

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 SUR-REPLY BRIEF ON REMAND

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	SRAM Has Failed to Meet Its Burden to Prove Nexus.....	1
II.	SRAM Has Not Proven the Long-Felt Need Was Solved as a “Direct Result” of the Claimed Combination, as Opposed to Other X-Sync Features.....	4
III.	SRAM Mischaracterizes the Law Regarding Licenses and Nexus.....	8
IV.	SRAM Both Ignores and Mischaracterizes Controlling Federal Circuit Law Regarding Copying.....	9
V.	The Challenged Claims Should Be Ruled Unpatentable.....	10

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Federal Cases	
<i>In re Cree, Inc.</i> , 818 F.3d 694 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	6
<i>In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Patent Litig.</i> , 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	7
<i>FOX Factory, Inc. v. SRAM, LLC</i> , 944 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2019)	<i>passim</i>
<i>In re Huang</i> , 100 F.3d 135 (Fed. Cir. 1996)	1, 3, 6
<i>Iron Grip Barbell Co. v. USA Sports, Inc.</i> , 392 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	8, 10
<i>J.T. Eaton & Co. v. Atl. Paste & Glue Co.</i> , 106 F.3d 1563 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	1
<i>Ormco Corp. v. Align Tech., Inc.</i> , 463 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	2
<i>Perfect Web Techs., Inc. v. InfoUSA, Inc.</i> , 587 F.3d 1324 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	5-6
<i>In re Piasecki</i> , 745 F.2d 1468 (Fed. Cir. 1984)	7
<i>Shoes by Firebug LLC v. Stride Rite Children’s Grp., LLC</i> , 962 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2020)	8
<i>WBIP, LLC v. Kohler Co.</i> , 829 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	3
<i>Wm. Wrigley Jr. Co. v. Cadbury Adams USA LLC</i> , 683 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	1, 9

Wyers v. Master Lock Co.,
616 F.3d 1231 (Fed. Cir. 2010)2

I. SRAM Has Failed to Meet Its Burden to Prove Nexus.

The burden on remand is entirely on SRAM to prove, if it can, “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 [in the X-Sync].” *FOX Factory, Inc. v. SRAM, LLC*, 944 F.3d 1366, 1378 (Fed. Cir. 2019) (bold type added). This means that SRAM must prove that its secondary considerations evidence is the “*direct result* of the unique characteristics of the claimed invention,” i.e., the combination of inboard offset, narrow-wide teeth, not the X-Sync. *Id.* at 1373-74 (quoting *In re Huang*, 100 F.3d 135, 140 (Fed. Cir. 1996)) (emphasis added); *see also Wm. Wrigley Jr. Co. v. Cadbury Adams USA LLC*, 683 F.3d 1356, 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2012) (finding lack of nexus where patentee failed to show the claimed combination “led to” copying); *J.T. Eaton & Co. v. Atl. Paste & Glue Co.*, 106 F.3d 1563, 1571 (Fed. Cir. 1997) (requiring patentee to show that the commercial success of the product “results from” the claimed invention).

SRAM has not met its burden to prove direct nexus. More specifically, it has not proven that the claimed inboard offset, narrow-wide teeth combination was “directly” responsible for (*FOX*, 944 F.3d at 1373-74) or “led to” (*Wrigley*, 683 F.3d at 1364) its secondary considerations evidence. SRAM tries to disguise its failure of proof by devoting most of its papers to rehashing its secondary considerations

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.