</i> , 968 F.2d 1202 (Fed. Cir. 1992) | 13 |
| <i>Omega Eng'g, Inc. v. Raytek Corp.</i> , 334 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2003) | 13 |
| <i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (<i>en banc</i>) | 9 |
| <i>Purdue Pharma L.P. v. Epic Pharma, LLC</i> , 811 F.3d 1345 (Fed. Cir. 2016) | 9, 10, 13, 54 |
| <i>SmithKline Beecham Corp. v. Apotex Corp.</i> , 439 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2006) | 9 |

STATUTES

| | |
|--------------------------|--------|
| 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) | passim |
| 35 U.S.C. § 103 | 1 |
| 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) | 7 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page No.

OTHER AUTHORITIES

| | |
|-----------------------------|----|
| 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(e)..... | 2 |
| 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(a)(1)..... | 1 |
| 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1)..... | 1 |
| 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2)..... | 1 |
| 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3)..... | 1 |
| 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4)..... | 1 |
| 37 C.F.R. § 42.15(a)..... | 75 |
| 37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b) | 9 |
| 37 C.F.R. § 42.103 | 75 |
| 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a)..... | 2 |

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.