IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

RIMFROST AS Petitioner

v.

AKER BIOMARINE ANTARCTIC AS Patent Owner

CASE IPR: IPR2020-01532

U.S. Patent No. 9,644,169 B2

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE TO PETITION FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW

Mail Stop "PATENT BOARD" Patent Trial and Appeal Board United States Patent and Trademark Office P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

DOCKET

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABL	LE OF AUTHORITIES	3
I.	INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT	5
II.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	7
III.	COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL DOES NOT APPLY	12
V.	GROUND 1 SHOULD BE DENIED	17
	A. Breivik II is Not Available as Prior Art	17
	B. The Combined References Do Not Teach Element of the Claims	
	C. Petitioner's Basis for Combining the References Fails	40
	D. Claims Directed to Use of Krill Meal are Independently Patentable	48
VI.	GROUND 2 SHOULD BE DENIED	52
VII.	CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE	53
VIII.	CONCLUSION AND PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED	54
CERT	TIFICATE OF SERVICE	55

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>AbbVie Deutschland GmbH & Co., KG v. Janssen Biotech, Inc.</i> , 759 F.3d 1285, 1295 (Fed. Cir. 2014)
Aspex Eyewear, Inc. v. Zenni Optical Inc., 713 F.3d 1377, 1380 (Fed. Cir. 2013) 13
<i>B</i> & <i>B</i> Hardware, Inc. v. Hargis Indus., Inc., 575 U.S. 138, (2015)
Brown v. Barbacid, 436 F.3d 1376, 1380 (Fed. Cir. 2006) 18
Cooper v. Goldfarb, 154 F.3d 1321, 1330 (Fed. Cir. 1998)
Eaton v. Evans, 204 F.3d 1094, 1097 (Fed. Cir. 2000)
Fleming v. Escort Inc., 774 F.3d 1371, 1377 (Fed. Cir. 2014) 18
Lacotte v. Thomas, 758 F.2d 611, 613 (Fed. Cir. 1985)
Loral Fairchild Corp. v. Matsushita Elec., 266 F.3d 1358, 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2001) 17
Medichem, S.A. v. Rolabo, S.L., 437 F.3d 1157, 1170 (Fed. Cir. 2006) 18
New Railhead Mfg. L.L.C. v. Vermeer Mfg. Co., 298 F.3d 1290, 1297 (Fed. Cir. 2002) 18
Ohio Willow Wood Co. v. Alps South, LLC, 735 F.3d 1333, 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2013) 12, 14, 15
Perfect Surgical Techniques, Inc. v. Olympus Am., Inc., 841 F.3d 1004, 1007–08 (Fed. Cir. 2016)
Pfizer, Inc. v. Genentech, Inc., IPR2017-01488, Paper 87, at 24 (PTAB Nov. 29, 2018
Phillips v. AWH, 415 F.3d 1303, 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2005)
Price v. Symsek, 988 F.2d 1187, 1196 (Fed. Cir. 1993)
Spiller, 500 F.2d 1170, 182 USPQ 614 (CCPA 1974)
Standard Oil Co. v. Am. Cyanamid Co., 774 F.2d 448, 452 (Fed. Cir. 1985)
<i>Stempel</i> , 241 F.2d 755, 759 (C.C.P.A. 1957
Stephen Slesinger, Inc. v. Disney Enterprises, Inc., 702 F.3d 640, 644 (Fed. Cir. 2012) 13, 16
Stern v. Trs. of Columbia Univ. in NY, 434 F.3d 1375, 1378 (Fed. Cir. 2006) 17

Stryker, 435 F.2d 1340, 168 USPQ 372 (CCPA 1971).	. 24
Tanczyn, 347 F.2d 830, 833 (C.C.P.A. 1965)	. 19
United Access Techs., LLC v. CenturyTel Broadband Services LLC, 778 F.3d 1327, 1331 (Fed Cir. 2015)	
Vitronics Corp. v. Conceptronic, Inc., 90 F.3d 1576, 1582 (Fed. Cir. 1996)	8
Wakefield, 422 F.2d 897, 164 USPQ 636 (CCPA 1970)	. 24

I. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

Antarctic krill (*Euphausia superba*, hereafter referred as krill), at between 300 and 500 million tons, has the largest biomass of any multicellular wild animal species on the planet. The Southwest Atlantic sector of the Southern Ocean, where 70% of the krill population resides, is the main focus of the modern krill fishery, which is managed by the Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR). The annual krill catch in the SW Atlantic sector has been increasing steadily since 2010 and, in the 2019 fishing season (December 2018 to November 2019) it reached 390,195 tons.

The inventors sought to develop methods for efficient production of highquality krill oil containing phospholipids from krill caught in the South Ocean. They did so by producing krill meal, a denatured krill product, from krill caught in the Southern Ocean on board a ship and then extracting that krill meal after it had been stored for a period of time to provide a phospholipid-rich krill oil. This method is different from prior art methods which emphasized the necessity of using fresh krill and on board processing. This method is claimed in U.S. Patent No. 9,644,169 (the '169 patent) which is the subject of this *Inter Partes* Review.

This proceeding involves Petitioner's challenge of the validity of the claims of the '169 patent based on two different but related grounds. First, Petitioner alleges that claims 1-5, 7-15 and 17-20 are obvious under pre-AIA 35 U.S.C. §103

DOCKET A L A R M



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.