UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

PHILIP MORRIS PRODUCTS, S.A., Petitioner

v.

RAI STRATEGIC HOLDINGS, Inc., Patent Owner

Patent No. 9,901,123

Inter Partes Review No. IPR2020-00919

PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE



TABLE OF CONTENTS

					Page			
I.	INT	RODU(CTION	N AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT	1			
II.	BACKGROUND							
	A.	The '	e '123 Patent					
	B.	The C	Challenged Claims					
	C.	State	e of the Art					
	D.	Othe	er Proceedings on the '123 Patent11					
III.	LEV		ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART12					
IV.	CLA	IM CC	CONSTRUCTION13					
V.	THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION BECAUSE PETITIONER HAS NOT SHOWN A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT ANY CHALLENGED CLAIM IS UNPATENTABLE							
	A.			Ias Not Shown a Reasonable Likelihood That to Claims are Unpatentable Under Ground 1				
		1.	Elong	oner Has Not Shown That Morgan Discloses a gated Portion of a Resistance Heating Element ositioned Proximal to the Center of the Outer ing"	That			
		2.		oner Has Not Demonstrated a Motivation to Man Alone, Based on a Purported "Design Choice	•			
		3.		oner Has Not Demonstrated a Motivation to Man in View of Adams	•			
	4.		Korea Was I	oner's "Invention Record" (Exhibit 1016) and an Park Patent (Exhibit 1015)—Neither of Wh Publicly Available Before October 18, 2006— Demonstrate a Motivation to Modify Morgan	ich -Do			
			a.	Petitioner has not established that its internal "Invention Record" (Exhibit 1016) was publi available prior to the filing date of the '123 p	icly			



Page

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(continued)

		b.	Even if Petitioner were permitted to rely on Exhibit 1016, the document does not support any motivation to modify the heating element in Morgan in the manner claimed by the '123 patent	37		
		c.	Petitioner has not established that Park (Exhibit 1015) is prior art	39		
	B.		as Not Shown a Reasonable Likelihood That the Claims Are Unpatentable Under Ground 2	42		
	C.		as Not Shown a Reasonable Likelihood That the Claims Are Unpatentable Under Ground 3	49		
VI.	THE BOARD SHOULD EXERCISE ITS DISCRETION UNDER SECTION 325(d) TO DENY INSTITUTION					
	A.	The Same Art Was Previously Presented to the Office				
	B.	The Petition Does Not Even Attempt to Demonstrate That the Office Materially Erred in Evaluating the Art and Arguments				
VII.		E BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION IN VIEW OF THE RALLEL ITC PROCEEDING60				
VIII.	CON	CONCLUSION65				



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page **CASES** Advanced Bionics, LLC v. MED-EL Elektromedizinische Geräte GmbH, IPR2019-01469, Paper No. 6 (PTAB Feb. 13, 2020)......52, 55, 56, 58 Apple Inc. v. MPH Techs. OY, IPR2019-00819, Paper No. 9 (PTAB Aug. 8, 2019).....59 Apple, Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc., IPR2020-00019, Paper No. 11 (PTAB Mar. 20, 2020)passim Argentum Pharm., LLC v. Research Corp. Techs., Inc., IPR2016-00204, Paper No. 19......33, 34 Becton, Dickinson & Co. v. B. Braun Melsungen AG, IPR2017-01586, Paper No. 8 (PTAB Dec. 15, 2017) (precedential)......passim Benitec Biopharma Ltd. v. Cold Spring Harbor Lab., IPR2016-00014, Paper No. 7 (PTAB Mar. 23, 2016)......54 Bio-Rad Labs. v. 10X Genomics, IPR2019-00567, Paper No. 23 (PTAB Aug. 9, 2019)......61 Clim-A-Tech Ind., Inc. v. William A. Ebert, IPR2017-01863, Paper No. 13 (PTAB Feb. 12, 2018)......57 Compass Bank v. Intellectual Ventures II, LLC, IPR2014-00724, Paper No. 12 (PTAB Nov. 6, 2014)......13 Cross Med. Prods. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc.,



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

(continued)

	Page
DePuy Synthes Sales, Inc. v. Acantha LLC, IPR2016-00329, Paper No. 12 (PTAB June 3, 2016)	23, 24
Facebook, Inc. v. Sound View Innovations, LLC, IPR2017-01005, Paper No. 13 (PTAB Sept. 1, 2017)	13
Grain Processing Corp. v. Am. Maize-Prods. Co., 840 F.2d 902 (Fed. Cir. 1988)	14, 15
In re Ekenstam, 256 F.2d 321, 118 USPQ 349 (CCPA 1958)	40
<i>In re Gordon</i> , 733 F.2d 900 (Fed. Cir. 1984)	24
<i>In re ICON Health & Fitness, Inc.</i> , 496 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	23
<i>In re Kubin</i> , 561 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	49
<i>In re NuVasive, Inc.</i> , 842 F.3d 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	37, 40
Intex Recreation Corp. v. Team Worldwide Corp., IPR2018-00859, Paper No. 128 (PTAB Oct. 21, 2019)	41
Jones v. Hardy, 727 F.2d 1524 (Fed. Cir. 1984)	14
Leo Pharm. Prods., Ltd. v. Rea, 726 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	49
Merial, Inc. v. Intervet Int'l B.V., IPR 2018-00919 Paper 11 (PTAR Aug. 21, 2018)	50



DOCKET

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.

