

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

BASF CORPORATION
Petitioner

v.

INGEVITY SOUTH CAROLINA, LLC
Patent Owner

Case No. IPR2019-00202
Patent RE38,844

**INGEVITY SOUTH CAROLINA, LLC'S PATENT OWNER'S
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

	<u>Page</u>
I. Introduction.....	1
II. Background.....	5
A. Overview of the '844 Patent.....	5
B. The Alleged Prior Art Asserted by Petitioner.....	7
1. Overview of Park.....	7
2. Overview of Meiller.....	12
3. Overview of Abe.....	13
III. The Petition Should Be Denied Because Petitioner Failed to Show How the Asserted Prior Art or Arguments Differ from Those Already Considered By the PTO.....	14
A. Overview of Prosecution History.....	15
B. References Specifically Considered During Prosecution.....	18
1. Park (U.S. Patent No. 5,914,294).....	18
2. AAPA (Applicant Admitted Prior Art).....	19
3. Tennison (WO 92/01585).....	20
C. References Substantially the Same as References Specifically Considered During Prosecution.....	21
1. References Considered During First Consideration.....	22
a) U.S. Patent No. 6,279,548 (Reddy).....	23
b) KR 2002012826 (Oh).....	24
2. References Considered During Request for Continued Examination.....	25
a) EP 1 113 163 (Uchino).....	25
b) U.S. Patent No. 5,460,136 (Yamazaki).....	28
3. References Considered During Reissue Examination.....	29

TABLE OF CONTENTS *(continued)*

	<u>Page</u>
IV. The Petition Should Be Denied Because the Low IAC Adsorbent Volume Limitation Cannot Be Found Obvious Under an Inherency Theory as a Matter of Law	30
V. The Petition Should Be Denied Because Petitioner Did Not Demonstrate a Reasonable Likelihood of Success for the Grounds Advanced	34
A. Ground 1: The Challenged Claims are Not Obvious over the Combination of Meiller, Park, and AAPA At Least Because Those References Do Not Disclose the Low IAC Adsorbent Volume Limitation	34
1. Park’s Honeycombs Do Not Necessarily Have an IAC Less Than 35 g/L.....	36
2. Petitioner’s Hypothetical Honeycomb Does Not Render the Low IAC Adsorbent Volume Limitation Obvious	37
a) Petitioner’s Hypothetical Honeycomb	38
b) The Asserted Prior Art Does Not Disclose Petitioner’s Hypothetical Honeycomb	40
(1) The Asserted Prior Art Does Not Disclose That Formulation D, or Any Other Composition or Structure, Is Intended for Use in Conjunction With a Fuel Vapor Canister	40
(2) The Asserted Prior Art Does Not Disclose Using BAX 1100 or BAX 1500 in a Honeycomb.....	45
(3) Park Does Not Disclose That Formulation D Can Be Made With Petitioner’s Voidage Percentage.....	47
c) Petitioner’s Hypothetical Honeycomb Does Not Necessarily Have An IAC Less Than 35 g/L	47

TABLE OF CONTENTS *(continued)*

	<u>Page</u>
(1) Petitioner’s Reliance on BAX 1500 Is Misplaced.....	49
(2) Volumetric Dilution Alone Does Not Guarantee That Petitioner’s Hypothetical Honeycomb Has an IAC Less Than 35 g/L	51
(3) Compositional Dilution Does Not Guarantee That Petitioner’s Hypothetical Honeycomb Has an IAC Less Than 35 g/L	52
(4) It Is Impossible To Deduce the IAC Of Petitioner’s Hypothetical Honeycomb From Example 2 of the ’844 Patent	53
B. Ground 2: The Challenged Claims are Not Obvious over the Combination of Abe, Park, and AAPA Because the References Do Not Disclose the Low IAC Adsorbent Volume Limitation	58
C. Ground 3: The Challenged Claims are Not Obvious over the Combination of Meiller, Park, and Tennison Because the References Do Not Disclose the Low IAC Adsorbent Volume Limitation	60
VI. Objective Indicia of Nonobviousness Also Show that the Challenged Claims are Not Obvious	60
VII. Conclusion	62

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases

Conopco, Inc. v. Procter & Gamble Co.,
IPR2014-00628, Paper 21 (PTAB Oct. 20, 2014).....14, 15

Continental Can Co. USA, Inc. v. Monsanto Co.,
948 F.2d 1264 (Fed. Cir. 1991)35, 36

Honeywell Int’l v. Mexichem Amanco Holding,
865 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2017)4, 31, 34

Ingevity Corp. and Ingevity South Carolina, LLC v. BASF Corp.,
Case No. 18-1391 (D. Del.).....60

Par Pharmaceutical, Inc. v. TWi Pharmaceuticals, Inc.,
773 F.3d 1186 (Fed. Cir. 2014)36

Unified Patents Inc. v. Berman,
IPR2016-01571, Paper 10 (PTAB Dec. 14, 2016) 15

WL Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.,
721 F.2d 1540 (Fed. Cir. 1983)35, 53

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 314(a)5, 14

35 U.S.C. § 325(d)2, 15

Regulations

37 C.F.R. § 42.22(a)(2).....50

37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(4).....3

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.