

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

TIFFANY AND COMPANY,
Petitioner,

v.

LAZARE KAPLAN INTERNATIONAL INC.,
Patent Owner.

Patent No. 6,476,351

Inter Partes Review No. IPR2015-00024

PATENT OWNER RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. STATE OF THE PRIOR ART	4
III. THE '351 PATENT	6
IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	12
A. Introduction	12
B. The Claim Language And Specification Require That The “Controlling” Limitations Be Based On Electronic Image Information Fed Back From The Imaging Step/System	15
C. The Claim Language And Specification Require That The “Controlling” Limitations Use Both “Marking Instructions” And Electronic Image Information In Combination To Generate A Marking	19
D. Prior Art Uses Of Imaging Systems Do Not Fall Within The “Controlling” Limitations	24
E. The Prosecution History Of The '351 Patent Supports LKI's Construction Of The “Controlling” Limitations	26
F. The 2010 Federal Circuit Opinion Is Consistent With LKI's Construction Of The “Controlling” Limitations	29
G. LKI's Proposed Construction Is Required By The Intrinsic Record And Is Supported By The 2010 Federal Circuit Opinion.....	32
V. GROUND 1: FINE DIAMONDS ALONE DOES NOT RENDER OBVIOUS CLAIMS 1 AND 7.....	33
A. Summary Of Fine Diamonds.....	33
B. Fine Diamonds Does Not Disclose Or Suggest The “Controlling” Limitations	35
VI. GROUND 2: FINE DIAMONDS IN COMBINATION WITH THE ILR ARTICLE DOES NOT RENDER OBVIOUS CLAIMS 1 AND 7	38
A. Summary Of The ILR Article	38

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
B. Fine Diamonds In Combination With The ILR Article Does Not Disclose Or Suggest The “Controlling” Limitations	39
C. A POSITA Would Not Combine Fine Diamonds With The ILR Article.....	42
VII. GROUND 6: GRESSER IN COMBINATION WITH THE ILR ARTICLE DOES NOT RENDER OBVIOUS CLAIMS 1 AND 7	47
A. Summary Of Gresser	47
B. Gresser In Combination With The ILR Article Does Not Disclose Or Suggest The “Controlling” Limitations	47
C. A POSITA Would Not Combine Gresser With The ILR Article	49
VIII. OBJECTIVE INDICIA OF NON-OBVIOUSNESS FURTHER DIRECT A FINDING OF NON-OBVIOUSNESS	50
A. The Claimed Invention Of The '351 Patent Experienced Commercial Success.....	51
B. The Claimed Invention Of The '351 Patent Was Copied.....	56
C. The Commercial Success And Copying Demonstrate That Claims 1 And 7 Are Not Obvious Over The Prior Art	57
IX. PATENT OWNER’S FINAL REMARKS	58

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
<i>Allen Archery, Inc. v. Browning Mfg. Co.</i> , 819 F.2d 1087 (Fed. Cir. 1987)	51
<i>Corning Inc. v. DSM IP Assets B.V.</i> , IPR2013-00048, Paper No. 96 (P.T.A.B. July 11, 2014)	42
<i>Eurand, Inc. v. Mylan Pharms., Inc. (In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Patent Litig.)</i> , 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	44
<i>Fenner Invs., Ltd. v. Cellco Partnership</i> , 778 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	14, 26
<i>Gould v. Quigg</i> , 822 F.2d 1074 (Fed. Cir. 1987)	47
<i>Graham v. John Deere, Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966)	51
<i>GSI Technology, Inc., v. Cypress Semiconductor Corp.</i> , IPR2014-00121, Paper No. 46 (P.T.A.B. April 9, 2015)	42
<i>Honeywell Int’l, Inc. v. ITT Indus., Inc.</i> , 452 F. 3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	18
<i>In re Rambus, Inc.</i> , 753 F.3d 1253 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	13
<i>Intri-Plex Techs., Inc. v. Saint-Gobain Performance Plastics Rencol, Ltd.</i> , IPR2014-00309, Paper No. 83 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 23, 2014)	51
<i>KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007)	42, 43, 51
<i>Leo Pharm. Prods., Ltd. v. Rea</i> , 726 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	50, 51

<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Proxyconn, Inc.</i> , No. 2014-1542, 789 F.3d 1292, 2015 U.S. App. LEXIS 10081 (Fed. Cir. June 16, 2015).....	13, 26
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	passim
<i>Retractable Tech. v. Becton, Dickinson and Co.</i> , 653 F.3d 1296 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	26
<i>SciMed Life Sys. v. Advanced Cardiovascular Sys.</i> , 242 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	18
<i>Toyota Motor Corp. v. Hagenbuch</i> , IPR2013-00483, Paper No. 37 (PTAB Dec. 5, 2014)	13
<i>Verizon Servs. Corp. v. Vonage Holdings Corp.</i> , 503 F.3d 1295 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	18
<i>Vulcan Eng'g, Co. v. Fata Aluminium, Inc.</i> , 278 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	51
STATUTES	
35 U.S.C. § 103	1
35 U.S.C. § 311(b)	47
35 U.S.C. § 316(e)	42

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.