

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

---

**PETITIONER'S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF  
PETITION FOR POST-GRANT REVIEW**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
I. Introduction.....	1
II. The Challenged Claims are Not Enabled Under 35 U.S.C. § 112(a).....	2
A. A Significant Portion of the Claimed Temperature Ranges Do Not Achieve the Claimed Permanent Deformation .....	2
B. Luebke Admitted that a Significant Portion of the Claimed Temperature Ranges are Unlikely to Achieve the Claimed Permanent Deformation .....	4
C. Petitioner’s Testing Confirms that a Significant Portion of the Claimed Temperature Ranges Fail to Achieve the Claimed Deformation.....	5
D. Patent Owner’s Alleged “Testing” Should Not Be Given Any Weight .....	8
E. Undue Experimentation Would Be Required to Practice the Full Scope of the Claimed Invention .....	10
III. The Specification Lacks Adequate Written Description Support for the Challenged Claims .....	15
A. The Board Has Not Previously Rejected Petitioner’s Arguments .....	15
B. Luebke Did Not Have Possession of the Claimed Invention with Respect to a Significant Portion of the Claimed Temperature Ranges—A Fact that He Admitted.....	16
IV. Petitioner Has Demonstrated that the Challenged Claims are Not Entitled to an Effective Filing Date Earlier than January 29, 2014 .....	17
V. Patent Owner Concedes that Claims 12-16 are Unpatentable Over Luebke 2008 Alone and that Claim 15 is Additionally Unpatentable Over Luebke 2008 in View of Heath or ISO Standard 3630-1 .....	18
VI. Kuhn Anticipates Claims 12-14 and 16, and Renders Obvious Claim 15 Either Alone or in View of Heath or the 1992 ISO Standard 3630-1 .....	18

A.	Kuhn Does Not State the Heat Treated Files Recovered Their Original State After Bending.....	19
B.	Patent Owner’s Experimental Results are Unavailing .....	20
C.	Kuhn Describes in Detail the Bend Test Employed .....	22
D.	The 2001 Publication Does Not “Confirm that the Heat-Treated Specimens Discussed in Kuhn are Superelastic” .....	23
E.	The Board’s Final Written Decision in IPR2015-00632 is Consistent with Petitioner’s Position that Kuhn’s Disclosure of Heat-Treating Would Meet the ’991 Patent’s Claimed Deformation Limitation.....	24
VII.	Conclusion .....	25

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases	Page
<i>AK Steel Corp. v. Sollac &amp; Ugine</i> , 344 F.3d 1234 (Fed. Cir. 2003) .....	3
<i>Impax Labs. Inc. v. Aventis Pharm. Inc.</i> , 468 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2006) .....	21
<i>LizardTech, Inc. v. Earth Res. Mapping, Inc.</i> 424 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2005) .....	16
<i>O2 Micro Int'l Ltd. v. Beyond Innovation Tech. Co.</i> , 521 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....	9
<i>Sitrick v. Dreamworks, LLC</i> , 516 F.3d 993 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....	2

## UPDATED EXHIBIT LIST

Exhibit No.	Description
1001	U.S. Patent No. 8,876,991
1002	Declaration of A. Jon Goldberg
1003	Prosecution history of U.S. Patent No. 8,876,991
1004	Fujio Miura et al., <i>The super-elastic property of the Japanese NiTi alloy wire for use in orthodontics</i> , 90 AM. J. ORTHODONTICS & DENTOFACIAL ORTHOPEDICS 1 (1986)
1005	Satish B. Alapati, "An investigation of phase transformation mechanisms for nickel-titanium rotary endodontic instruments," PhD thesis, 2006
1006	Alan R. Pelton et al., <i>Optimisation of Processing and Properties of Medical-Grade Nitinol Wire</i> , MINIMALLY INVASIVE THERAPIES & ALLIED TECHS. 107 (2000)
1007	U.S. Patent No. 5,697,906 to Ariola et al.
1008	Prosecution history of U.S. Patent No. 8,727,773
1009	Prosecution history of U.S. Patent No. 8,083,873
1010	Prosecution history of U.S. Patent No. 8,062,033
1011	U.S. Patent No. 8,727,773
1012	Prosecution history of European Patent Appl. No. 05756629.1
1013	Excerpts of Preliminary Injunction Motion Hearing Transcript, Nov. 25, 2014, <i>Dentsply International, Inc. v. US Endodontics, LLC</i> , Case No. 2:14-CV-196 (E.D. Tenn.)
1014	International Standard ISO 3630-1, 2 <sup>nd</sup> ed. (2008)
1015	Declaration of Walter Zanes

# 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.