

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ARKEMA AND ARKEMA FRANCE,
Petitioner

v.

HONEYWELL INTERNATIONAL INC.,
Patent Owner.

PGR2016-00011
Patent No. 9,157,017

**PATENT OWNER'S MOTION
FOR LEAVE TO REQUEST A CERTIFICATE OF CORRECTION**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....1

Background.....2

Argument6

I. The Board Should Grant Honeywell Leave To Petition For A Certificate Of Correction.....6

A. Honeywell Can Amend Its Priority Claim Through A Certificate Of Correction.....7

1. Honeywell’s Proposed Correction Is Of Minor Character.7

2. Honeywell’s “Delay” In Seeking A Correction Is Unintentional.....10

3. Honeywell’s Correction Will Not Add New Matter Or Require Reexamination.....11

B. The Board’s Decision Cannot Stand If The Director Grants Honeywell’s Proposed Correction.11

II. Granting Honeywell’s Motion Will Not Prejudice Arkema.....13

Conclusion.....15

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

ASM IP Holding B.V. v. Kokusai Elec. Corp.,
IPR2019-00378, Paper 17 (PTAB July 5, 2019)8

B. Braun Melsungen AG v. Becton, Dickinson & Co.,
2017 WL 2531939 (D. Del. 2017).....8

Carotek, Inc. v. Kobayashi Ventures, L.L.C.,
875 F. Supp. 2d 313 (S.D.N.Y. 2012)8

In re Donohue,
766 F.2d 531 (Fed. Cir. 1985) 13

E.I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. v. MacDermid Printing Sols., L.L.C.,
525 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 2008) 14

Emerson Elec. Co. v. Sipco, LLC,
IPR2017-00001, Paper 37 (PTAB Nov. 22, 2017).....8

Hologic, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.,
884 F.3d 1357 (Fed. Cir. 2018) 12

Honeywell Int’l Inc. v. Arkema Inc.,
939 F.3d 1345 (Fed. Cir. 2019) 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14

Kaidi LLC v. Limoss US, LLC,
IPR2019-01184, Paper 8 (PTAB July 19, 2019)8

In re Lambrech,
202 U.S.P.Q. 620 (Comm’r Pat. & Trademarks 1976)8

In re Schuurs & Van Weemen,
218 U.S.P.Q. 443 (Comm’r Pat & Trademarks 1983)8

SPTS Tech. Ltd. v. Plasma-Therm LLC,
IPR2018-00618, Paper 7 (PTAB May 1, 2018)8

United Servs. Auto Ass’n v. Asghari-Kamrani,
CBM2016-00063, Paper 10 (PTAB Aug. 4, 2016)8, 9, 12

Word to Info, Inc. v. Google Inc.,
140 F. Supp. 3d 986 (N.D. Cal. 2015).....8, 10

Statutes

35 U.S.C. §102.....12, 13
35 U.S.C. §103.....12
35 U.S.C. §112.....10, 12, 14
35 U.S.C. §120.....5, 7
35 U.S.C. §254.....13
35 U.S.C. §255.....7, 9, 10, 11, 14

Regulations

37 C.F.R. §1.78.....5, 10
37 C.F.R. §1.323.....4

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure

MPEP §201.06.....5
MPEP §1481.03.....7
MPEP §1485.....4

Introduction

Honeywell's claimed automobile air conditioning compositions defied industry skepticism and made the apparently impossible possible: a safe and efficient refrigerant-lubricant combination with virtually no impact on the ozone layer or global warming. Honeywell began seeking patent protection on its groundbreaking compositions and methods as early as 2002 and disclosed detailed examples of their uses in automobile air conditioning in applications dating back to 2005. Earlier in this case, the Board held the claims of Honeywell's U.S. Patent No. 9,157,017 unpatentable over uses of Honeywell's own products in 2012—but only after denying Honeywell leave to correct an inadvertent mistake in the '017 patent's chain of priority which would have resulted in a priority date of 2005.

The Federal Circuit vacated that decision and ordered that Honeywell be allowed to file this motion for leave to seek a certificate of correction. The bar for Honeywell to prevail is low: The Board cannot rule on the ultimate merits of the proposed correction, but instead may only “determine if Honeywell ha[s] demonstrated a ‘sufficient basis’ that the mistake ‘may’ be correctable.” *Honeywell Int'l Inc. v. Arkema Inc.*, 939 F.3d 1345, 1349 (Fed. Cir. 2019). It plainly has.

Honeywell's requested correction easily falls within the class of “minor character” mistakes for which the Director grants certificates of correction. For at least forty years, “the PTO has previously allowed patentees to correct priority

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.