

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

ONE WORLD TECHNOLOGIES, INC.  
D/B/A TECHTRONIC INDUSTRIES POWER EQUIPMENT,  
Petitioner

v.

THE CHAMBERLAIN GROUP, INC.  
Patent Owner

---

Case No. IPR2017-00126  
Patent No. 7,161,319

---

**PATENT OWNER'S REQUEST FOR REHEARING**

## I. Introduction and Statement of Relief Requested

Patent Owner hereby requests rehearing under 37 CFR § 42.71(d), in response to the Final Written Decision (“Decision”) in proceeding IPR2017-00126.

In the Decision, the Board found that Applicant Admitted Prior Art (“AAPA”) “can be used to challenge claims in an *inter partes* review,” and that “Petitioner’s use of AAPA in its asserted ground in this proceeding was proper.” Decision, 41. These findings are based on misapprehension of the statutory and regulatory requirements for *inter partes* review, and are inconsistent with several cases in which panels of the Patent Trial and Appeal Board denied petitions for relying on ineligible AAPA in the same manner as Petitioner. *See* Pap. 6, 5-14; Pap. 11, 41-54<sup>1</sup>; 35 U.S.C. § 311(b); C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(4); Decision, 35-41. For

---

<sup>1</sup> *Citing Kingbright Electronics Co. Ltd., et al. v. Cree, Inc.*, IPR2015-00741, Pap. 8, 5 (PTAB August 20, 2015)(“*Kingbright I*”); *Kingbright Electronics Co. Ltd., et al. v. Cree, Inc.*, IPR2015-00746, Pap. 8, 6 (PTAB August 20, 2015)(“*Kingbright IP*”); *Kingbright Electronics Co. Ltd., et al. v. Cree, Inc.*, IPR2015-00743, Pap. 8, 6 (PTAB September 9, 2015)(“*Kingbright IIP*”); *Kingbright Electronics Co. Ltd., et al. v. Cree, Inc.*, IPR2015-00744, Pap. 8, 5-6 (PTAB September 9, 2015)(“*Kingbright IV*”); *LG Electronics, Inc. v. Core Wireless Licensing S.A.R.L.*, IPR2015-01987, Pap. 7, 18 (PTAB March 24, 2016).

this reason, Patent Owner requests rehearing.

In the Decision, the Board also found that “the Petition challenges the patentability of the challenged claims as obvious over ... Doppelt, AAPA, and Jacobs.” Pap. 56, 20, 89. This finding is based on misapprehension of the ground of rejection set forth in the Petition, and oversight of the Supreme Court’s guidance in *SAS Institute Inc. v. Iancu* that it is “the petitioner’s petition, not the Director’s discretion, [that] is supposed to guide the life of the litigation.” *SAS Institute Inc. v. Iancu*, 6-7. See Pap. 1, ii, 3, 38, 52, 59, 65; Ex. 3003; Pap. 39, 4; Pap. 45, 21, FN 3 (citing Pap. 6, 1, 21-31); Pap. 53, 31-34; *SAS Institute Inc. v. Iancu*, 584 U.S. \_\_\_, 6-8 (2018). For this additional reason, Patent Owner requests rehearing.

## **II. The Decision Misapprehended Federal Circuit Jurisprudence On Use Of AAPA In Reexamination, Misapprehended Regulations Adopted By The Director, And Misapprehended The Statutory Framework Of 35 U.S.C. § 311(b)**

35 U.S.C. § 311(b) provides that “[a] petitioner in an inter partes review may request to cancel as unpatentable 1 or more claims of a patent only on a ground that could be raised under section 102 or 103 and *only on the basis of prior art consisting of patents or printed publications*” (emphasis added). The ground over which claims 1–4, 7, 9–12, and 15 of the ’319 patent were found to be unpatentable relies on the combination of two references, Doppelt and Jacobs, with “AAPA” attributed to portions of the ’319 patent’s background section. Pap. 56,

20, 89; Pap. 8, 3 (citing Pap. 1, 10), 22; Ex. 1001, 1:21-23, 1:41-43.

As set forth in Patent Owner response, however, the use-based “AAPA” relied on by Petitioner is not “prior art consisting of patents or printed publications” and, thus, is ineligible for *inter partes* review. Pap. 11, 41-54. Specifically, the AAPA included in Petitioner’s singular Ground 1 is not patent or printed publication prior art. Indeed, the ’319 patent’s background section is devoid of any mention of a patent or a printed publication. ’319 patent, 1:14-2:9. The ’319 patent at 1:21-23, for example, indicates that “[i]t has been known to *use*” (emphasis added) either of pyroelectric infrared detectors or passive infrared detectors for a particular purpose, but does not indicate in any way that such “use” was patented or published. In fact, Petitioner never even attempted to argue that the cited AAPA relates to a prior art patent or printed publication, and instead emphasized in its writing that the “Admitted Art” relates to a known “use” of infrared detectors. Petition, 10.

With this background, the Decision incorrectly concluded that the AAPA relied on by Petitioner is eligible for IPR. For the reasons discussed below, the incorrect conclusion stems from misapprehension of Federal Circuit jurisprudence on use of AAPA in reexamination proceedings, misapprehension of regulations adopted by the Director, and misapprehension of the statutory framework of 35 U.S.C. § 311(b).

**A. The Decision Misapprehended Federal Circuit Jurisprudence On Use Of AAPA In Reexamination**

The Decision contends that “the Federal Circuit has found, as we do above, that ‘prior art consisting of patents or publications’ includes AAPA.” Pap. 56, 38.

To reach this conclusion, the Decision cites two, different Federal Circuit cases:

(1) *In re NTP, Inc.*, 654 F.3d 1268 (“*NTP 1*”) and (2) *In re NTP, Inc.*, 654 F.3d 1279 (“*NTP 2*”).<sup>2</sup> *Id.* Specifically, the Decision cites *NTP 1* for the rule that pre-AIA reexamination “must be based *only* on ‘prior art consisting of patents or printed publications’” and cites *NTP 2* for affirmance of a reexamination ground involving AAPA. *Id.* (emphasis in original). However, *NTP 1* never mentions AAPA and *NTP 2* never mentions the rule limiting pre-AIA reexamination to prior art consisting of patents or printed publications. *See generally NTP 1* and *NTP 2*.

The Decision cannot piece together two, separate Federal Circuit decisions to reach a holding that is present in neither.

Without doubt, neither *NTP 1* nor *NTP 2* found “that ‘prior art consisting of patents or printed publications’ includes AAPA,” as contended. Pap. 56, 38.

Indeed, neither of the *NTP* cases cited by the Decision endorsed a ground involving AAPA, against an argument that AAPA was ineligible for use in a

---

<sup>2</sup> Both *NTP 1* and *NTP 2* were first raised by the Board in the Decision.

# 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.