

---

---

**United States Court of Appeals  
for the  
Federal Circuit**

---

---

No. 2017-1977

E.I. DUPONT DE NEMOURS & COMPANY,  
ARCHER DANIELS MIDLAND COMPANY,

*Appellants,*

– v. –

SYNVINA C.V.,

*Appellee.*

---

ON APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE,  
PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD IN NO. IPR2015-01838  
(ADMINISTRATIVE PATENT JUDGES CHRISTOPHER G. PAULRAJ,  
TONI R. SCHEINER AND SHERIDAN K. SNEDDEN)

---

---

**COMBINED PETITION FOR PANEL REHEARING  
AND REHEARING *EN BANC***

---

---

Paul M. Richter, Jr.  
PEPPER HAMILTON LLP  
The New York Times Building  
620 Eighth Avenue, 37th Floor  
New York, New York 10018  
(212) 808-7200

– and –

Mark A. Chapman  
HUNTON ANDREWS KURTH LLP  
200 Park Avenue  
New York, New York 10166  
(212) 309-1000

*Counsel for Appellee Synvina C.V.*

October 17, 2018

---

---

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

E.I. DuPont de Nemours v. Synvina C.V.

Case No. 17-1977

CERTIFICATE OF INTEREST

Counsel for the:

(petitioner)  (appellant)  (respondent)  (appellee)  (amicus)  (name of party)

Synvina C.V.

certifies the following (use "None" if applicable; use extra sheets if necessary):

1. Full Name of Party Represented by me	2. Name of Real Party in interest (Please only include any real party in interest NOT identified in Question 3) represented by me is:	3. Parent corporations and publicly held companies that own 10% or more of stock in the party
Synvina C.V.	None.	Avantium N.V. and BASF SE

4. The names of all law firms and the partners or associates that appeared for the party or amicus now represented by me in the trial court or agency or are expected to appear in this court (and who have not or will not enter an appearance in this case) are:

Kenyon & Kenyon LLP: Michael Glynn

FORM 9. Certificate of Interest

Form 9  
Rev. 10/17

5. The title and number of any case known to counsel to be pending in this or any other court or agency that will directly affect or be directly affected by this court's decision in the pending appeal. *See* Fed. Cir. R. 47. 4(a)(5) and 47.5(b). (The parties should attach continuation pages as necessary).

None.

10/17/2018

Date

/s/ Paul M. Richter, Jr.

Signature of counsel

Please Note: All questions must be answered

Paul M. Richter, Jr.

Printed name of counsel

cc: Counsel of Record

Reset Fields

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
I. RULE 35(b) STATEMENT .....	1
II. POINTS OF LAW OR FACT OVERLOOKED OR MISAPPREHENDED BY THE PANEL .....	2
III. ARGUMENT IN SUPPORT OF PANEL REHEARING AND REHEARING <i>EN BANC</i> .....	4
A. The Panel Erroneously Failed to Analyze Whether Appellants Met the Requirements For Article III Standing At the Time They Filed This Appeal .....	4
B. The Panel Erroneously Imposed a “Presumption of Obviousness” and Improperly Shifted the Burden to Patent Owner to Prove Non-Obviousness .....	9
C. The Panel Incorrectly Concluded that Temperature and Oxygen Partial Pressure Are “Results-Effective Variables” and Overlooked The Substantial Evidence to the Contrary .....	13

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Consumer Watchdog v. Wis. Alumni Research Found.</i> , 753 F.3d 1258 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....	5
<i>Davis v. Fed. Election Comm’n</i> , 554 U.S. 724 (2008) .....	1, 2, 5
<i>In re Aller</i> , 220 F.2d 454 (C.C.P.A. 1955).....	16
<i>In re Antonie</i> , 559 F.2d 618 (C.C.P.A. 1977).....	16
<i>In re Applied Materials, Inc.</i> , 692 F.3d 1289 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	3, 14
<i>In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Patent Litig.</i> , 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	1, 3, 11, 12
<i>In re Geisler</i> , 116 F.3d 1465 (Fed. Cir. 1997) .....	12
<i>In re Magnum Oil Tools Int’l, Ltd.</i> , 829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	1, 2, 10, 11
<i>In re Woodruff</i> , 919 F.2d 1575 (Fed. Cir. 1990) .....	12
<i>Iron Grip Barbell Co. v. USA Sports Inc.</i> , 392 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2004) .....	12
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007) .....	3, 4, 14, 17
<i>Lang v. Pacific Marine &amp; Supply Co.</i> , 895 F.2d 761 (Fed. Cir. 1990) .....	7
<i>Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife</i> , 504 U.S. 555 (1992) .....	6, 8

# 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.