

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

In re U.S. Patent No.: 10,422,617 B2

Trial Number: PGR2020-00056

Filed: June 27, 2019

Attorney Ref.: 1330.0012AB

Issued: September 24, 2019

Petitioner: Apex Tool Group,
LLC.

Inventors: Jonathan F. Vitas, Abhijeet A. Khangar

Patent Owner: Milwaukee Electric Tool Corporation

Title: Tape Measure with Tape Blade Profile Increasing Tape Standout

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

**PETITION FOR POST GRANT REVIEW
OF UNITED STATES PATENT NO. 10,422,617**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. MANDATORY NOTICES 3

 A. Real Party-In-Interest..... 3

 B. Related Matters 3

 C. Lead and Backup Counsel 3

 D. Service Information..... 3

III. SERVICE..... 4

IV. FEES 4

V. GROUNDS FOR STANDING (37 C.F.R. § 42.204(a))..... 4

VI. INTRODUCTION TO THE CHALLENGE AND RELIEF REQUESTED..... 4

VII. SUMMARY OF THE '617 PATENT 6

 A. The Specification and Claims 6

 B. The Prosecution History 11

VIII. GENERAL KNOWLEDGE OF THE SKILLED ARTISAN..... 11

IX. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART 14

X. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION (37 C.F.R. § 42.204(B)(3))..... 15

 A. “the upper surface of the elongate blade defines a concave surface” 16

 B. “the lower surface of the elongate blade defines a convex surface” 19

 C. “the elongate blade comprising . . . a flat width” 19

 D. “the elongate blade comprising . . . a curved width” 23

XI. THE CLAIMS OF THE '617 PATENT WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS..... 25

 A. Ground 1: Claims 1-11 would have been obvious based on Applicant Admitted Prior Art (“AAPA”) in light of the general knowledge of the skilled artisan..... 30

 1. Applicant Admitted Prior Art 30

2.	Claim 1.....	33
3.	Claim 2.....	38
4.	Claim 3.....	38
5.	Claim 4.....	39
6.	Claim 5.....	39
7.	Claim 6.....	40
8.	Claim 7.....	41
9.	Claim 8.....	41
10.	Claim 9.....	43
11.	Claim 10.....	44
12.	Claim 11.....	44
B.	Ground 2: Claims 6-7 would have been obvious based on AAPA in light of Ruttly and the general knowledge of the skilled artisan	45
1.	U.S. Patent No. 4,429,462 (“Ruttly”).....	46
2.	Claim 6.....	48
3.	Claim 7.....	48
C.	Ground 3: Claims 8-10 would have been obvious based on AAPA in light of Critelli and the general knowledge of the skilled artisan	49
1	U.S. Patent No. 7,159,331 (“Critelli”).....	50
2.	Claim 8.....	50
3.	Claim 9.....	51
4.	Claim 10.....	52
D.	Ground 4: Claims 1-11 would have been obvious based on Craig in light of the general knowledge of the skilled artisan	52
1.	U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2015/0247716 (“Craig”).....	52
2.	Claim 1.....	54
3.	Claim 2.....	61
4.	Claim 3.....	61
5.	Claim 4.....	62
6.	Claim 5.....	62
7.	Claim 6.....	62
8.	Claim 7.....	63
9.	Claim 8.....	64
10.	Claim 9.....	65

11.	Claim 10.....	65
12.	Claim 11.....	66
E.	Ground 5: Claims 8-10 would have been obvious based on Craig in light of Critelli and the general knowledge of the skilled artisan	67
1.	Claim 8.....	67
2.	Claim 9.....	68
3.	Claim 10.....	69
F.	Ground 6: Claims 1-11 would have been obvious based on Murray in light of the general knowledge of the skilled artisan	69
1.	U.S. Patent No. 6,324,769 (“Murray”).....	70
2.	Claim 1.....	71
3.	Claim 2.....	77
4.	Claim 3.....	78
5.	Claim 4.....	78
6.	Claim 5.....	78
7.	Claim 6.....	79
8.	Claim 7.....	79
9.	Claim 8.....	80
10.	Claim 9.....	81
11.	Claim 10.....	81
12.	Claim 11.....	82
G.	Ground 7: Claims 6-7 would have been obvious based on Murray in light of Rutty and the general knowledge of the skilled artisan	82
1.	Claim 6.....	83
2.	Claim 7.....	83
H.	Ground 8: Claims 8-10 would have been obvious based on Murray in light of Critelli and the general knowledge of the skilled artisan	84
1.	Claim 8.....	85
2.	Claim 9.....	86
3.	Claim 10.....	86
I.	No Secondary Considerations Support Non-Obviousness .	87
XII.	THE BOARD SHOULD INSTITUTE PGR.....	88

XIII. CONCLUSION..... 91

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.