

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

E. MISHAN & SONS, INC.,
PETITIONER,

V.

AVENUE INNOVATIONS, INC.,
PATENT OWNER.

CASE IPR2017-00140
PATENT 6,340,189

AVENUE INNOVATIONS, INC.'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE
37 C.F.R. § 42.107

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION	1
A. Patent-at-Issue	1
B. Petitioner’s Impermissible “Shortcuts”	2
C. Embodiments Illustrating Claim Limitations.....	3
1. First Embodiment.....	3
2. Second through Fourth Embodiments.....	4
3. Fifth Embodiment	5
4. Sixth Embodiment.....	6
5. Petitioner’s Incorrect Positions	7
a. Claim 2 vis-à-vis 6th Embodiment	7
b. Claim 1 relative to other Claims.....	8
II. PETITIONER’S REFERENCES ARE MISSING MANY IMPORTANT LIMITATIONS.....	8
A. Van Meter—A Couch-Supported Standing Aid	8
B. Bergsten—Bolt-On Standing Aide	10
C. Stuhlmacher—Vehicle Door Alignment Device	12
D. Baker—Tool for Opening Frozen Automobile Doors	13
III. AVENUE INNOVATION’S PRODUCT DISCLOSURE.....	13
IV. PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	15
V. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.....	15
A. Non-Means-Plus-Function Terms	15
B. Terms Governed by 35 U.S.C § 112 Para. 6.....	15
1. “securement means” (claim 1).....	16
2. “securement means” (claim 2).....	17
3. “securement means” (claim 3).....	19
4. “engagement means” (claim 20).....	20

VI. VAN METER OR COMBINATIONS WITH VAN METER AS A PRIMARY REFERENCE FAILS TO ANTICIPATE OR RENDER OBVIOUS	21
A. One Does Not Use Van Meter by Pulling Upward	21
B. Van Meter Does Not Move in Operation	23
C. Petitioner Cannot Ignore the Preamble Limitations	25
D. Petitioner Does Not Identify Corresponding Structure for “Removably Securing”	27
E. Petitioner Cannot Ignore Vehicle Limitations	28
VII. STUHLMACHER DOES NOT SUPPORT OBVIOUSNESS	30
A. Petitioner Fails to Do a Graham Analysis, Explaining Modifications and Motivation Therefor	30
1. Preamble Language Is Limiting in Claims 2–3 and 20	30
2. Petitioner Utterly Fails to Disclose How Van Meter Is Modified	30
3. Describing Stuhlmacher’s Two Embodiments Does Not Portray the Undisclosed Van Meter-Stuhlmacher Modified Device	31
a. Stuhlmacher’s First Embodiment Does Not Connect to The Striker and Blocks Entering/Exiting a Vehicle	31
b. Stuhlmacher’s Second Embodiment Remains Attached to the Door and Has a Hole or Arcuate Apertures Connection	32
c. Simply Replacing the End of Van Meter’s Embodiment with Stuhlmacher’s Disclosed Lock Pin Connections Would Not Meet the Claim Language	34
B. Petitioner Does Not Explain How Van Meter’s Structure Is Used to Meet the “Removably Securing” Limitation	35

C.	Petitioner’s Cross-Referencing Covers-Up Missing Analysis “Extension” and “Support” Limitations.....	36
D.	Petitioner Does Not Clarify How Van Meter-Stuhlmacher would Provide Support while Entering a Vehicle.....	38
E.	There is No Description How a Modified Device Still Meets the “Limited Movements” Limitations.....	39
VIII.	BAKER DOES NOT AMELIORATE VAN METER-STUHLMAKER ISSUES	40
A.	The Additional Preamble Language Cannot Be Ignored	40
B.	Van Meter in View Stuhlmacher or Stuhlmacher and Baker Do Not Teach Engagement of a Striker to Provide Required Functionality	41
C.	Petitioner Does Not Show How a Baker Modified Device Still “Provides Support”	45
D.	Dependent Claims 4–8 are Not Obvious.....	46
1.	Petitioner Uses Deceptively Modified Image to Allege Functionality.....	47
2.	Petitioner Addresses Wrong Dimension	48
IX.	SUBSTITUTING BERGSTEN FOR VAN METER AS A PRIMARY REFERENCE FAILS TO ANTICIPATE OR RENDER OBVIOUS	49
A.	Petitioner Fails to Conduct a Structural Equivalence Analysis	49
B.	Bergsten Is Only Used by Pulling Generally Up	53
C.	Bergsten-Stuhlmacher Does Not Teach “Limited Movement”	55
1.	Bergsten Does Not Suggest the Bar May Be Swung	55
2.	Petitioner Does Not Explain Motivation to Modify, or How to Modify Bergsten’s Device in light of Stuhlmacher.....	56

X. BAKER IS IRRELEVANT AND NOT USEFUL59

 A. Petitioner Does Not Explain the Baker-Modified Device
 against Claim 3 and 20’s Limitations.....61

 B. Dependent Claims 4–862

XI. CONCLUSION.....62

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.