

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

FOX Factory, Inc.,  
Petitioner,

v.

SRAM, LLC,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2017-00118  
U.S. Patent No. 9,182,027

---

**PETITIONER'S RESPONSE TO  
PATENT OWNER'S OPENING BRIEF ON REMAND**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. Introduction.....1

II. Background.....2

III. Argument .....3

    A. SRAM Has Not Proven that the Claimed Combination, as  
    Opposed to Other Unclaimed X-Sync Features, Met the  
    Asserted Long-Felt Need .....3

    B. SRAM’s Additional Arguments Do Not Cure Its Failure to  
    Prove Nexus for Long-Felt Need .....9

    C. SRAM Cannot Prove a Nexus for Licenses (or Commercial  
    Acquiescence) .....11

    D. SRAM Has Failed to Prove a Nexus for Alleged Copying.....13

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Federal Cases</b>	
<i>In re Cree, Inc.</i> , 818 F.3d 694 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	8
<i>Echolochem, Inc. v. S. Cal. Edison Co.</i> , 227 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2000) .....	15
<i>Ethicon Endo-Surgery, Inc. v. Covidien LP</i> , 812 F.3d 1023 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	10
<i>EWP Corp. v. Reliance Universal Inc.</i> , 755 F.2d 898 (Fed. Cir. 1985) .....	13
<i>FOX Factory, Inc. v. SRAM, LLC</i> , 944 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2019) .....	<i>passim</i>
<i>George M. Martin Co. v. Alliance Mach. Sys. Int'l LLC</i> , 618 F.3d 1294 (Fed. Cir. 2010) .....	8
<i>In re GPAC, Inc.</i> , 57 F.3d 1573 (Fed. Cir. 1995) .....	13
<i>In re Huang</i> , 100 F.3d 135 (Fed. Cir. 1996) .....	8
<i>Iron Grip Barbell Co. v. USA Sports, Inc.</i> , 392 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2004) .....	11
<i>Leo Pharm. Prods. v. Rea</i> , 726 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....	10-11
<i>Perfect Web Techs., Inc. v. InfoUSA, Inc.</i> , 587 F.3d 1324 (Fed. Cir. 2009) .....	3, 8
<i>Shoes by Firebug LLC v. Stride Rite Children's Grp., LLC</i> , No. 2019-1622 (Fed. Cir. June 25, 2020) .....	13

*Standard Havens Prods., Inc. v. Gencor Indus., Inc.*,  
897 F.2d 511 (Fed. Cir. 1990) .....4

*Tokai Corp. v. Easton Enters., Inc.*,  
632 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....10

*Wm. Wrigley Jr. Co. v. Cadbury Adams USA LLC*,  
683 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....14

**PTAB Cases**

*Celltrion, Inc. v. Genentech, Inc.*,  
IPR2017-01121, Paper 90 (PTAB Oct. 3, 2018).....4

**Federal Rules**

Fed. R. Evid. 201 .....4

## I. Introduction

The Federal Circuit’s remand is clear: SRAM’s asserted secondary considerations evidence for its X-Sync chainring is not relevant to the Board’s obviousness determination unless SRAM can meet its burden to prove the evidence is the “*direct result* of the unique characteristics of the claimed invention,” the combination of inboard-offset, narrow-wide teeth. *FOX Factory, Inc. v. SRAM, LLC*, 944 F.3d 1366, 1373-74, 1378 (Fed. Cir. 2019) (emphasis added). SRAM has not and cannot meet this burden. SRAM has presented no evidence focusing on the effect, impact, or desirability of the inboard-offset, narrow-wide teeth feature of the X-Sync chainring. Nor has SRAM performed any testing to demonstrate the relative utility, significance, or specific contribution of that feature to the X-Sync’s performance, as opposed to the many other chain-retention features of the X-Sync.

Instead, SRAM’s evidence addresses the chain-retention abilities or “technology” of the X-Sync as a whole. But the Federal Circuit rejected that approach because the X-Sync includes many chain-retention features not claimed in the ’027 patent. *FOX*, 944 F.3d at 1374-76. Accordingly, the Federal Circuit specifically required SRAM to prove “that the evidence of secondary considerations is attributable to the claimed *combination* of wide and narrow teeth with inboard . . . offset teeth, as opposed to, for example, prior art features in isolation or unclaimed features.” *Id.* at 1378. SRAM has failed to meet that burden.

# 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.