

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 SUR-REPLY TO PETITIONER'S REPLY

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES3

I. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.....5

II. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.....6

III. COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL DOES NOT APPLY7

IV. BREIVIK II IS NOT PRIOR ART7

A. Petitioner’s arguments fail under the Rule of Reason.....8

B. Dr. Tilseth’s testimony is properly corroborated19

C. *Stempel* has not been overruled.....20

**V. THE CLAIMS ARE NONOBVIOUS EVEN IF BREIVIK II IS
ADMITTED AS PRIOR ART.....22**

A. There is a missing element.....22

B. There is no motivation to combine the references28

VI. CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE31

VIII. CONCLUSION AND PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED32

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE33

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

ATI Tech. ULC v. Iancu, 920 F.3d 1362, 1370–71 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....20

Borrer v. Herz, 666 F.2d 569, 573-74 (C.C.P.A. 1981).....11

Clarke, 356 F.2d 987, 992 (CCPA 1966)21

Coleman v. Dines, 754 F.2d 353, 360 (Fed. Cir. 1985).....8

Cooper v. Goldfarb, 154 F.3d 1321, 1331 (Fed.Cir.1998).....9

E.I. du Pont De Nemours & Co. v. Unifrax I LLC, 921 F.3d 1060, 1077 (Fed. Cir. 2019) 5, 9, 16

Fleming v. Escort Inc., 774 F.3d 1371, 1377 (Fed. Cir. 2014)..... 9, 15

Intellectual Ventures II LLC v. Motorola Mobility LLC, 692 F.App’x. 626, 627 (Fed. Cir. 2017)..... 9, 15

Intelligent Bio-Systems, Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd., 821 F.3d 1359, 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....25

Interstate Circuit v. U.S., 306 U.S. 208, 226 (1939)11

Medichem, S.A. v. Rolabo, S.L., 437 F.3d 1157, 1170 (2006)..... 8, 9, 16

Motorola Mobility LLC. v. Intellectual Ventures II LLC., IPR2014-00504.....19

NFC Technology, LLC v. Mattal, 871 F.3d 1367, 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2017)5

Pfizer, Inc. v. Genentech, Inc., IPR2017-01488, Paper 87, at 24 (PTAB Nov. 29, 2018).....19

Price v. Symsek, 988 F.2d 1187, 1195 (Fed.Cir.1993)8

Rainer, 390 F.2d 771, 773-74 (CCPA 1968).....21

Sandt Tech., Ltd. v. Resco Metal & Plastics Corp., 264 F.3d 1344, 1350–51 (Fed.Cir.2001).....15

Schaub, 537 F.2d 509 (CCPA 1976)21

Sonos, Inc. v. Implicit, LLC, 2019 WL 4419356 (PTAB Sept. 16, 2019).....20

Spiller, 500 F.2d 1170, 182 USPQ 614 (CCPA 1974)..... 20, 21

Stempel, 241 F.2d 755, 759 (C.C.P.A. 1957)..... 20, 21

Stryker, 435 F.2d 1340, 168 USPQ 372 (CCPA 1971) 20, 21

Tanczyn. Reply, 16, 18..... 20, 21, 22

Wakefield, 422 F.2d 897 (CCPA 1970)21

I. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

Petitioner has failed to provide any analysis under the “rule of reason” that establishes why Dr. Tilseth’s testimony of conception and reduction to practice of the claimed invention is not credible. In fact, Petitioner failed to take Dr. Tilseth’s deposition regarding his Declaration and the corroborating documents cited therein. Instead of analyzing the evidence provided by Dr. Tilseth as a whole under the rule of reason, Petitioner focuses solely on the issue of whether a single exhibit (Ex. 2003) specifically discloses cooking during the krill meal production process. This narrow focus ignores dispositive portions of Dr. Tilseth’s testimony and evidences a failure to understand that the rule of reason analysis requires “an evaluation of all pertinent evidence . . . so that a sound determination of the credibility of the inventor’s story may be reached.” *NFC Technology, LLC v. Mattal*, 871 F.3d 1367, 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2017). Petitioner’s analysis further ignores controlling case law that provides that the rule of reason does not require that evidence have a source independent of the inventors on every aspect of conception and reduction to practice. *E.I. du Pont De Nemours & Co. v. Unifrax I LLC*, 921 F.3d 1060, 1077 (Fed. Cir. 2019). The law requires only that the corroborative evidence, including circumstantial evidence, support the credibility of the inventors’ story. *Id.* Dr. Tilseth’s testimony and supporting corroborative evidence

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.