

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

TENNANT COMPANY,

Petitioner,

v.

OXYGENATOR WATER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,

Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2021-00602

Patent RE45415

---

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO PETITION**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION .....	1
II.	BACKGROUND .....	4
	A. State of the Art .....	4
	B. The '415 Patent .....	5
III.	LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART .....	7
IV.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	8
V.	THE PRIMARY ASSERTED REFERENCES.....	8
	A. Tremblay (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2003/0042134) .....	8
	B. Satoh (U.S. Patent No. 6,251,259) .....	12
VI.	THE BOARD SHOULD DECLINE TO INSTITUTE REVIEW .....	15
	A. ALL GROUNDS: Institution Should Be Denied Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 314(a).....	15
	1. Factor 1: Petitioner Sought An Extension to Obtain More Discovery Instead of a Stay of the Case to Conserve Resources .....	17
	2. Factor 2: The District Court Case Will be Ready For Trial Five Months Prior to the Board's Projected Statutory Deadline for a Final Written Decision .....	20
	3. Factor 3: The Court and the Parties Have Invested Substantial Time and Resources Into the District Court Litigation .....	22
	4. Factor 4: Significant Overlap Exists Between Issues Raised in the Petition and in the District Court Litigation .....	26
	5. Factor 5: The Parties are Identical in Both Proceedings.....	28
	6. Factor 6: The Merits of the Petition and History of the Patent at Issue Weigh Strongly Against Institution.....	28
	7. Conclusion: The <i>Fintiv</i> Factors Unanimously Support the Exercise of the Board's Discretionary Denial Authority Under § 314(a) .....	31
	B. ALL GROUNDS: Petitioner Has Not Justified the Need for this Parallel Petition .....	31

C.	Petitioner’s Anticipation Arguments Are Flawed.....	34
1.	GROUND 1: Tremblay Does Not Anticipate.....	36
a.	Tremblay Does Not Concern Oxygenation or the Formation of Micro- or Nanobubbles.....	37
b.	The Applicant Did Not “Admit” Inherency .....	37
c.	Petitioner’s Embodiment is Not Taught by Tremblay ...	38
d.	Different Values Within the Ranges Disclosed by Tremblay Yield Different Outcomes, and the Observed Results Are Not Inherent to Tremblay .....	42
2.	GROUND 2: Satoh Does Not Anticipate .....	43
a.	The Applicant Did Not “Admit” Inherency .....	43
b.	Satoh Does Not Teach an Anticipatory Embodiment ...	44
i.	Petitioner Ignores the Fundamental Feature of Satoh: A Semiporous Membrane Disposed Between the Electrodes .....	44
ii.	Satoh’s Generic Disclosure of Numerous Options for Numerous Design Parameters that Impact the Electrolytic Process Cannot Anticipate.....	45
D.	Petitioner’s Obviousness Grounds Do Not Raise a Substantial Question of Patentability Because Petitioner Has Failed to Identify Any Motivation to Modify the Prior Art.....	47
1.	GROUND 3: Petitioner Fails to Identify any Motivation to Modify Tremblay Based on Satoh .....	49
2.	GROUND 4: Petitioner Fails to Identify any Motivation to Modify Tremblay Based on Wendt, Han, Glembotsky, or Burns.....	50
3.	GROUND 5: Petitioner Fails to Identify any Motivation to Modify Tremblay Based on Hough .....	50
4.	GROUNDS 6 and 7: Petitioner Fails to Identify any Motivation to Modify Tremblay Based on the Cited References.....	51
5.	GROUND 8: Petitioner Fails to Identify any Motivation to Modify Satoh Based on Wendt, Han, Glembotsky, or Burns...	52

..

6.	GROUND 9: Petitioner Fails to Identify any Motivation to Modify Satoh Based on Aoki.....	53
7.	GROUND 10: Petitioner Fails to Identify any Motivation to Modify Satoh Based on Aoki.....	54
VII.	CONCLUSION.....	55

...

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>10X Genomics, Inc. v. United Kingdom Research and Innovation et al.</i> , IPR2020-01467, Paper 21, (PTAB Feb. 22, 2021) .....	21
<i>Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc.</i> , IPR2020-00019, Paper 11, 5-6 (PTAB March 20, 2020).....	2, 16, 17, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 28, 30, 31
<i>ATD Corp. v. Lydall, Inc.</i> , 159 F.3d 534 (Fed. Cir. 1998) .....	48
<i>Atofina v. Great Lakes Chem. Corp.</i> , 441 F.3d 991 (Fed. Cir. 2006) .....	35, 41
<i>Belden Inc. v. Berk-Tek LLC</i> , 805 F.3d 1064 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....	48, 49, 50, 52, 53
<i>Bentley Motors Limited et al v. Jaguar Land Rover Limited</i> , IPR2019-01539, Paper 9 at 13 (Mar. 10, 2020) .....	25, 26
<i>Cisco Sys., Inc. v. Ramot at Tel Aviv Univ. Ltd.</i> , IPR2020-00122, Paper 15 at 7-8 (PTAB May 15, 2020).....	22
<i>Comcast Cable Commc'ns, LLC v. Rovi Guides, Inc.</i> , IPR2019-00279, Paper 10 at 6-7 (PTAB July 1, 2019) .....	33
<i>Comcast Cable Commc'ns, LLC v. Rovi Guides, Inc.</i> , IPR2019-01354, Paper 10 at 6 (PTAB Jan. 27, 2020) .....	33
<i>Cont'l Can Co. v. Monsanto Co.</i> , 948 F.2d 1264 (Fed. Cir. 1991) .....	36, 44
<i>Dane Technologies, Inc. v. Gatekeeper Systems, Inc.</i> , No. 12-2730 ADM/AJB, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 117718, at *7-8 (D. Minn. Aug. 20, 2013) .....	19
<i>General Plastic Industrial Co., Ltd. v. Canon Kabushiki Kaisha</i> , IPR2016-01357, Paper 19 (PTAB Sept. 6, 2017) .....	22

# 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.