

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

---

**PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b>Page</b>
INTRODUCTION .....	1
I. THE '172 PATENT AND ITS LITIGATION HISTORY.....	2
II. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.....	6
A. An Enclosure Defining a Substantially Fluidly Sealed Air Chamber. ....	7
B. An Enclosure Portion and Rear Cover Portion with a Flexible Seal.....	9
C. Guides and Stops. ....	10
D. Pressure Monitor Means. ....	12
III. PETITIONER FAILS TO DEMONSTRATE INVALIDITY THROUGH ANY OF GROUNDS 1 TO 13. ....	14
A. Petitioner’s Anticipation Grounds Based on Shafer and Vrzalik Fail.....	14
1. Vrzalik Does Not Disclose All Claim Limitations (Ground 11). ....	15
a) Vrzalik Does Not Disclose “Guides and Stops.” .....	15
b) Vrzalik Does Not Disclose the Claimed Enclosure. ....	17
2. Shafer Does Not Anticipate Claims 2, 12, or 22 (Ground 1). ....	20
a) Shafer Does Not Disclose a Substantially Fluidly Sealed Air Chamber.....	20
b) Shafer Does Not Disclose “Guides and Stops.”.....	23
c) Petitioner Fails to Show Shafer Discloses the PMM. ....	26

B.	Petitioner’s Obviousness Grounds Fail. ....	27
1.	Petitioner Relies on Non-Analogous Art. ....	29
2.	Vrzalik and Shafer Do Not Render Claim 22 Obvious (Ground 12). ....	31
C.	Petitioner’s Remaining Grounds Do Not Render the Challenged Claims Obvious. ....	33
1.	Shafer in View of Grant Does Not Render Claims 6, 16, 20, and 24 Obvious (Ground 2).....	34
2.	Shafer in View of Kashiwamura (Ground 3) Does Not Render Claim 2 Obvious.....	37
3.	Shafer in View of Dye (Ground 5) Does Not Render Claim 12 Obvious.....	40
4.	Shafer in View of Cammack (Grounds 7 and 8) Does Not Render Claims 2, 12, or 22 Obvious. ....	43
a)	Cammack Does Not Disclose the Claimed Guides and Stops. ....	44
b)	Petitioner Fails to Show a Motivation to Combine Shafer with Cammack.....	52
5.	Shafer in View of Ramacier (Ground 13) Does Not Render Claim 4 Obvious. ....	53
6.	Petitioner’s Three-Reference Combination Grounds Are All Procedurally and Substantively Deficient.....	55
IV.	SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS .....	58
A.	Industry Praise. ....	60
B.	Copying. ....	60
C.	Commercial Success. ....	65

Case IPR2019-00514

Patent 5,904,172

V. THE IPR IS BARRED BY PETITIONER’S PRIOR ACTION. ....	67
VI. PATENT OWNERSHIP AND SERVICE DEFECTS.....	68
CONCLUSION .....	69

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Al-Site Corp. v. VSI Int’l, Inc.</i> , 174 F.3d 1308 (Fed. Cir. 1999).....	65
<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).....	67
<i>Apple Inc. v. ContentGuard Holdings, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00449, Paper 10 (P.T.A.B. July 15, 2015).....	55, 56, 57
<i>Apple Inc. v. Samsung Electronics Co. Ltd.</i> , 839 F.3d 1034 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	60
<i>Arctic Cat, Inc. v. Bombardier Recreational Prods. Inc.</i> , 876 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	29, 36
<i>ATD Corp. v. Lydall, Inc.</i> , 159 F.3d 534 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....	65
<i>Avant Tech., Inc. v. Anza Tech., Inc.</i> , IPR2018-00828, Paper 7 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 16, 2018) .....	1
<i>Aylus Networks, Inc. v. Apple Inc.</i> , 856 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	6
<i>Bettcher Indus., Inc. v. Bunzl USA, Inc.</i> , 661 F.3d 629 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	15
<i>In re Bigio</i> , 381 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	29, 31
<i>Brown &amp; Williamson Tobacco Corp. v. Phillip Morris Inc.</i> , 229 F.3d 1120 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	66
<i>C.R. Bard, Inc. v. Medline Indus., Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00511, Paper 9 (P.T.A.B. July 15, 2015).....	1

# 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.