

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

MAHLE FILTER SYSTEMS OF NORTH AMERICA, INC.  
Petitioner

v.

INGEVITY SOUTH CAROLINA, LLC  
Patent Owner

---

Case No. IPR2019-00960

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.....	7
A. Overview of the '844 Patent.....	7
B. The Alleged Prior Art Asserted by Petitioner.....	9
1. Overview of Park.....	9
2. Overview of Meiller.....	14
3. Overview of Abe.....	15
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.....	16
A. Overview of Prosecution History.....	17
B. References Specifically Considered During Prosecution.....	20
1. Park (U.S. Patent No. 5,914,294).....	20
2. AAPA (Applicant Admitted Prior Art).....	21
3. Tennison (WO 92/01585).....	22
C. References Substantially the Same as References Specifically Considered During Prosecution.....	23
1. References Considered During First Consideration.....	24
a) U.S. Patent No. 6,279,548 (Reddy).....	25
b) KR 2002012826 (Oh).....	26
2. References Considered During Request for Continued Examination.....	27

**TABLE OF CONTENTS** *(continued)*

	<u>Page</u>
a)    EP 1 113 163 (Uchino) .....	27
b)    U.S. Patent No. 5,460,136 (Yamazaki) .....	30
3.    References Considered During Reissue Examination .....	31
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 .....	32
V.    The Petition Should Be Denied Because Petitioner Did Not Demonstrate a Reasonable Likelihood of Success for the Grounds Advanced.....	36
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 .....	36
1.    Park’s Honeycombs Do Not Necessarily Have an IAC Less Than 35 g/L .....	38
2.    Petitioner’s Hypothetical Honeycomb Does Not Render the Low IAC Adsorbent Volume Limitation Obvious .....	39
a)    Petitioner’s Hypothetical Honeycomb .....	40
b)    The Asserted Prior Art Does Not Disclose Petitioner’s Hypothetical Honeycomb .....	42
(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.....	42
(2)    The Asserted Prior Art Does Not Disclose Using BAX 1100 or BAX 1500 in a Honeycomb .....	47

**TABLE OF CONTENTS** (*continued*)

	<u>Page</u>
(3) Park Does Not Disclose That Formulation D Can Be Made With Petitioner's Voidage Percentage .....	49
c) Petitioner's Hypothetical Honeycomb Does Not Necessarily Have An IAC Less Than 35 g/L .....	49
(1) Petitioner's Reliance on BAX 1500 Is Misplaced .....	51
(2) Volumetric Dilution Alone Does Not Guarantee That Petitioner's Hypothetical Honeycomb Has an IAC Less Than 35 g/L .....	53
(3) Compositional Dilution Does Not Guarantee That Petitioner's Hypothetical Honeycomb Has an IAC Less Than 35 g/L.....	54
(4) It Is Impossible To Deduce the IAC Of Petitioner's Hypothetical Honeycomb From Example 2 of the '844 Patent .....	55
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 .....	60
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 .....	62
VI. Objective Indicia of Nonobviousness Also Show that the Challenged Claims are Not Obvious .....	62
VII. Conclusion .....	64

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

Page(s)

**Cases**

*BASF Corp. v. Ingevity South Carolina, LLC*,  
IPR2019-00202, Paper 10 (May 13, 2019).....1, 3, 8

*Conopco, Inc. v. Procter & Gamble Co.*,  
IPR2014-00628, Paper 21 (PTAB Oct. 20, 2014).....16, 17

*Continental Can Co. USA, Inc. v. Monsanto Co.*,  
948 F.2d 1264 (Fed. Cir. 1991) .....37, 38

*General Plastic Industrial Co., Ltd. v. Canon Kabushiki Kaisha*,  
IPR2016-01357, Paper 19 (PTAB Sept. 6, 2017).....2

*Honeywell Int’l v. Mexichem Amanco Holding*,  
865 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2017) .....6, 33, 36

*Par Pharmaceutical, Inc. v. TWi Pharmaceuticals, Inc.*,  
773 F.3d 1186 (Fed. Cir. 2014) .....38

*Samsung Elecs. Am., Inc. v. Uniloc 2017 LLC*,  
IPR2018-01756, Paper No. 7 (PTAB Mar. 11, 2019).....2

*Unified Patents Inc. v. Berman*,  
IPR2016-01571, Paper 10 (PTAB Dec. 14, 2016) .....17

*WL Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*,  
721 F.2d 1540 (Fed. Cir. 1983) ..... 37, 55-56

**Statutes**

35 U.S.C. § 314(a) .....1, 7, 16

35 U.S.C. § 325(d) .....1, 4, 17

# 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.