

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

AMERICAN NATIONAL MANUFACTURING INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

SELECT COMFORT CORPORATION,<sup>1</sup>  
Patent Owner.

---

Case No. IPR2019-00500  
Patent No. 9,737,154

---

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

---

<sup>1</sup> Sleep Number Corporation, not Select Comfort Corporation, is the patent owner.

To date, Petitioner has not made any effort to rectify this error.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

INTRODUCTION ..... 1

I. THE PETITION IS PROCEDURALLY DEFICIENT..... 2

    A. The Petition Is Untimely and Should Not Be Accorded a Filing Date. .... 2

        i. Petitioner Did Not Serve the “Correspondence Address of Record.” ..... 5

        ii. The Petition Is Defective and Was Not Served “On the Patent Owner.” ..... 7

        iii. Patent Owner Is Prejudiced by Petitioner’s Actions..... 11

    B. The Petition Is Impermissibly Non-Specific, Conclusory, and Confusing. .... 16

        i. The Petition Fails to Sufficiently Identify Challenged Grounds. .... 16

        ii. The Petition Fails to Sufficiently Identify the Claims..... 18

        iii. The Petition’s Claim-by-Claim Analysis Includes Impermissible Cross-Referencing..... 20

    C. The Declaration of Joshua Phinney is Conclusory and Deficient and Thus the Petition is Based on Attorney Argument..... 21

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE ‘154 PATENT AND PRIOR ART..... 23

    A. The ‘154 Patent. .... 23

    B. Summary of the Asserted Art..... 26

        i. Giff: USPN 5,904,172 (Ex. 1004). .... 26

        ii. Mittal: USPN 5,629,873 (Ex. 1005). .... 28

        iii. Pillsbury: USPN 5,277,187 (Ex. 1006)..... 31

iv.	Ebel: U.S. Pub. No. 2007/0000559 (Ex. 1007).	33
	ARGUMENT	34
III.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.	34
A.	Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art.	34
B.	Petitioner Failed to Construe “Pressure Sensing Means.”	35
C.	“Determining” Should Be Given Its Plain and Ordinary Meaning....	37
IV.	EACH OF THE PETITION’S GROUNDS RELIES ON NON-ANALOGOUS ART.	39
A.	Pillsbury is From a Different Field of Endeavor.....	39
B.	Pillsbury Is Not Reasonably Pertinent to the Problem.....	40
V.	PETITIONER HAS NOT SUFFICIENTLY ARTICULATED AN ADEQUATE RATIONALE TO COMBINE THE ASSERTED REFERENCES.	42
A.	Petitioner’s Motivations to Combine Are Conclusory.....	44
B.	A POSITA Would Not Be Motivated to Combine Gifft with Mittal.	45
i.	Petitioner’s Stated Motivation to Combine Would Not Motivate a POSITA to Combine Gifft with Mittal.....	46
ii.	There Is No Motivation to Combine Gifft and Mittal Because the Teachings of the References Are at Odds With One Another.....	47
C.	Petitioner Fails to Identify a Motivation to Combine Gifft or Mittal with Pillsbury or Ebel.....	52
VI.	PETITIONER’S OBVIOUSNESS ARGUMENTS ARE BASED ON IMPERMISSIBLE HINDSIGHT	54

A.	Petitioner Engaged in Impermissible Hindsight Bias By Cherry-Picking Elements to Purportedly Demonstrate the Claimed Elements of the Invention Were Known In the Prior Art. ....	56
B.	Petitioner’s Failure to Articulate How the Asserted References Would Be Combined to Render the Claims Obvious Leaves Only Hindsight Bias. ....	57
VII.	PETITIONER FAILS TO ADEQUATELY IDENTIFY THE LIMITATIONS OF THE CLAIMS IN THE ASSERTED ART. ....	61
	CONCLUSION .....	63
	CERTIFICATE OF WORD COUNT .....	64
	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE .....	65

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>In re Am. Acad. of Sci. Tech. Ctr.</i> , 367 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2004) .....	34
<i>Apple Inc. v. ContentGuard Holdings, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00449, Paper 10 (July 15, 2015) .....	20, 44
<i>Apple Inc. v. ContentGuard Holdings, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00453, Paper 9 (PTAB July 13, 2015) .....	59
<i>Apple Inc. v. Uniloc Luxembourg SA</i> , IPR2017-02202, Paper 8 (PTAB May 1, 2018) .....	22
<i>Avant Tech., Inc. v. Anza Tech., Inc.</i> , IPR2018-00828, Paper 7 (Oct. 16, 2018) .....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Belden Inc. v. BerkTek LLC</i> , 805 F.3d 1064 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....	43
<i>In re Bigio</i> , 381 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2004) .....	39
<i>Blackberry Corp. v. NXP B.V.</i> , Case IPR2013-00232, Paper 9 (Sept. 30, 2013) .....	10, 11
<i>Blackberry Corp. v. NXP B.V.</i> , IPR2013-00232, 2013 WL 6514076 (PTAB Dec. 6, 2013) .....	10, 11
<i>In re Clay</i> , 966 F.2d 656 (Fed. Cir. 1992) .....	40
<i>Conmed Corp. v. Bonutti Skeletal Innovations LLC</i> , IPR2013-00624, Paper 18 (PTAB Feb. 21, 2014) .....	8
<i>Cont'l Circuits LLC v. Intel Corp.</i> , 915 F.3d 788 (Fed. Cir. 2019) .....	38

# 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.