

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

AMERICAN NATIONAL MANUFACTURING INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

SLEEP NUMBER CORPORATION
f/k/a SELECT COMFORT CORPORATION,
Patent Owner.

Case No. IPR2019-00500
Patent No. 9,737,154 B2

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

I. DESCRIPTION OF THE ‘154 PATENT AND PRIOR ART. 2

 A. The ‘154 Patent..... 2

 B. Summary of the Asserted Art..... 5

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

 ii. Mittal: USPN 5,629,873 (Ex. 1005)..... 7

 iii. Pillsbury: USPN 5,277,187 (Ex. 1006). 11

 iv. Ebel: U.S. Pub. No. 2007/0000559 (Ex. 1007)..... 11

ARGUMENT..... 12

I. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART. 12

II. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION. 13

 A. “pressure sensing means” (Claims 20, 21, 22)..... 14

 B. “desired pressure setpoint” (Claims 1, 6, 9, 10, 12, 15, 17, 18, 20). . 15

 C. “adjustment factor error” (Claims 1, 10, 12, 18, and 20). 16

 D. “pressure target” (Claims 1, 4, 6-7, 9-10, 12, 14-18, 20). 17

 E. “determining” (Claims 1, 9, 12, 17, 18, 20, 22)..... 18

III. PETITIONER’S ARGUMENTS ARE TAINTED BY IMPERMISSIBLE HINDSIGHT..... 18

 A. Petitioner Impermissibly Uses the Claims as a Roadmap. 20

 B. Petitioner’s Failure to Articulate How the Asserted References Would Be Combined to Render the Claims Obvious Leaves Only Hindsight Bias. 22

IV. PETITIONER’S GROUNDS RELY ON NON-ANALOGOUS ART..... 26

A.	The Asserted References Are From Different Fields of Endeavor....	27
B.	The Asserted Art Is Not Reasonably Pertinent to the Problem.	28
V.	THERE IS NO MOTIVATION TO COMBINE THE ASSERTED REFERENCES.	30
A.	Petitioner Must Articulate a Motivation to Combine Each Prior Art Reference.....	31
B.	A POSITA Would Not Be Motivated to Combine Gifft with Mittal.	34
i.	There Is No Motivation to Combine Gifft and Mittal Because a POSITA Would Understand Mittal’s Pressure Adjustment Cycles Would Not Increase Accuracy or Speed.	35
a.	A POSITA Would Not Combine Gifft with Mittal Because Mittal Is Not Concerned with Precision.	36
b.	Even if Motivated to Limit the Number of Pressure Adjustment Cycles, a POSITA Would Not Do So at the Expense of Accuracy.	39
c.	A POSITA Would Understand that Mittal’s Pressure Adjustment Cycles Would Not Achieve the Desired Pressure Faster Than Gifft’s Cycles.	41
ii.	There Is No Motivation to Combine Gifft and Mittal Because the Teachings of the References Are at Odds with One Another.	42
iii.	There Is No Motivation to Combine Gifft and Mittal Because Such a Combination Would Render Gifft Unfit for Its Intended Purpose.	44
iv.	Mittal Would Not Motivate a POSITA to Modify a Pressure Adjustment Factor in the System of Gifft.	46
v.	Petitioner Fails To Provide Any Motivation to Combine Gifft or Mittal with the Disclaimed Prior Art of Gifft.	46

C.	Petitioner Fails to Identify a Motivation to Combine Giffit or Mittal with Pillsbury.	47
D.	Petitioner Fails to Identify a Motivation to Combine Giffit-Mittal-Pillsbury with Ebel.....	50
i.	Petitioner Impermissibly Alters Ebel’s Disclosure.	50
a.	Nothing in Ebel, or Any Other References, Suggests the Fluid-Electric Equivalent Circuit Identified By Petitioner.....	51
b.	Nothing in Ebel, or Any Other References, Suggests the Multiplicative Factor Identified by Petitioner.	53
ii.	Petitioner Fails to Explain Any Problem Solved or Benefit Conferred By the Combination of Ebel with Giffit-Mittal-Pillsbury.....	55
VI.	PETITIONER FAILS TO ADEQUATELY IDENTIFY THE LIMITATIONS OF THE CLAIMS IN THE ASSERTED ART.	56
A.	“substantially equal” to the pressure target (1c, 10c, 12l, 18d, 20g, 20k). 56	
B.	“within an acceptable pressure target error range of the manifold pressure target” (12f).	57
C.	“control device” (20e, 20f).....	58
D.	“multiplicative pressure adjustment factor” and “dividing the desired pressure setpoint for the air chamber by a manifold deflate pressure adjustment factor” (5, 6, 15).....	59
VII.	SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS.	59
A.	Industry Praise.	61
B.	Copying.	61
C.	Commercial Success.	66

D. Unexpected Results.....	68
VIII. THE PETITION WAS PROCEDURALLY DEFICIENT.....	69
A. The Petition Was Untimely and Should Not Have Been Accorded a Filing Date.	69
B. The Petition Was Impermissibly Non-Specific, Conclusory, and Confusing.	69
CONCLUSION	70

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.