

Filed on behalf of: Gold Standard Instruments, LLC

Paper No. _____

By: Joseph A. Hynds, Lead Counsel
Steven Lieberman, *Pro Hac Vice*
R. Elizabeth Brenner-Leifer, Back-up Counsel
C. Nichole Gifford, Back-up Counsel
Derek F. Dahlgren, *Pro Hac Vice*
Jason M. Nolan, Back-up Counsel
ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK, P.C.
607 14th Street, N.W., Suite 800
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-783-6040; Facsimile: 202-783-6031
Emails: jhynds@rothwellfigg.com
sliberman@rothwellfigg.com
ebrenner@rothwellfigg.com
ngifford@rothwellfigg.com
ddahlgren@rothwellfigg.com
jnolan@rothwellfigg.com

Date filed: May 6, 2016

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

US ENDODONTICS, LLC,
Petitioner,

v.

GOLD STANDARD INSTRUMENTS, LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case PGR2015-00019
Patent 8,876,991 B2

**PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE
TO PETITION FOR POST-GRANT REVIEW**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES iv

TABLE OF ABBREVIATIONS vi

EXHIBIT LIST viii

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. THE '991 PATENT 6

 A. General Background of the '991 Patent 6

 1. How Endodontic Files are Used 6

 2. Dr. Luebke's Invention 11

 B. Claims 12-16 14

III. Claim Construction 16

IV. Claims 12-16 Are Enabled By The '991 Patent And Earlier Related Applications 17

 A. Petitioner's Argument that the Claims Contain Inoperable Embodiments is Wrong and is Insufficient as a Matter of Law 17

 B. Petitioner has Not Established that any Experimentation would be Undue 24

V. Claims 12-16 of the '991 Patent Have Adequate Written Description Support 33

VI. Because All of the Challenged Patent Claims are Entitled to an Effective Filing Date of June 7, 2005, the '991 Patent is Ineligible for PGR and the Review Should be Terminated 39

VII. As Demonstrated Above, Claims 12-16 are Entitled to at Least the June 7, 2005 PCT Filing Date and Therefore Luebke 2008 does Not Constitute Prior Art 40

VIII. Kuhn Does not Anticipate Claims 12-14 or 16, Nor Does it Render Claim 15 Obvious Either Alone or in View of Heath or the 1992 ISO 41

 A. Kuhn Does Not Anticipate Claims 12-14 or 16 41

 1. Kuhn States that the File Specimens Recovered Their Original State after Bending, which was Confirmed by Patent Owner's Experiments 41

- 2. None of Kuhn’s Heat-Treated Shank Pieces Demonstrate at Least 10 Degrees of Permanent Deformation in the ISO Test 45
 - i. Kuhn does not identify the bend test used45
 - ii. Kuhn Discloses Annealing Heat Treatments, Which Further Supports the Statement that the heat-treated shank pieces recovered their original shape48
 - iii. Kuhn’s 2001 companion article—which Dr. Goldberg never reviewed—confirms that the heat-treated specimens discussed in Kuhn are superelastic50
 - iv. The Fig. 4A DSC thermograms do not show that the heat-treated specimens would have at least 10 degrees of permanent deformation in the ISO Standard 3630-1 test51
- B. Kuhn, Either Alone or in Combination with Heath or the 1992 ISO, Does Not Render Claim 15 Obvious (Ground 7) 57
- IX. CONCLUSION.....58

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Ariad Pharms., Inc. v. Eli Lilly & Co.,
598 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2010)..... 35, 39

Capon v. Eshar,
418 F.3d 1349 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....20

Cephalon, Inc. v. Watson Pharms., Inc.,
707 F.3d 1330 (Fed. Cir. 2013)..... 26, 28

Ex Parte Jackson,
217 U.S.P.Q.2d 804 (B.P.A.I. 1982).....26

In re Angstadt,
537 F.2d 498 (C.C.P.A. 1976)19

In re Cook,
439 F.2d 730 (C.C.P.A. 1971)20

In re Corkill,
771 F.2d 1496 (Fed. Cir. 1985).....20

In re Rasmussen,
650 F.2d 1212 (C.C.P.A. 1981)35

In re Wands,
858 F.2d 731 (Fed. Cir. 1988)..... passim

In re Wertheim,
541 F.2d 257 (C.C.P.A. 1976) 36, 37

Johns Hopkins Univ. v. CellPro, Inc.,
152 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....26

LizardTech, Inc. v. Earth Res. Mapping, Inc.,
424 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....35

Martek Biosciences Corp. v. Nutrinova, Inc.,
579 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....35

Mintz v. Dietz & Watson, Inc.,
679 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....5

PPG Indus. v. Guardian Indus. Corp.,
75 F.3d 1558 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....26

Reiffin v. Microsoft Corp.,
214 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....34

Union Oil of Cal. v. Atl. Richfield Co.,
208 F.3d 989 (Fed. Cir. 2000)..... 38, 39

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 102.....1

35 U.S.C. § 103.....1

35 U.S.C. § 112(a).....1

Other Authorities

37 C.F.R. § 42.65(a).....29

MPEP § 2164.08.....20

MPEP § 2164.08(b).....20

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.