

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 No. IPR2015-00632
U.S. Patent No. 8,727,773 B2

**PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR PARTIAL REHEARING OF THE
BOARD'S DECISION INSTITUTING *INTER PARTES* REVIEW**

Mail Stop PATENT BOARD
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
US Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Submitted Electronically via the Patent Review Processing System

GOLD STANDARD EXHIBIT 2016
US ENDODONTICS v. GOLD STANDARD

Table of Contents

	Page(s)
I. STANDARD FOR REHEARING	2
II. THE EFFECTIVE FILING DATE OF THE '773 PATENT	3
A. US Endo's Petition	3
B. Patent Owner's Preliminary Response	5
C. The Board's Institution Decision	7
III. THE BOARD SHOULD GRANT PARTIAL REHEARING	7
A. The Board Abused Its Discretion in Concluding that the Challenged Claims Are Entitled to Claim Priority to the PCT Application	7
1. The PCT Application's Disclosure of "Coating" Does Not Show Possession of the Claimed Heat-Treating in an Atmosphere Reactive with Nickel-Titanium Shank	7
2. The Board Overlooked Petitioner's Argument that Earlier Applications Do Not Show Possession of the Combination of Elements Recited in the Challenged Claims	14
B. The Board Abused its Discretion by Not Instituting Grounds 1 Through 4 on the Basis that Luebke 2008 and Gao Are Not Prior Art.....	14
IV. CONCLUSION.....	15

Table of Authorities

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Ariad Pharms., Inc. v. Eli Lilly & Co.</i> , 598 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (en banc).....	10
<i>Daciel Corp. v. Celanese Int’l Corp.</i> , IPR2015-00173, Paper 15	3, 9
<i>McDavid, Inc. v. Stirling Mouldings Ltd.</i> , 892 F. Supp. 2d 970 (N.D. Ill. 2012)	10
<i>Merial Ltd. v. Virbac</i> , IPR2014-01279, Paper 18	3, 9
Statutes	
35 U.S.C. § 112.....	4
Rules	
37 C.F.R. § 42.71(c).....	1, 3
37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d)	1, 3

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.71(c) and (d), US Endodontics, LLC (“Petitioner” or “US Endo”) respectfully requests partial rehearing of the Board’s August 5, 2015 decision instituting *Inter Partes* Review in IPR2015-00632 (Paper 29). In particular, US Endo requests rehearing of the Board’s determinations that (1) U.S. Patent No. 8,727,773 (“the ’773 patent”) is “entitled to an effective filing date that is the filing date of the PCT application,” and (2) US Endo has not shown a reasonable likelihood of prevailing on proposed grounds of unpatentability 1 through 4 because the Luebke 2008 and Gao references are not properly considered prior art. Paper 29 at 13-15.

The Petition provides two reasons why the ’773 patent claims are not entitled to priority to earlier-filed applications: (1) the earlier applications do not demonstrate that the inventor possessed “heat-treating” in an atmosphere reactive with the nickel-titanium (“Ni-Ti”) shank, and (2) the earlier applications do not disclose the claimed combination of elements. Paper 2 at 15-20.

The Board rejected the first argument, finding that the PCT application’s disclosure of applying a titanium-nitride coating to a shank by physical vapor deposition (“PVD”) showed possession of heat-treating in a reactive atmosphere. In doing so, the Board was apparently misled by Patent Owner’s arguments regarding the nature and extent of the PCT application’s disclosure of such PVD coating process. That disclosure does not describe heat-treating in a reactive

atmosphere at a temperature within the ranges recited in the '773 patent claims. It discloses no temperature whatsoever for the PVD coating procedure. Thus, even if the PCT application discloses heat-treating in a reactive atmosphere, which Petitioner disputes, it does not disclose the *claimed* heat-treating in a reactive atmosphere, which requires heat-treating at temperatures from at least 400°C.

Moreover, the reaction that Patent Owner asserts occurs during the PVD coating process is between nitrogen and a titanium rod used for the coating; the reaction is not with the Ni-Ti shank itself. It therefore does not expand the PCT application's explicitly limited disclosure of heat-treatment in an atmosphere "unreactive *with the shank*." Because the claimed "heat-treating" encompasses, under the broadest reasonable construction standard, heat-treating in "any atmosphere," including one reactive with the shank, the PCT application's disclosure does not demonstrate that the inventor possessed the full scope of the '773 patent claims.

Regarding Petitioner's second priority date argument—i.e., the earlier applications do not disclose the claimed combination of elements—the Board apparently overlooked this argument altogether.

I. STANDARD FOR REHEARING

A party may seek rehearing of a Board decision by filing a request that identifies the "matters the party believes the Board misapprehended or

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.