

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Chanel, Inc.,

Petitioner,

v.

Molo Design, Ltd.,

Patent Owner.

Case IPR2022-00545
U.S. Patent 9,689,161

**PETITION FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW
OF U.S. PATENT NO. 9,689,161**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	MANDATORY NOTICES	2
	A. Real Party-in-Interest	2
	B. Related Matters.....	2
	C. Lead and Back-Up Counsel, and Service Information	3
III.	REQUIREMENTS FOR <i>INTER PARTES</i> REVIEW	4
	A. Grounds for Standing	4
	B. Identification of Challenge.....	4
	1. Prior Art on Which the Challenge is Based.....	4
	2. Statutory Grounds on Which the Challenge is Based.....	7
	C. No Basis To Deny Institution Under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d).....	8
IV.	OVERVIEW OF THE PRIOR ART	8
	A. General Background.....	8
	B. Primary Prior Art References.....	10
	1. <i>SoftHousing</i>	10
	2. <i>SoftWall</i>	15
	3. <i>MacAllen 2008</i>	16
V.	OVERVIEW OF THE '161 PATENT	16
	A. Specification.....	16
	B. Prosecution History	19
	C. Priority Date of the Challenged Claims	20
VI.	LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	22
VII.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	22
VIII.	GROUND OF UNPATENTABILITY.....	23
	A. Ground 1: Claims 2, 6-8, 10, 12, 14 are Anticipated by <i>SoftHousing I</i>	23
	1. Independent Claim 2	23

2.	Dependent Claim 6	27
3.	Dependent Claims 7, 8, 10.....	28
4.	Dependent Claims 12, 14.....	29
5.	Dependent Claim 18	31
B.	Ground 2: Claims 1-10, 12, 14 and 18 are Obvious Over <i>SoftHousing I</i> Alone and in View of <i>SoftHousing II-III</i> , <i>Arens</i> , and/or <i>Okuno</i>	32
1.	Independent Claim 1	33
2.	Independent Claim 2	39
3.	Dependent Claim 3	39
4.	Dependent Claims 4, 5.....	39
5.	Dependent Claim 6	42
6.	Dependent Claims 7-10.....	42
7.	Dependent Claims 12, 14.....	43
8.	Dependent Claim 18	44
C.	Ground 3: Claims 2, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14 are Anticipated by <i>SoftWall</i>	44
1.	Independent Claim 2	44
2.	Dependent Claim 6	48
3.	Dependent Claims 8, 10.....	48
4.	Dependent Claims 12, 14.....	49
5.	Dependent Claim 18	50
D.	Ground 4: Claims 1-10, 12, 14 and 18 are Obvious Over <i>SoftWall</i> Alone and in View of <i>SoftHousing I-III</i> , <i>Arens</i> , and/or <i>Okuno</i>	51
1.	Independent Claim 1	52
2.	Independent Claim 2	57
3.	Dependent Claim 3	57
4.	Dependent Claims 4, 5.....	57
5.	Dependent Claim 6	58

..

6.	Dependent Claims 7-10.....	58
7.	Dependent Claims 12, 14.....	59
8.	Dependent Claim 18	59
E.	Ground 5: Claims 19-25 and 27 are Obvious Over <i>MacAllen 2008</i> in View of <i>Stratton, Fischer, Reisenthel, Tolna</i> , and/or <i>EnduroFence</i>	59
1.	Independent Claims 19, 22	59
2.	Dependent Claim 20	71
3.	Dependent Claim 21	72
4.	Independent Claims 23, 27	73
5.	Dependent Claims 24, 25.....	81
IX.	CO-PENDING DISTRICT COURT ACTION SHOULD NOT PRECLUDE INSTITUTION	82
A.	The Potential for a Stay Favors Institution (Factor 1)	83
B.	The Lack of a Scheduled Trial Date Favors Institution (Factor 2).....	85
C.	Investment in the District Court Action Is Minimal, Favoring Institution (Factor 3).....	87
D.	The Petition and District Court Action Raise Unique Issues, Favoring Institution (Factor 4)	88
E.	The Parties Are Identical, Favoring Institution (Factor 5).....	89
F.	The Merits of Petitioner’s Challenge Favor Institution (Factor 6).....	90
X.	CONCLUSION.....	90

...

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
<i>Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc.</i> , IPR2020-00019, Paper 11 (PTAB Mar. 20, 2020)	82, 90
<i>Apple Inc. v. Maxell, Ltd.</i> , IPR2020-00204, Paper 11 (PTAB Jun. 19, 2020)	90
<i>Apple v. Maxell</i> , IPR2020-00200, Paper 11, 22 (PTAB July 15, 2020)	89
<i>Apple v. Seven Networks</i> , IPR2020-00235, Paper 10 (PTAB July 28, 2020)	89, 90
<i>GES.M.B.H v. Advanced Bionics AG</i> , IPR2020-00190, Paper 15 (PTAB June 3, 2020)	90
<i>Kannuu Pty Ltd. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , 2021 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 10377 (S.D.N.Y. Jan. 19, 2021)	83, 84
<i>KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007)	passim
<i>Lectrosonics inc. v. ZaxCom, Inc.</i> , IPR2018-01129, Paper 33 (PTAB 2020)	22
<i>Molo Design, Ltd. v. Chanel, Inc.</i> , No. 1:21-cv-01578-VEC (S.D.N.Y.)	2
<i>Ohio Willow Wood Co. v. Alps S., LLC</i> , 735 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. Nov. 15, 2013)	44, 72, 81
<i>Paice LLC v. Ford Motor Co.</i> , 681 F. App'x 904 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	32, 51
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (<i>en banc</i>)	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.