

PGR2015-00019
Patent 8,876,991

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES vi

TABLE OF ABBREVIATIONS ix

EXHIBIT LIST xi

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. THE '991 PATENT 3

 A. General Background of the '991 Patent 3

 1. How Endodontic Files are Used 3

 2. Dr. Luebke's Invention 6

 B. Claims 12-16 8

 C. Claim Construction 12

III. SPECIFIC REASONS WHY NO PGR SHOULD BE INSTITUTED 16

 A. Ground 1 should Not be Instituted Because Petitioner has Not Presented a *Prima Facie* Case that the Claims are Not Enabled 16

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

 2. Petitioner has Not Conducted a *Wands* Analysis, Nor Established that any Experimentation would be Undue 19

 B. Ground 2 should Not be Instituted Because Petitioner has Not Presented a *Prima Facie* case that the Claims Lack Written Description Support 25

 C. 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 Remaining Grounds should be Denied 31

 D. Grounds 3 and 4 should Not be Instituted Because they Each Rely on Luebke 2008, which does Not Constitute Prior Art 31

 E. Ground 5 should Not be Instituted Because it Relies on Matsutani, which does Not Constitute Prior Art under the Applicable Pre-AIA Provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 102 32

F. Grounds 6-8 should Not be Instituted Because Petitioner has Not shown that the Claims are Either *Prima Facie* Anticipated by Kuhn under § 102, or *Prima Facie* Obvious under § 103 over Kuhn, Alone or in View of Heath or the 1992 ISO 33

1. Kuhn Does Not Anticipate Claims 12-14 and 16 (Ground 6)34

a. Kuhn does Not Teach or Suggest Making a Permanently Deformable File and does Not show the Specific Level of Deformation Required by the Claims 34

b. Kuhn Nowhere Teaches or Suggests Heat-Treating the Entire Shank..... 36

c. None of Kuhn’s Heat-Treated Shank Pieces Demonstrate at Least 10 Degrees of Permanent Deformation in the ISO Test 39

i. Kuhn does not identify the bend test used39

ii. Kuhn also explicitly states that the heat-treated shank pieces recovered their original shape41

iii. The Figure 6A bending curves show heat-treated shanks that maintained their superelasticity42

iv. Kuhn’s 2001 companion article—which Dr. Goldberg never reviewed—confirms that the heat-treated shanks discussed in Kuhn are superelastic45

v. The Fig. 4A DSC thermograms do not show that the heat-treated shanks would have at least 10 degrees of permanent deformation in the ISO Standard 3630-1 test47

vi. Kuhn affirmatively teaches that superelasticity of NiTi files is a good thing and thus expressly teaches away from the claimed invention51

2.	Kuhn, Either Alone or in Combination with Heath or the 1992 ISO, Does Not Render Claim 15 Obvious (Ground 7)	52
3.	Kuhn, Either Alone or in Combination with Heath or the 1992 ISO, Does Not Render Claims 12-16 Obvious (Ground 8).....	53
G.	Grounds 9 and 10 should Not be Instituted Because Petitioner has Not Shown that the Claims are <i>Prima Facie</i> Obvious under § 103 over Pelton and McSpadden in View of Kuhn, Heath or the 1992 ISO.....	55
1.	McSpadden Seeks to Make a <i>Stiffer</i> NiTi file, Not a Permanently Deformable File.....	57
2.	Pelton Seeks to Optimize Superelasticity and Nowhere Teaches or Suggests Making a Permanently Deformable File.....	62
3.	The Combination of McSpadden, Pelton, and Kuhn would Not Result in the Claimed Invention	63
4.	Heath and the 1992 ISO Do Not Bridge the Gap Between Claim 15 and the Claimed Invention	66
H.	Grounds 11 and 12 should Not be Instituted for the Same Reasons the Board Denied Institution of Petitioner’s Second Petition for IPR of the ’773 Patent	68
1.	Grounds 11 and 12 should Not be Instituted Because they are Redundant to Grounds 9 and 10.....	68
2.	Neither Tripi or McSpadden Teach or Disclose All of the Limitations of Claims 12-14 and 16	69
3.	One of Skill in the Art Would Not Be Motivated to Combine Tripi with McSpadden to Make Softer, Deformable Files and Minimize or Remove Superelasticity.....	73
4.	Ground 12 Should Not Be Instituted Because Heath and the 1992 ISO Do Not Bridge the Critical Gaps Between the Tripi and McSpadden and the Claimed Invention	75
IV.	CONCLUSION.....	76

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.