

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

FLEX LOGIX TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
Petitioner

v.

KONDA TECHNOLOGIES INC.
Patent Owner

Patent No. 10,003,553

**PETITION FOR POST GRANT REVIEW
OF U.S. PATENT NO. 10,003,553**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION1

II. MANDATORY NOTICES UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.8.....3

 A. Real Parties-in-Interest3

 B. Related Matters.....3

 1. Lawsuit(s).....3

 2. Related Applications3

 3. Concurrently filed petitions4

 C. Counsel and Service Information.....4

III. PAYMENT OF FEES UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.15(a)5

IV. TIME FOR FILING UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.2025

V. GROUNDS FOR STANDING UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.204(a).....5

VI. PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED AND GROUNDS RAISED.....5

 A. Claims for Which Review is Requested.....5

 B. Statutory Grounds of Challenge5

VII. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART6

VIII. BACKGROUND6

 A. The '553 Patent7

 B. Material Incorporated by Reference in the '553 Patent12

IX. PGR ELIGIBILITY16

 A. The Two Pre-AIA Applications Do Not Support Switches
 Configurable By a Flip Flop (Claim 9)18

B.	The Two Pre-AIA Applications Do Not Support Claims 1, 2, 4, 11, 12, and 14	20
1.	Claim 1	22
2.	Claim 2	25
3.	Claim 4	26
4.	Claims 11, 12, and 14	29
C.	AIA Applicability.....	30
X.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	31
XI.	EARLIEST EFFECTIVE FILING DATE OF THE '553 PATENT.....	32
XII.	DETAILED EXPLANATION OF GROUNDS.....	32
A.	Ground 1: Claims 1-20 Are Indefinite	32
1.	Claim 1	34
2.	Claim 11	46
3.	Dependent Claims 2-10 and 12-20	47
B.	Ground 2: Claims 1-20 Fail to Satisfy the Written Description Requirement	59
1.	Independent Claim 1	60
2.	Independent Claim 11	71
3.	Dependent Claims 2-10 and 12-20	72
C.	Ground 3: Claims 1-20 Fail to Satisfy the Enablement Requirement	82
XIII.	CONCLUSION.....	87

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>AK Steel Corp. v. Sollac</i> , 344 F.3d 1234 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	82
<i>Allergan, Inc. v. Sandoz Inc.</i> , 796 F.3d 1293 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	16
<i>Amgen, Inc. v. Chugai Pharm. Co.</i> , 927 F.2d 1200 (Fed. Cir. 1991).....	83
<i>Ariad Pharms., Inc. v. Eli Lilly and Co.</i> , 598 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (en banc).....	15, 17, 59, 65
<i>Auto. Techs. Int’l, Inc. v. BMW of N. Am., Inc.</i> , 501 F.3d 1274 Fed. Cir. 2007).....	85
<i>Cook Biotech Inc. v. Acell, Inc.</i> , 460 F. 3d 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	12, 13
<i>D Three Enters., LLC v. Sunmodo Corp.</i> , 890 F.3d 1042 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	13, 14, 18
<i>Enzo Biochem, Inc. v. Gen-Probe, Inc.</i> , 323 F.3d 956 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	65
<i>Fiers v. Revel</i> , 984 F.2d 1164 (Fed. Cir. 1993).....	65
<i>Genentech, Inc. v. Novo Nordisk, A/S</i> , 108 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....	82
<i>In re Gosteli</i> , 872 F.2d 1008 (Fed. Cir. 1989).....	16, 17
<i>Grunenthal GmbH v. Antecip Bioventures II LLC</i> , PGR2018-00001, Paper 17 (May 1, 2018)	16
<i>LizardTech, Inc. v. Earth Resource Mapping, Inc.</i> , 424 F.3d 1336 (Fed Cir. 2005).....	16, 65
<i>Lockwood v. Am. Airlines, Inc.</i> , 107 F.3d 1565 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....	15, 16, 17

Petition for Post Grant Review
Patent No. 10,003,553

<i>Nat'l Recovery Techs., Inc. v. Magnetic Separation Sys., Inc.</i> , 166 F.3d 1190 (Fed. Cir. 1999).....	82
<i>Nautilus, Inc. v. Biosig Instr., Inc.</i> , 134 S. Ct. 2120 (2014).....	32
<i>Nautilus, Inc. v. Icon Health & Fitness Inc.</i> , IPR2017-01408, 2018 WL 6318050 (PTAB Dec. 3, 2018)	13, 14
<i>Nippon Suisan Kaisha Ltd. v. Pronova Biopharma Norge AS</i> , PGR2017-00033, Paper 37 (January 16, 2019)	33
<i>In re Packard</i> 751 F.3d 1307 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	32, 33
<i>Paice LLC v. Ford Motor Co.</i> , 881 F.3d 894 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	12
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (<i>en banc</i>)	31, 32
<i>PowerOasis, Inc. v. T-Mobile USA, Inc.</i> , 522 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	16, 17
<i>Purdue Pharma L.P. v. Recro Tech., LLC</i> , 694 F. App'x 794 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	15
<i>Toyota Motor Corp. v. Cellport Systems, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00633, Paper 11 (August 14, 2015). A	31
<i>Trans Video Elecs., Ltd. v. Sony Elecs., Inc.</i> , 822 F. Supp. 2d 1020 (N.D. Cal. 2011)	15
<i>Turbocare Div. of Demag Delaval Turbomachinery Corp. v. General Electric Co.</i> , 264 F.3d 1111 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	60
<i>US Endodontics, LLC v. Gold Standard Instruments, LLC</i> , PGR2015-00019, Paper 54 (Dec. 28, 2016).....	86
<i>In re Wands</i> , 858 F.2d 731 (Fed. Cir. 1988).....	83
<i>Wyeth v. Abbott Labs.</i> , No. 08-1021 (JAP), 2012 WL 175023 (D.N.J. Jan. 19, 2012), <i>aff'd sub nom.</i> <i>Wyeth & Cordis Corp. v. Abbott Labs.</i> , 720 F.3d 1380 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	83

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.