

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

KAZ USA, INC.,  
Petitioner

v.

BRITA LP,  
Patent Owner

---

CASE IPR2016-01893

U.S. Patent No. 8,167,141

---

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE  
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.107(a)**

***Mail Stop "PATENT BOARD"***  
Patent Trial and Appeal Board  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	The Board should disregard Petitioner’s claim construction of “Filter Rate and Performance (FRAP) factor”.....	5
III.	Petitioner’s arguments regarding inherent anticipation by Knipmeyer and Rinker belie its simultaneous allegations of lack of priority, requiring denial of Grounds 1 and 5-8 .....	7
	A. The challenged claims are entitled to claim priority benefit to June 30, 2004.....	10
	B. Knipmeyer and Rinker do not qualify as prior art to the ’141 patent claims.....	15
	C. To the extent that the Board determines that Knipmeyer and Rinker do not provide written description support for the ’141 patent claims, Petitioner’s Grounds 1, 5, 7, and 8, based on inherent anticipation by Knipmeyer and Rinker, fail.....	16
IV.	Petitioner’s Grounds based on Cutler ’483 fail to establish a reasonable likelihood of prevailing with respect to any challenged claim.....	17
	A. The Board should deny trial on Ground 2 because Petitioner has not met its burden to demonstrate inherent anticipation .....	18
	1. Patent Owner does not bear the burden to disprove inherency at this stage.....	18
	2. Petitioner’s inherency argument fails legally .....	22
	(a) Petitioner fails to demonstrate that Cutler ’483 inherently discloses the claimed FRAP factor .....	22
	(b) Petitioner has not demonstrated that Cutler ’483 discloses all the elements of claim 1 arranged as claimed.....	25
	B. The Board should deny trial on Grounds 3 and 4 because Petitioner fails to meet the legal standards for demonstrating that the challenged claims would have been obvious .....	27

*Patent Owner's Preliminary Response*  
*IPR2016-01893*

1.	Ground 3 fails to demonstrate that the '141 patent claims would have been obvious.....	28
2.	Ground 4 fails to demonstrate that the '141 patent claims would have been obvious.....	31
V.	The Grounds are redundant .....	32
VI.	Conclusion .....	34

Patent Owner Brita LP provides this preliminary response to Petitioner KAZ USA, Inc.'s Petition for *inter partes* review of U.S. Patent No. 8,167,141 ("the '141 patent"; EX1001) in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 42.107(a).

## **I. Introduction**

The Board should deny institution because the Petition falls far short of establishing a reasonable likelihood of prevailing with respect to any challenged claim. The challenged claims are generally directed to a gravity-fed water filter comprising at least activated carbon and a lead scavenger, wherein the filter achieves certain performance metrics. (EX1001, 34:6-26.) The patent arises from discoveries made by Brita LP, a company known for its innovative household water filter products.

Brita discovered and developed a new class of gravity-fed water filters that improve water safety by enhancing lead removal from drinking water while at the same time achieving flow rates suitable for a home water filtration system. Prior art water filters did not achieve these objectives because they often did not maintain their lead extraction properties over the expected life of the water filter and/or they failed to achieve the flow rates suitable for a gravity-fed water filter. (EX1001, 3:51 – 5:14.) The claimed gravity-fed water filters are an advancement over the art as measured by their ability to achieve the specified Filter Rate and Performance ("FRAP") factor, which takes into consideration the volume of the

filter media ( $V$ ), the average flow rate over the filter's lifetime ( $f$ ), and the concentration of lead present in effluent at the end of the filter's lifetime ( $c_e$ ).

The Petition raises eight grounds for challenging various claims of the '141 patent. Four of these grounds (Grounds 1, 5-8) rely on either Knipmeyer (EX1009) or Rinker (EX1004), the very applications to which the '141 patent claims priority. Because a priority application by definition is not prior art to a patent claiming the benefit of the earlier application, Petitioner first seeks to sever the priority chain by asserting that the '141 patent's priority applications lack written description support for the "FRAP factor or its very specific formulaic relationship between the variables contained therein." (Paper 1 at 19.) However, Petitioner also alleges that the FRAP factor "is merely a performance factor that accounts for various properties and/or characteristics of a tested water filter." (*Id.*) It then contradicts its own assertions by arguing that the same priority applications *inherently* disclose and *anticipate* gravity-fed filters having the claimed FRAP factor. (*Id.* at 23-29, 58-59.) Petitioner cannot have it both ways. It cannot argue that the inventors lacked possession of the claimed filters on the one hand, while arguing on the other hand that the inventors' disclosure of their filters in the priority documents are sufficient to anticipate.

If Knipmeyer and Rinker contain an inherent disclosure of gravity-fed water filters with the properties characterized by the claimed FRAP factor as Petitioner

# 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.