Filed on behalf of: Arkema Inc. and Arkema France

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ARKEMA INC. AND ARKEMA FRANCE, Petitioner,

v.

HONEYWELL INTERNATIONAL INC., Patent Owner.

> PGR2016-00011 Patent No. 9,157,017

PETITIONER'S SUR-REPLY IN OPPOSITION TO PATENT OWNER'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO REQUEST A CERTIFICATE OF CORRECTION

DOCKET

TABLE OF ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviation	Definition
'017 patent	U.S. Patent No. 9,157,017 (Ex. 1001)
'605 application	U.S. Patent Application No. 11/475,605 (Ex. 2170), which issued as U.S. Patent No. 9,005,467
AAC	automobile air conditioning
Bold Italics	emphasis added
COC	certificate of correction
HWBr	<i>Honeywell Int'l Inc. v. Arkema Inc.</i> , Appeal Nos. 18-1151, -1153, D.I. 25 (Fed. Cir. May 9, 2018)
HWRBr	Honeywell Int'l Inc. v. Arkema Inc., Appeal Nos. 18-1151, -1153, D.I. 37 (Fed. Cir. Oct. 10, 2018)
Minor	U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2008/0230738
Motion	Paper 61, Patent Owner's Motion for Leave to Request a Certificate of Correction
Opp.	Paper 71, Petitioner's Opposition to Patent Owner's Motion for Leave to Request a Certificate of Correction
Reply	Paper 74, Patent Owner's Reply in Support of its Motion for Leave to Request a Certificate of Correction
WO '625	WO 2007/02625 (PGR2016-00012, Ex. 1011)

U.S. Patent No. 9,157,017 PGR2016-00011

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases

ASM IP Holding B.V. v. Kokusai Elec. Corp., IPR2019-00378, Paper 17 (PTAB July 5, 2019) ("ASM")
<i>Emerson Elec. Co. v. SIPCO, LLC</i> , IPR2016-00984, Paper 52 (PTAB Jan. 24, 2020)
<i>Emerson Elec. Co. v. SIPCO, LLC</i> , IPR2017-00001, Paper 37, 2 (PTAB Nov. 22, 2017) (" <i>Emerson</i> ") 1
Honeywell Int'l Inc. v. Arkema Inc., 939 F.3d 1345 (Fed. Cir. 2019) ("Honeywell")
<i>In re Giacomini</i> , 612 F.3d 1380 (Fed. Cir. 2010)
In re Slayter, 276 F.2d 408 (CCPA 1960)
Inline Packaging, LLC v. Graphic Packaging Int'l, Inc., IPR2015-01609, Paper 19 (PTAB Mar. 31, 2016)
Pfizer, Inc. v. Teva Pharm. USA, Inc., 518 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 2008)
Prime Focus Creative Servs. Can. Inc. v. Legend3D, Inc., IPR2016-01491, Paper 21 (PTAB Mar. 1, 2017) ("Prime Focus")
<i>SPTS Tech. Ltd. v. Plasma-Therm LLC</i> , IPR2018-00618, Paper 7, 2 (PTAB May 1, 2018) (" <i>SPTS Tech.</i> ")
Sw. Software, Inc. v. Harlequin Inc., 226 F.3d 1280 (Fed. Cir. 2000)
United Servs. Auto Ass'n v. Asghari-Kamrani, CBM2016-00063, Paper 10, 5 (PTAB Aug. 4, 2016) ("USAA") 1
Statutes
35 U.S.C. § 102(b)
35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

DOCKET A L A R M Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at <u>docketalarm.com</u>.

U.S. Patent No. 9,157,017 PGR2016-00011

35 U.S.C. § 112	
35 U.S.C. § 255	1, 3, 5
35 U.S.C. § 303(a)	
35 U.S.C. § 304	
Other Authorities	
MPEP § 1481.03	
MPEP § 1485	4
MPEP § 2133.01	4
MPEP § 2242	
Regulations	
37 C.F.R. § 1.56(e)	4

Honeywell seeks a COC to establish an entirely new priority date via applications never identified in the '017 patent record. But, as admitted by Honeywell's prosecution counsel, "*it was never Honeywell's intent* during the lifetime of the '017 patent prosecution to make a claim to [an] additional priority chain" and "*[t]here was no error that was made during the prosecution itself*." Ex. 1197, 25:3-26:16, 70:11-18, 72:4-9. No precedent, much less Honeywell's alleged "40+ years of precedent," supports this misuse of a COC. Indeed, it is precluded by statute, regulation, and Office practice. Honeywell's Motion thus fails to establish a "sufficient basis" for issuance of a COC. *See Honeywell* at 1349.

A. Honeywell has not shown "mistake" or "unintentional delay"

Honeywell's citations to "at least 10 cases" allowing COCs for priority claims (Reply, 1) are irrelevant given that Honeywell's deliberate actions preclude issuance of a COC. *See* Opp., 3-5. That COCs were allowed for *other* patents under *other* circumstances does not support Honeywell's burden to establish a sufficient basis that its litigation strategy here is a § 255 "mistake" or "unintentional delay."

Unlike USAA, Honeywell's proposed change is not based on a clerical error. Ex. 2041, 9:24-10:5, 22:20-24. Honeywell's admission that "[t]here was no error that was made during the prosecution itself" (Ex. 1197, 72:4-9) distinguishes *Emerson* (change of "and is a continuation" to "which is a continuation" said to be consistent with file history) and *SPTS Tech*. (priority claimed in ADS but not

DOCKET A L A R M



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.