UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

RIMFROST AS

Petitioner

V.

AKER BIOMARINE ANTARCTIC AS

Patent Owner

Case No.: IPR2020-01533

U.S. Patent 9,816,046

Issue Date: November 14, 2017

Title: Bioeffective Krill Oil Compositions

PETITIONER'S REPLY TO PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.24(c)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| I. | INT | RODUCTION | 1 |
|------|---|---|----|
| II. | PETITIONER'S "KRILL MEAL" CONSTRUCTION IS SUPPORTED BY THE INTRINSIC EVIDENCE | | |
| III. | COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL APPLIES | | |
| IV. | . PATENT OWNER'S ANTEDATION PROOFS ARE INSUFFICIA | | |
| | A. | Patent Owner's Burden To Prove Actual Reduction To Practice | 8 |
| | B. | Dr. Tilseth's Reduction to Practice Story Is Uncorroborated | 9 |
| | C. | Stempel Cannot Cure Patent Owner's Lack Of Corroboration | 15 |
| V. | CLAIMS 1-19 WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS | | |
| | A. | Patent Owner's Piece-Meal Prior Art Attack Is Improper | 18 |
| | B. | A POSITA Possessed Reasons And Motivation To Combine Petitioner's References | 23 |
| | C. | Patent Owner's Arguments Regarding Grounds 2 and 3 Are Similarly Meritless | 29 |
| VI. | CON | ICLUSION | 30 |
| VII | CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE 3 | | 31 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

| ACCO Brands Corp. v. Fellowes, Inc., 813 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2016) | 28 |
|--|----|
| Brown v. Barbacid, 276 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2002) | 13 |
| Cooper v. Goldfarb, 154 F.3d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 1998) | 14 |
| Dow Chem. Co. v. Am. Cyanamid Co., 816 F.2d 617 (Fed. Cir. 1987) | 20 |
| Dynamic Drinkware, LLC v. Nat'l Graphics, Inc., 800 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2015) | 8 |
| EmeraChem Holdings v. Volkswagon Group of Am., 859 F.3d. 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2017) | |
| <i>In re Fulton</i> , 391 F.3d 1195 (Fed. Cir. 2004) | 27 |
| <i>In re Garner</i> , 508 F.3d 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2007) | 14 |
| Grit Energy Sols., LLC v. Oren Techs., LLC, 957 F.3d 1309 (Fed. Cir. 2020) | 21 |
| KSR Int'l v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. 398 (2007) | |
| LG Elecs., Inc. v. Conversent Wireless Licensing S.A.R.L., 759 F. App'x 917 (Fed. Cir. 2019) | 29 |
| In re Magnum Oil Tools, 829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016) | |
| <i>Medichem, S.A. v. Rolabo, S.L.,</i> 437 F.3d 1157 (Fed. Cir. 2006) | 8 |
| Mintz v. Dietz & Watson, Inc., 679 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2012) | 20 |



| Newkirk v. Lulejian, 825 F.2d 1581 (Fed. Cir. 1987)14 |
|--|
| In re NTP, Inc., 654 F.3d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2011) |
| Pfizer v. Genentech, IPR 2017-01488 (PTAB Nov. 29, 2018) |
| Randall Mfg; v. Rea, 733 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2013) |
| Seabed Geosolutions (US) Inc. v. Magseis FF LLC, Appeal No. 2020-1237 (Fed. Cir. Aug. 11, 2021) |
| Software Rights Archive, LLC v. Facebook, Inc., 659 F. App'x 627 (Fed. Cir. 2016)19 |
| <i>In re Steed</i> , 802 F.3d 1311 (Fed. Cir. 2015) |
| In re Stempel, 241 F.2d 755 (CCPA 1957)15 |
| Swartz v. USPTO, 743 F. App'x 426 (Fed. Cir. 2018) |
| In re Tanczyn, 146 USPQ 298 (CCPA 1965)16 |
| Vitronics Corp. v. Conceptronic, 90 F.3d 1576 (Fed. Cir. 1996)5 |

I. INTRODUCTION

Patent Owner wants the Board to cast aside common sense and find simply storing denatured krill for 1-36 months prior to solvent extraction is novel and affords patentability to the process recited in the '046 patent. It was known, however, that sufficiently heating krill prevents the rapid enzymatic decomposition of krill lipids by lipases and phospholipases, and results in a stable denatured product with improved storage properties. It was also unremarkable that krill caught in the middle of the Antarctic Ocean would need to be stored for at least a month while being transported back to land for further processing.

It is not disputed, with the exception of the '046 patent's 1-36 month storage limitation, the Board, in finding U.S. Patent Nos. 9,028,887, 9,375,453, 9,078,905, 9,072,752 and 9,320,765 unpatentable, determined claims virtually identical to the claims of the '046 patent were obvious, and the '046 patent's limitations were disclosed in the prior art.

To avoid the sixth "krill oil" patent in the same patent family from being found unpatentable, Patent Owner now argues Breivik II does not qualify as prior art because the '046 patent's invention was reduced to practice before Breivik II's priority date. This attempt to antedate Breivik II, however, rests on the uncorroborated testimony of one of the '046 patent's inventors, Dr. Tilseth, that



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.

