

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

COLLECTIVE MINDS GAMING CO. LTD.
Petitioner,

v.

IRONBURG INVENTIONS LTD.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2018-00354
Patent 8,641,525

PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

Mail Stop "PATENT BOARD"
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 325(D).....	7
A. Petitioner Advances “Substantially The Same” Prior Art Already Presented During Prosecution	10
1. Kotkin Is “Substantially The Same” As Ogata, Goto, Soma, Komata And Takatsuka	10
2. Willner Previously Considered By The Examiner And “Substantially The Same” As Park And Enright; Koji’s Features Are Not New	13
B. Petitioner Advances “Substantially The Same” Arguments Already Presented To The Board	16
C. Re-Litigating The Same Or Substantially The Same Issues Is A Waste Of Time, Effort And Resources	17
III. THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 314(A).....	18
A. Factor 1: Whether The Same Petitioner Previously Filed A Petition Directed To The Same Claims Of The Same Patent	20
B. Factor 2: Whether At The Time Of Filing Of The First Petition The Petitioner Knew Of The Prior Art Asserted In The Second Petition Or Should Have Known Of It	23
C. Factor 3: Whether The Petitioner Already Received The Patent Owner’s Preliminary Response To The First Petition Or Received The Board’s Decision On Whether To Institute Review In The First Petition	23
D. Factor 4: The Length Of Time That Elapsed Between The Time The Petitioner Learned Of The Prior Art Asserted In The Second Petition And The Filing Of The Second Petition	25
E. Factor 5: Whether The Petitioner Provides Adequate Explanation For The Time Elapsed Between The Filings Of Multiple Petitions Directed To The Same Claims Of The Same Patent	25
F. Factor 6: The Finite Resources Of The Board	26

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
G. Factor 7: The Requirement Under 35 U.S.C. § 316(A)(11) To Issue A Final Determination Not Later Than 1 Year After The Date On Which The Director Notices Institution Of Review	27
IV. THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE IT FAILS TO SHOW A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT AT LEAST ONE OF THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS IS UNPATENTABLE	28
A. Legal Standard For Combining References	28
B. Claim Construction	29
1. Directional References (All Claims).....	29
2. “Inherently Resilient And Flexible” (Claims 1-19).....	30
C. Level Of Ordinary Skill.....	31
D. Kotkin Does Not Render Obvious Any Of Claims 1-3, 5-11, 13, 14, 17-18 And 20 (Ground 1).....	34
1. Kotkin Does Not Disclose “Inherently Resilient And Flexible” Elongate Members (Claims 1-3, 5-11, 13, 14, 17-18).....	34
a. Housing Bottom 320 Is Not Inherently Flexible	35
b. Line 219 Is Not Inherently Resilient	36
c. Kotkin’s Provisional Application Does Not Disclose Back Controls Or Elongate Members That Are Inherently Resilient And Flexible	37
2. Kotkin Does Not Disclose The Claimed Thickness Range (Claims 9-11)	39
E. The Proffered Combination Of Willner, Koji And Raymond Do Not Render Obvious Any Of Claims 1-11, 13-17, And 19-20 (Ground 2)	40
1. No Motivation To Combine Raymond With Koji And Willner	41
2. No Motivation To Combine Koji With Willner	44
3. Raymond Does Not Disclose The Claimed Thickness Range (Claims 9-11)	48
V. CONCLUSION.....	49

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

CASES

<i>Apotex Inc. v. Wyeth LLC</i> , IPR2014-00115 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 20, 2015).....	41
<i>Broadcom Corp. v. Emulex Corp.</i> , 732 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	28
<i>CFMT, Inc. v. Yieldup Int’l Corp.</i> , 349 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	34
<i>Cultec, Inc. v. Stormtech LLC</i> , IPR2017-00777 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 22, 2017)	8
<i>Endo Pharmaceuticals v. Depomed</i> , IPR2014-00652 (P.T.A.B. Sep. 29, 2014).....	34
<i>General Plastic Indus. Co., Ltd. v. Canon Kabushiki Kaisha</i> , IPR2016-01357 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 6, 2017).....	passim
<i>Grain Processing Corp. v. Am. MaizeProds. Co.</i> , 840 F.2d 902 (Fed. Cir. 1988)	48
<i>Heart Failure Techs., LLC v. Cardiokinetix, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00183 (P.T.A.B. July 31, 2013)	28
<i>Hilti, Inc. et al. v. Milwaukee Elec. Tool Corp.</i> , IPR2015-01164 (P.T.A.B. November 14, 2016).....	40, 49
<i>In re Fritch</i> , 972 F.2d 1260 (Fed. Cir. 1992)	48
<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	28
<i>In re Royka</i> , 490 F.2d 981 (C.C.P.A. 1974)	34
<i>In re Warner</i> , 379 F.2d 1011 (C.C.P.A. 1967)	38
<i>Intri-Plex Techs., Inc. v. Saint-Gobain Performance Plastics Rencol Ltd.</i> , IPR2014-00309 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 23, 2014)	32
<i>Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.</i> , 688 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	47

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
(continued)

	Page
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	28, 41
<i>KTEC, Inc. v. Vita-Mix Corp.</i> , 696 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	41, 42
<i>Medtronic, Inc. v. Nuvasive, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00487 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 11, 2014).....	4, 8
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Enfish, LLC</i> , 662 F. App’x 981 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	45
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Proxyconn, Inc.</i> , IPR2012-00026 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 21, 2012)	34
<i>Neil Ziegmann N.P.Z., Inc. v. Stephens</i> , IPR2015-01860 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 6, 2017).....	18
<i>NetApp Inc. v. Crossroads Systems, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00776, Paper 13 (P.T.A.B. 2015).....	24
<i>NetApp Inc. v. Realtime Data LLC</i> , IPR2017-01195 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 12, 2017)	21
<i>Nichia Corporation v. Everlight Americas, Inc.</i> , 855 F.3d 1328 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	46
<i>NRT Tech. Corp. et al. v. Everi Payments Inc.</i> , CBM2016-00080, Paper 12 (P.T.A.B. 2016)	12, 16
<i>NVIDIA Corp. v. Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd.</i> , IPR2016-00134 (P.T.A.B. May 4, 2016).....	20
<i>Procter & Gamble Co. v. Teva Pharms. USA, Inc.</i> , 566 F.3d 989 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	41
<i>Samsung Electronics Co. Ltd. v. Rembrandt Wireless Techs., LP</i> , IPR2014-00518 (P.T.A.B. Sep. 17, 2015).....	33
<i>Sony Corp. of Am. v. Network-1 Sec. Solutions, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00092 (P.T.A.B. May 24, 2013)	28
<i>Spaceco Business Solutions, Inc. v. Moscovitch</i> , IPR2015-00127 (P.T.A.B. May 14, 2015)	45
<i>Starbucks Corp. v. Ameranth, Inc.</i> , CBM2017-00053 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 4, 2017).....	20

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.