

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 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. None Of The Stated Grounds For Unpatentability Render The Challenged Claims Obvious | 2 |
| A. Legal Standard For Combining References | 2 |
| B. Claim Construction - “Inherently Resilient And Flexible” (Claims 1-19)..... | 3 |
| 1. The Board’s Analysis In The Prior Proceedings Confirms That The Terms “Resilient” And “Flexible” Both Describe Inherent Properties Of The Material From Which The Elongate Member Is Formed, And Not Other Components In An Assembly That May Include An Elongate Member | 4 |
| 2. Petitioner’s New Arguments In Its Reply To The POPR Violate Board Rules And The Updated Trial Practice Guide, And Should Not Be Considered..... | 10 |
| 3. Even If Petitioner’s New Arguments Were Considered, They Are Unsupported By Any Expert Testimony And Are Legally And Scientifically Erroneous..... | 11 |
| 4. “Inherently” Is “A Permanent And Inseparable Attribute, Characteristic Or Quality Of The Material From Which The Elongate Member Itself Is Formed” | 14 |
| C. Level Of Ordinary Skill..... | 16 |
| D. Kotkin Does Not Render Obvious Any Of Claims 1-3, 5-11, 13, 14, 17-18 And 20 (Ground 1)..... | 19 |
| 1. Kotkin Does Not Disclose “Inherently Resilient And Flexible” Elongate Members (Claims 1-3, 5-11, 13, 14, 17-18) | 19 |
| a. Housing Bottom 320 Is Not Inherently Resilient And Flexible | 20 |
| b. Line 219 Is Not Inherently Resilient | 24 |
| c. Kotkin’s Provisional Application Does Not Disclose Back Controls Or Elongate Members That Are Inherently Resilient And Flexible | 28 |

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

| | Page |
|--|-------------|
| 2. Kotkin Does Not Disclose The Claimed Thickness Range (Claims 9-11) | 30 |
| E. The Proffered Combination Of Willner, Koji And Raymond Does Not Render Obvious Any Of Claims 1-11, 13-17, And 19-20 (Ground 2)..... | 34 |
| 1. Raymond Is Non-Analogous Art | 34 |
| a. Petitioner Never Demonstrated That Raymond Is From The Same Field Of Endeavor..... | 36 |
| b. Raymond Is Not Pertinent To The Problems Faced By The '525 Inventors | 39 |
| 2. Petitioner Failed To Provide Any Objective Evidence Or Sufficient Reason For Combining Raymond With Koji..... | 43 |
| 3. No Motivation To Combine Koji With Willner | 50 |
| F. Raymond Does Not Disclose The Claimed Thickness Range (Claims 9-11)..... | 57 |
| III. Conclusion | 59 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

CASES

| | |
|--|--------|
| <i>A.C. Dispensing Equip. Inc. v. Prince Castle LLC</i> , IPR2014- 00511, Paper 16 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 10, 2014)..... | 49 |
| <i>ActiveVideo Networks v. Verizon Commc 'ns</i> , 694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012) | 44, 47 |
| <i>Apotex Inc. v. Wyeth LLC</i> , IPR2014-00115, Paper 94 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 20, 2015) | 34 |
| <i>Apple Inc. v. ContentGuard Holdings, LLC</i> , IPR2015-00446, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. July 10, 2015) | 49 |
| <i>Beiden Inc. v. Berk-Tek LLC</i> , 805 F.3d 1064 (Fed. Cir. 2015) | 47, 48 |
| <i>Broadcom Corp. v. Emulex Corp.</i> , 732 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2013) | 2 |
| <i>CFMT, Inc. v. Yieldup Int'l Corp.</i> , 349 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2003) | 19 |
| <i>Cisco Sys., Inc. v. C-Cation Techs., LLC</i> , IPR2014-00454, Paper 12 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 29, 2014) | 48 |
| <i>Endo Pharmaceuticals v. Depomed</i> , IPR2014-00652, Paper 12 (P.T.A.B. Sep. 29, 2014)..... | 19 |
| <i>Ex Parte Jan Vetesnik</i> , 2009 WL 291177 (B.P.A.I. Feb. 5, 2009) | 45 |
| <i>Fidelity Nat'l Info. Servs., Inc. v. Datatransury Corp.</i> , IPR2014-00489, Paper 9 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 13, 2014)..... | 49 |
| <i>Grain Processing Corp. v. Am. MaizeProds. Co.</i> , 840 F.2d 902 (Fed. Cir. 1988) | 56 |
| <i>Heart Failure Techs., LLC v. Cardiokinetix, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00183, Paper 12 (P.T.A.B. July 31, 2013)..... | 3 |
| <i>Hilti, Inc. et al. v. Milwaukee Elec. Tool Corp.</i> , IPR2015-01164, Paper 87 (P.T.A.B. November 14, 2016)..... | 31, 57 |
| <i>Hockerson-Halberstadt, Inc. v. Avia Grp., Int'l</i> , 222 F.3d 951 (Fed. Cir. 2000) | 31, 58 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
(continued)

| | Page |
|---|----------------|
| <i>In re Bigio</i> , 381 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2004) | 37, 38 |
| <i>In re Clay</i> , 966 F.2d 656 (Fed. Cir. 1992) | 39 |
| <i>In re Fritch</i> , 972 F.2d 1260 (Fed. Cir. 1992) | 56 |
| <i>In re Gordon</i> , 733 F.2d 900 (Fed. Cir. 1984) | 47, 48 |
| <i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006) | 2 |
| <i>In re Klein</i> , 647 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2011) | 39 |
| <i>In re Magnum Oil Tools Int’l, Ltd.</i> , 829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016) | 42, 54 |
| <i>In re Oetiker</i> , 977 F.2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992) | 41 |
| <i>In re Royka</i> , 490 F.2d 981 (C.C.P.A. 1974) | 19 |
| <i>In re Warner</i> , 379 F.2d 1011 (C.C.P.A. 1967) | 22, 29, 44, 56 |
| <i>In re Wright</i> , 569 F.2d 1124 (C.C.P.A. 1977) | 31 |
| <i>Intelligent Bio-Sys., Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge, Ltd.</i> , 821 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016) | 10, 36, 42 |
| <i>Intri-Plex Techs., Inc. v. Saint-Gobain Performance Plastics Rencol Ltd.</i> , IPR2014-00309 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 23, 2014) | 17 |
| <i>Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.</i> , 688 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2012) | 53 |
| <i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007) | 2, 34, 44 |
| <i>KTEC, Inc. v. Vita-Mix Corp.</i> , 696 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2012) | 35 |

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.