

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

NU MARK, LLC,
Petitioners

v.

FONTEM HOLDINGS 1 B.V.,
Patent Owner

Case **IPR2016-01668**
Patent No. **9,364,027**

**PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO PETITION FOR
INTER PARTES REVIEW**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. BACKGROUND	3
A. The '027 Patent's Priority Claim	3
B. A Person Of Ordinary Skill In The Art.....	4
C. Claim Construction	5
III. PETITIONER'S EXPERT'S CONCLUSORY OPINIONS SHOULD BE ACCORDED NO WEIGHT.....	6
IV. THE PETITION FAILS TO SHOW A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT ANY CLAIM OF THE '027 PATENT IS UNPATENTABLE.....	8
A. The '027 Patent Is Entitled To The Benefit Of At Least The Filing Date Of The '244 Application	9
1. Requirements for a priority claim under 35 U.S.C. § 120.....	9
B. Unclaimed Features Of The Invention Are Not Relevant to Whether The '244 Application Provides Written Description Support for the '027 Patent Claims	11
1. Petitioner admits the '027 patent claims are supported by the '244 application.....	14
2. The '027 patent claims need not recite every aspect disclosed in the '244 application's specification	15
C. The '244 Application Is Not Limited To An Electronic Cigarette Having A Liquid Storage Container And A Pump Or Valve.....	24
1. The terms "the invention" or "the present invention" and applicant's subsequent amendments do not demonstrate that the '244 application is limited to a device comprising a liquid storage container and a valve or pump	24
a. Use of the phrase "the invention" or "the present invention"	24
b. Amendments to the '244 application.....	28

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
2. Patent Owner’s statements in IPR2015-01301, IPR2015-01604, and IPR2015-01513 do not limit the ’244 application’s written description to a liquid storage container and a valve or pump	30
3. The District Court’s tentative ruling did not limit the specification of the ’641 patent to a device utilizing a liquid storage container	34
V. CONCLUSION.....	35
CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE.....	36

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

<i>Abbott Labs. v. Dey L.P.</i> , 287 F.3d 1097 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	33
<i>Absolute Software, Inc. v. Stealth Signal, Inc.</i> , 659 F.3d 1121 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	24
<i>ActiveVideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Commc'ns, Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	8
<i>Anascope, Ltd. v. Nintendo of Am. Inc.</i> , 601 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	22, 23
<i>Apple Inc. v. ContentGuard Holdings, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00457, Paper 9 (Decision Denying Institution of <i>Inter Partes</i> Review, June 30, 2015) (Ex. 2004)	16, 17, 29
<i>Carl Zeiss Stiftung v. Renishaw PLC</i> , 945 F.2d 1173 (Fed. Cir. 1991)	17
<i>Cordis Corp. v. Boston Sci. Corp.</i> , 188 F. App'x 984 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Crown Packaging Tech., Inc. v. Ball Metal Beverage Container Corp.</i> , 635 F.3d 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	15, 16, 20, 21
<i>Fontem Ventures, B.V., et al. v. NJOY, Inc. et al.</i> , Case No. 2:14-cv-1645-GW(MRWx)	34
<i>Goldenberg v. Cytogen, Inc.</i> , 373 F.3d 1158 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	32, 33
<i>Golight, Inc. v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.</i> , 355 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	15, 25, 26
<i>Greene's Energy Grp., LLC v. Oil States Energy Services</i> , IPR2014-00364, 2015 WL 2089119 (PTAB May 1, 2015)	16

ICU Med., Inc. v. Alaris Med. Sys.,
558 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2009)21, 22

Pfizer, Inc. v. Ranbaxy Labs. Ltd.,
457 F.3d 1284 (Fed. Cir. 2006)32

Research Corp. Techs. v. Microsoft Corp.,
627 F.3d 859 (Fed. Cir. 2010)22, 23

Revolution Eyewear, Inc. v. Aspex Eyewear, Inc.,
563 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2009)passim

ScriptPro LLC v. Innovation Associates, Inc.,
833 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2016)22, 23

SRI Int’l v. Matsushita Elec. Corp. of Am.,
775 F.2d 1107 (Fed. Cir. 1985)2

Ventana Med. Sys., Inc. v. Biogenex Labs, Inc.,
473 F.3d 1173 (Fed. Cir. 2006)16

STATUTES

35 U.S.C. § 1028

35 U.S.C. § 112passim

35 U.S.C. § 1209

OTHER AUTHORITIES

M.P.E.P. § 1893.03(b)4

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.