

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

AMERICAN NATIONAL MANUFACTURING INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

SELECT COMFORT CORPORATION,¹
Patent Owner.

Case No. IPR2019-00514
Patent No. 5,904,172

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

¹ 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

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THE PETITION IS BARRED BY PETITIONER’S PRIOR ACTION	3
III. PATENT OWNERSHIP AND SERVICE DEFECTS.....	6
A. Patent Owner and Real Party in Interest.....	6
B. Because the Petition is Incomplete, Its Filing Date Should Be Rescinded	6
1. The Patent Owner Was Not Served.....	8
2. Service Was Not Effectuated On the Correspondence Address of Record	11
3. Patent Owner Is Prejudiced by Petitioner’s Actions	13
IV. THE PETITION’S REHASHED ARGUMENTS SHOULD BE REJECTED.....	16
A. Relevant Prosecution History.....	17
1. During the Initial Prosecution, Art Analogous to Shafer Was Overcome	17
2. During a 2012 <i>Ex Parte</i> Reexamination, Analogous Art to Shafer Was Again Overcome	18
B. The 2014 Petition for <i>Inter Partes</i> Review Was Denied.....	20
C. In Prior ITC Litigation, the Validity of the ’172 Patent Was Reconfirmed Over the Same or Similar Prior Art.....	20
V. THE ’172 PATENT AND ITS LITIGATION HISTORY	21
A. The ’172 Patent.....	21
B. The State of the Prior Art.....	23

VI.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	24
A.	Petitioner Fails to Construe “Pressure Monitor Means.”	25
1.	Petitioner Fails to Propose a Construction It Believes Is Correct	25
2.	Petitioner Fails to Identify Specific Portions of the Specification to Support Its Construction.....	27
VII.	PETITIONER FAILS TO DEMONSTRATE ANY REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF PREVAILING ON ANY OF GROUNDS 1 TO 13.....	28
A.	Ground 1 Should Be Denied - Petitioner Has Failed to Establish that Shafer (Ex-1007) Discloses All Limitations of Claims 2, 12, and 22	32
1.	Shafer Does Not “Necessarily” Have a Substantially Fluidly Sealed Air Chamber.....	33
2.	Shafer Does Not Disclose “Guides and Stops... For Correctly Positioning Components.”	35
B.	Ground 2 Should Be Denied – Petitioner Uses Hindsight and Fails to Explain How a POSITA Would Modify Shafer (Ex-1007) to Add the Hermetic Seal of Grant (Ex-1008) to Arrive at the Valve Enclosure Assembly of Claims 6, 16, 20, and 24	36
C.	Ground 3 Should Be Denied – Petitioner Fails to Explain Why a POSITA Would Consider Kashiwamura (Ex-1009) and How Shafer (Ex-1007) Would Be Modified to Incorporate Kashiwamura	40
D.	Ground 4 Should Be Denied Because It Is Procedurally Defective and Petitioner Has Not Established <i>Prima Facie</i> Obviousness.....	42
E.	Ground 5 Should Be Denied – Petitioner Fails to Explain Why a POSITA Would Consider Dye (Ex-1010) and How Shafer (Ex-1007) Would Be Modified to Incorporate Dye.....	44
F.	Ground 6 Should Be Denied – Petitioner Fails to Address the Combination of References.....	45

G.	Ground 7 Should Be Denied – Petitioner Fails to Explain Why a POSITA Would Consider Cammack (Ex-1011) and How Shafer (Ex-1007) Would Be Modified to Incorporate Cammack to Arrive at the Valve Enclosure Assembly of Claim 12	46
H.	Ground 8 Should Be Denied – Petitioner Fails to Specifically Address the Asserted Combination of References	48
I.	Ground 9 Should Be Denied – Petitioner Fails to Explain Why a POSITA Would Consider Cammack (Ex-1011) and How Shafer (Ex-1007) Would Be Modified to Incorporate	49
J.	Ground 10 Should Be Denied – Petitioner Fails to Address the Combination of Shafer, Kashiwamura, and Cammack and How Shafer (Ex-1007) Would Be Modified to Incorporate Them	51
K.	Ground 11 Should Be Denied - Petitioner Fails to Establish that Vrzalik (Ex-1012) Discloses All Claim Limitations	52
	1. Vrzalik Does Not Disclose “Guides and Stops.”	53
	2. Vrzalik Does Not Disclose a “Flexible Seal . . . Between the Enclosure Portion and a Rear Cover Portion.”	54
L.	Ground 12 Should Be Denied – Petitioner Has Failed to Show How a POSITA Could Modify Vrzalik to Remove the Motors and Incorporate Shafer’s Solenoid	58
M.	Ground 13 Should Be Denied – Petitioner Has Failed to Show How a POSITA Could Modify Shafer to Incorporate the Design of Ramacier (Ex-1014).....	60
VIII.	CONCLUSION	60

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Am. Nat’l Mfg. v. Select Comfort Corp., et al.</i> , Case No. 16-cv-00582-GHK-JC (C.D. Cal. Mar. 30, 2016)	4
<i>Apple Inc. v. ContentGuard Holdings, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00449, Paper 10 (PTAB July 15, 2015).....	42, 43, 49
<i>Arctic Cat, Inc. v. Bombardier Recreational Prods. Inc.</i> , 876 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	38
<i>Avant Tech., Inc. v. Anza Tech., Inc.</i> , IPR2018-00828, Paper 7 (PTAB Oct. 16, 2018)	29
<i>Aylus Networks, Inc. v. Apple Inc.</i> , 856 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	24
<i>Becton, Dickinson & Co. v. B. Braun Melsungen AG</i> , IPR2017-01586, Paper 8 (PTAB Dec. 15, 2017).....	16
<i>Bettcher Indus., Inc. v. Bunzl USA, Inc.</i> , 661 F.3d 629 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	32
<i>BioGatekeeper, Inc. v. Kyoto Univ.</i> , IPR2014-01286, 2015 WL 604984 (PTAB Feb. 11, 2015)	41
<i>Blackberry Corp. v. NXP B.V.</i> , IPR2013-00232, Paper 9 (PTAB Sept. 30, 2013)	10, 11
<i>Blackberry Corp. v. NXP B.V.</i> , 2013 WL 6514076 (PTAB Dec. 6, 2013).....	10, 11
<i>C.R. Bard, Inc. v. M3 Systems, Inc.</i> , 157 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	4
<i>C.R. Bard, Inc. v. Medline Indus., Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00511, Paper 9 (PTAB July 15, 2015)	29

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.