

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ALIGN TECHNOLOGY, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

3SHAPE A/S,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2019-00117
Patent 9,962,244 B2

Before SALLY C. MEDLEY, IRVIN E. BRANCH, and
JESSICA C. KAISER, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

KAISER, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION

Denying Institution of *Inter Partes* Review
35 U.S.C. § 314 and 37 C.F.R. § 41.108

Align Technology, Inc. (“Petitioner”) filed a Petition pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §§ 321–329 requesting an *inter partes* review of claims 1–5, 8–10, 12, 15, 16, 18, 21, 22, 24, 26, 28, and 29 of U.S. Patent No. 9,962,244 B2, issued on May 8, 2018 (Ex. 1001, “the ’244 patent”). Paper 1 (“Pet.”). 3Shape A/S (“Patent Owner”) filed a Preliminary Response. Paper 6 (“Prelim. Resp.”). Applying the standard set forth in 35 U.S.C. § 314(a), which requires demonstration of a reasonable likelihood that Petitioner would prevail with respect to at least one challenged claim, we deny Petitioner’s request and do not institute an *inter partes* review of any challenged claim.

I. ANALYSIS

Prior to filing this Petition for *inter partes* review, Petitioner filed a petition for post-grant review (“PGR”) challenging nearly¹ the same claims of the ’244 patent based on nearly identical challenges.² See PGR2018-00103, Paper 6 (“PGR2018-00103 Pet.”).³ Petitioner acknowledges that this petition for *inter partes* review presents “nearly identical arguments” as PGR2018-00103. Pet. 5–6. Petitioner further states that it “has purposely filed nearly identical prior art [g]rounds against the claims in the PGR[] and IPR[] knowing that one of the two types of proceedings must fail under the

¹ Petitioner challenged claim 7 in PGR2018-00103, but does not challenge that claim in this petition for *inter partes* review. Compare PGR2018-00103 Pet. 1–4, with Pet. 3–4.

² Compare PGR2018-00103 Pet. 3–4, with Pet. 3–4.

³ In PGR2018-00103, Petitioner filed an Original Petition, a Corrected Petition, and a Second Corrected Petition. We address Petitioner’s Second Corrected Petition in that proceeding.

law,” with the issues being identical except “which proceeding type is proper.” *Id.* at 6. In other words, Petitioner filed a nearly identical petition here so that the Board would still address Petitioner’s challenges even if the Board determines either at institution or during the trial that the ’244 patent is not eligible for PGR. Thus, Petitioner asks us to institute both types of proceedings with nearly identical challenges as to the claims at issue. *Id.*

In PGR2018-00103, we determined Petitioner had sufficiently shown the ’244 patent is PGR eligible and that we would not exercise our discretion under § 325(d), but we nevertheless determined not to institute a post-grant review of any challenged claim. *See* PGR2018-00103, Paper 12, at 8–12, 24–25 (“PGR2018-00103 Dec.”). In particular, applying the standard set forth in 35 U.S.C. § 324(a), which requires demonstrating that it is more likely than not that at least 1 of the claims challenged in the petition is unpatentable, we determined Petitioner failed to adequately show that the references in its asserted challenges, alone or in combination, teach “the data processing system also configured to derive surface color information for the block of said image sensor pixels from at least one of the 2D images used to derive the surface geometry information,” as recited in independent claim 1 and similarly recited in independent claim 29. PGR2018-00103 Dec. 13–24; Ex. 1001, 19:48–52, 22:21–25.

In this case, Petitioner’s analysis of that limitation is substantially similar to its analysis in PGR2018-00103. *Compare* PGR2018-00103 Pet. 26–28, 58–59, 69–72, 76–78, *with* Pet. 15–17, 41, 51–54, 57–59. We have reviewed Petitioner’s evidence and argument in light of the different standard for institution of an *inter partes* review. 35 U.S.C. § 314(a) (We may not institute an *inter partes* review unless the information presented in

the petition and any response “shows that there is a reasonable likelihood that the petitioner would prevail with respect to at least 1 of the claims challenged in the petition.”). Application of the different standard for institution of *inter partes* review, as compared to post-grant review, does not change our conclusions as to the merits of Petitioner’s substantive arguments. Accordingly, based on our review of the same arguments and evidence under the standard for institution of *inter partes* review, we determine that Petitioner has not demonstrated a reasonable likelihood that it would prevail with respect to at least one challenged claim for the same reasons we discussed in PGR2018-00103. *See* PGR2018-00103 Dec. Accordingly, we deny Petitioner’s request and do not institute an *inter partes* review of any challenged claim.

II. ORDER

In consideration of the foregoing, it is hereby:

ORDERED that the Petition is *denied* as to all challenged claims and no trial is instituted.

Case IPR2019-00117

Patent 9,962,244 B2

PETITIONER:

Robert Greene Sterne

Jason Eisenberg

Salvador Bezos

Trent Merrell

George Howarah

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX

RSterne-ptab@sternekessler.com

JasonE-ptab@sternekessler.com

SBezostab@sternekessler.com

TMerrell-ptab@sternekessler.com

GHowarah-ptab@sternekessler.com

PATENT OWNER:

Todd Walters

Roger Lee

Andrew Cheslock

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Todd.Walters@bipc.com

Roger.Lee@bipc.com

Andrew.Cheslock@bipc.com