

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

L'ORÉAL USA, INC.,

Petitioner,

v.

LIQWD, INC.,

Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2018-00779

Patent No. 6,645,513 B1

**PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR REHEARING  
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d)**

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

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. REQUEST FOR RELIEF.....1

II. ARGUMENT.....1

**A. The Board’s interpretation amounts to an erroneous application of the law and is unreasonable in view of relevant factors.....1**

    1. The Decision misapplies *Phillips* in construing “dermal cells”.....2

        a. The Decision overlooked the remaining language of the claim.....3

        b. The Decision improperly found no prosecution disclaimer.....5

            i. The Board acknowledged PO’s characterization of the claims, but improperly focused only on “dermal cells”.....6

            ii. PO’s statements after prosecution was closed were insufficient to rescind disclaimer of subject matter made to obtain allowance .....8

        c. The Decision misapprehends the specification.....10

    2. The Board misconstrued Petitioner’s proposed interpretation.....10

**B. The Board’s interpretation rewrites the claim as PO intended.....12**

**C. The Board’s interpretation is erroneous as it fails under 35 U.S.C. §112**  
    13

**D. The Decision misapplies *Chef America*, which is distinguishable.....14**

III. CONCLUSION.....15

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>ACTV, Inc. v. Walt Disney Co.</i> , 346 F.3d 1082 (Fed. Cir. 2003) .....	3
<i>Biogen Idec, Inc. v. GlaxoSmithKline LLC</i> , 713 F.3d 1090 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....	5
<i>Cardinal Chem. Co. v. Morton Int'l</i> , 508 U.S. 83 (1993).....	7
<i>Chef America, Inc. v. Lamb-Watson, Inc.</i> , 358 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2004) .....	12, 14, 15
<i>Elkay Mfg. Co. v. Ebco Mfg. Co.</i> , ..... 192 F.3d 973, 980 (Fed.Cir.1999)	5
<i>Hakim v. Cannon Avent Group, PLC</i> , 479 F.3d 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2007) .....	9
<i>Intellicall, Inc. v. Phonometrics, Inc.</i> , 952 F.2d 1384 (Fed. Cir. 1992) .....	6
<i>Modine Mfg. Co. v. United States I.T.C.</i> , 75 F.3d 1545 (Fed. Cir. 1996) .....	14
<i>Palo Alto Networks, Inc. v. Juniper Networks, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00369 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 14, 2014).....	1
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc) .....	passim
<i>Senmed, Inc. v. Richard-Allan Med. Indus., Inc.</i> , 888 F.2d 815 (Fed. Cir. 1989) .....	7
<i>Technology Props. Ltd. v. Huawei Techs. Co.</i> , 849 F.3d 1349 (Fed. Cir. 2017) .....	7, 8
<i>Unique Concepts, Inc. v. Brown</i> , 939 F.2d 1558 (Fed. Cir. 1991) .....	8

::

*Uship Intellectual Props., LLC v. United States*,  
714 F.3d 1311 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....5

**Statutes**

35 U.S.C. § 112 ..... 13, 14

**Rules**

37 C.F.R. § 1.104(e) .....9  
37 C.F.R. § 1.114(b) .....9  
37 C.F.R. § 42.71(c).....1  
37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d) .....1

## I. REQUEST FOR RELIEF

In response to the Decision Denying Institution of IPR2018-000779 (“Decision,” Paper 10) finding that claims 1-7 and 9 of U.S. Patent No. 6,645,513 (“the ‘513 patent”) are not unpatentable as set forth in Grounds 1-3 of the Petition for *Inter Partes* Review (“Petition,” Paper 2), Petitioner respectfully requests rehearing under 37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d) of Grounds 1-3.

## II. ARGUMENT

A party may request rehearing of a decision by the Board whether to institute a trial, which the Board will review for an abuse of discretion. 37 C.F.R. §42.71(c). “An abuse of discretion may be indicated if a decision is based on an erroneous interpretation of law, if a factual finding is not supported by substantial evidence, or if the decision represents an unreasonable judgment in weighing relevant factors.” *Palo Alto Networks, Inc. v. Juniper Networks, Inc.*, IPR2013-00369, Paper 39, 2–3 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 14, 2014).

In the current proceeding, Petitioner respectfully submits that the Board misapplied the standard for claim construction, erred in finding that prosecution disclaimer did not apply, and overlooked evidence of record in interpreting the language “applied to the dermal cells,” which interpretation the Board relied on to deny institution of Grounds 1-3. Rehearing is therefore respectfully requested.

### **A. The Board’s interpretation amounts to an erroneous application of the law and is unreasonable in view of relevant factors**

# 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.