

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

**JOHN CRANE, INC., JOHN CRANE
PRODUCTION SOLUTIONS, INC. &
JOHN CRANE GROUP CORP.,**

Petitioners,

v.

FINALROD IP, LLC,

Patent Owner.

IPR No. IPR2016-00521

U.S. Patent No. 8,851,162

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW
UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 311 & 37 C.F.R. 42.101**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS..... i

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES iv

EXHIBIT LIST vi

I. MANDATORY NOTICES (37 C.F.R. § 42.8) 1

 A. Real Party-In Interest (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1)) 1

 B. Related Matters (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2)) 1

 C. Counsel & Service Information (37 C.F.R. §§ 42.8(b)(3)-(4)) 1

II. PAYMENT OF FEES (37 C.F.R. § 42.103) 2

III. STANDING (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a)) 2

IV. INTRODUCTION 2

V. IDENTIFICATION OF CHALLENGE (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)) & RELIEF
REQUESTED (37 C.F.R. § 42.22(a)(1)) 3

VI. BACKGROUND INFORMATION FOR THE '162 PATENT 6

 A. Background of the Field of Art 6

 B. Overview of the '162 Patent 9

 C. Prosecution History of the '162 Patent 10

VII. THERE IS A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT AT LEAST ONE
CLAIM OF THE '162 PATENT IS UNPATENTABLE 12

 A. Relevant Field of Art and Level of Ordinary Skill 12

 B. Claim Constructions 12

 (a) “the compressive forces create a force differential along the wedge
system greater at the closed end of the fitting and decreasing toward the open
end of the fitting” (Claims 1, 11, 20, 31) 13

 (b) “the maximum thickness is substantially constant and the minimum
thickness is substantially constant” (Claims 9, 18, 27, 31) 14

 C. Legal Standard for Obviousness 16

 D. Ground 1: Claims 1, 6-11, 16-20, 25-28, 30 & 31 are invalid under 35
U.S.C. §103 as obvious over the Rutledge '431 Patent in view of Strandberg... 17

(a) Overview of the Rutledge '431 & Strandberg Patents.....	17
(b) Reasons and Motivations to Combine.....	18
(c) Independent Claims 1, 11, 20 & 31.....	19
(d) Independent Claim 31.....	35
(e) Dependent Claims 6, 16, and 25.....	40
(f) Dependent Claim 7.....	41
(g) Dependent Claims 8, 17, and 26.....	41
(h) Dependent Claims 9, 18, and 27.....	42
(i) Dependent Claims 10, 19, and 28.....	44
(j) Dependent Claim 30.....	45
E. Ground 2: Claims 2-5, 12-15, 21-24, and 32-38 are invalid under 35 U.S.C. §103 as obvious over the Rutledge '431 and Strandberg Patents further in view of Morrow.....	47
(a) Overview of Morrow.....	47
(b) Reasons and Motivations to Combine.....	48
(c) Dependent Claims 2, 12, 21, 32, and 38.....	48
(d) Dependent Claim 33.....	50
(e) Dependent Claims 3, 13, 22, 34, and 35.....	51
(f) Dependent Claims 4, 14, 23, and 36.....	52
(g) Dependent Claims 5, 15, 24, and 37.....	54
F. Ground 3: Claims 29 and 39 are invalid under 35 U.S.C. §103 as obvious over the Rutledge '431 and Strandberg Patents further in view of Iwasaki.....	55
(a) Overview of Iwasaki.....	55
(b) Reasons and Motivations to Combine.....	56
(c) Dependent Claim 29.....	56
(d) Dependent Claim 39.....	58
G. Ground 4: Claim 40 is invalid under 35 U.S.C. §103 as obvious over the Rutledge '431 and Strandberg Patents further in view Rutledge '560.....	58

(a) Overview of the Rutledge '560 Patent	58
(b) Reasons and Motivation to Combine	59
(c) Dependent Claim 40	59
VIII.CONCLUSION.....	60

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
<i>Boehringer Ingelheim Vetmedica, Inc. v. Schering-Plough Corp.</i> , 320 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	28, 32, 49
<i>In re Cuozzo Speed Techs.</i> , 793 F.3d 1268 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	12
<i>In re Paulsen</i> , 30 F.3d 1475 (Fed. Cir. 1994)	16
<i>In re Preda</i> , 401 F.2d 825 (CCPA 1968)	16
<i>In re Schreiber</i> , 128 F.3d 1473 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	28, 32, 49
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007)	16
<i>Minton v. Nat’l Ass’n of Securities Dealers, Inc.</i> , 336 F.3d 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	28, 49
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	12
STATUTES	
35 U.S.C. § 102(b)	5
35 U.S.C. § 103	passim
35 U.S.C. § 112	11, 13
35 U.S.C. § 311	1
OTHER AUTHORITIES	
37 C.F.R. § 42.8	1
37 C.F.R. § 42.15	2

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.