

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

TENNANT COMPANY,

Petitioner,

v.

OXYGENATOR WATER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,

Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2021-00625

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. Wikey (U.S. Patent No. 3,891,535) .....	8
	B. Davies (U.S. Patent No. 4,917,782 to Davies).....	10
VI.	THE BOARD SHOULD DECLINE TO INSTITUTE REVIEW .....	13
	A. ALL GROUNDS: Institution Should Be Denied Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 314(a).....	13
	1. Factor 1: Petitioner Sought an Extension to Obtain More Discovery Instead of a Stay of the Case to Conserve Resources .....	15
	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 .....	18
	3. Factor 3: The Court and the Parties Have Invested Substantial Time and Resources Into the District Court Litigation .....	20
	4. Factor 4: Significant Overlap Exists Between Issues Raised in the Petition and in the District Court Litigation .....	23
	5. Factor 5: The Parties are Identical in Both Proceedings.....	25
	6. Factor 6: The Merits of the Petition and History of the Patent at Issue Weigh Strongly Against Institution.....	26
	7. Conclusion: The <i>Fintiv</i> Factors Unanimously Support the Exercise of the Board's Discretionary Denial Authority Under § 314(a) .....	29
	B. Petitioner's Anticipation Arguments are Flawed.....	29
	1. GROUND 1: Wikey Does Not Anticipate.....	31

;

a.	Wikey Does Not Describe the Formation of Micro- or Nanobubbles .....	32
b.	The Applicant Did Not “Admit” Inherency .....	32
c.	Petitioner’s Embodiment is Not Taught by Wikey .....	33
d.	Different Electrode Dimensions Will Yield Different Results, and the Observed Results Are Not Inherent to Wikey.....	36
2.	GROUND 7: Davies Does Not Anticipate .....	37
a.	Davies Does Not Describe the Formation of Micro- or Nanobubbles .....	38
b.	The Applicant Did Not “Admit” Inherency .....	38
c.	Petitioner’s Embodiments Are Not Taught by Davies...38	
d.	Different Values Within the Ranges Disclosed by Davies Yield Different Outcomes, and the Observed Results Are Not Inherent to Davies.....	41
C.	Petitioner’s Obviousness Grounds All Fail Because Petitioner Never Identifies Any Motivations to Modify the Prior Art .....	43
1.	GROUND 2: Petitioner Fails to Identify any Motivation to Modify Wikey Based on AFD .....	44
2.	GROUND 3: Petitioner Fails to Identify any Motivation to Modify Wikey Based on AFD, Wendt, Han, Glembotsky, and Burns .....	46
3.	GROUND 4: Petitioner Fails to Identify any Motivation to Modify Wikey Based on Clark .....	47
4.	GROUND 5: Petitioner Fails to Identify any Motivation to Modify Wikey Based on Clark and AFD .....	48
5.	GROUND 6: Petitioner Fails to Identify any Motivation to Modify Wikey Based on Clark, AFD, Wendt, Han, Glembotsky, and Burns.....	48
6.	GROUND 8: Petitioner Fails to Identify any Motivation to Modify Davies in View of Hough .....	49

7.	GROUND 9: Petitioner Fails to Identify any Motivation to Modify Davies in View of Erickson .....	49
8.	GROUND 10: Petitioner Fails to Identify any Motivation to Modify Davies in View of Erickson and Hough .....	50
9.	GROUND 11: Petitioner Fails to Identify any Motivation to Modify Davies in View of Erickson, Wendt, Han, Glembotsky, and Burns .....	50
10.	GROUND 12: Petitioner Fails to Identify any Motivation to Modify Davies in View of Erickson, Hough, Wendt, Han, Glembotsky, and Burns.....	51
11.	GROUND 13: Petitioner Fails to Identify any Motivation to Modify Davies in View of Schoerbl .....	51
12.	GROUND 14: Petitioner Fails to Identify any Motivation to Modify Davies in view of Schoeberl and Hough Render Obvious .....	52
13.	GROUND 15: Petitioner Fails to Identify any Motivation to Modify Davies in view of Erickson and Schoeberl .....	53
14.	GROUND 16: Petitioner Fails to Identify any Motivation to Modify Davies in view of Erickson, Schoeberl, and Hough ....	53
15.	GROUND 17: Petitioner Fails to Identify any Motivation to Modify Davies in view of Erickson, Schoeberl, Wendt, Han, Glembotsky, and Burns.....	53
16.	GROUND 18: Petitioner Fails to Identify any Motivation to Modify Davies in view of Erickson, Schoeberl, Hough, Wendt, Han, Glembotsky, and Burns .....	53
17.	GROUND 19: Petitioner Fails to Identify any Motivation to Modify Davies in View of Peters .....	54
18.	GROUND 20: Petitioner Fails to Identify any Motivation to Modify Davies in view of Peters and Hough.....	55
19.	GROUND 21: Petitioner Fails to Identify any Motivation to Modify Davies in view of Peters and Erickson .....	55
20.	GROUND 22: Petitioner Fails to Identify any Motivation to Modify Davies in view of Peters, Erickson, and Hough .....	55

...

21.	GROUND 23: Petitioner Fails to Identify any Motivation to Modify Davies in view of Peter, Erickson, Wendt, Han, Glembotsky, and Burns.....	55
22.	GROUND 24: Petitioner Fails to Identify any Motivation to Modify Davies in view of Peter, Erickson, Hough, Wendt, Han, Glembotsky, and Burns.....	56
VII.	CONCLUSION.....	56

# 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.