

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

IRADION LASER, INC.
Petitioner,

v.

NOVANTA CORPORATION
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2017-00244
Patent 6,198,759

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE
TO PETITION PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.107**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	IPR SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE PETITION IS NOT TIMELY	2
A.	Petitioner Must File Petition within 1 year of Service of a Complaint Alleging Infringement	2
B.	Background Facts and Related Litigation	4
C.	The IPR Petition is Not Timely	6
III.	IPR SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE PETITIONER FAILS TO PROVIDE MEANINGFUL EVIDENCE THAT SUPPORTS ITS ALLEGATIONS.....	8
A.	No Expert Declaration.....	8
B.	No Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art	8
IV.	RESPONSE TO SUBSTANTIVE GROUNDS	11
A.	The Technology of the '759 Patent	11
1.	Introduction to Lasers	11
2.	State of the Art of Waveguide Lasers in 1999.....	16
3.	Overview of the '759 Patent	16
B.	Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art	20
C.	Claim Construction.....	21
D.	Alleged Prior Art.....	23
4.	Opower.....	23
5.	Vitruk	25
E.	GROUND 1: Claims 11, 14, 24, 26, and 28 are Not Anticipated by Opower	25

1.	Claims 11 and 14 – Opower lacks “the lasing media sections being shaped to have continuous variations in thickness along the longitudinal axis....”	25
2.	Claim 11 and 14 – Opower lacks “the first inner surface and the second inner surface being shaped along the longitudinal axis to have continuous variation in the inter-electrode gap.”	29
3.	Claim 14 – Opower lacks “the thickness of one of the lasing media sections at a first longitudinal position along the longitudinal axis is at least 10% different than the thickness of one of the other lasing media sections at a second longitudinal position along the longitudinal axis.”	30
4.	Claims 24, 26, and 28 – Opower lacks “varying the thickness of the lasing media sections to have continuous variations for portions of one or more sections of the set of lasing media sections along their respective longitudinal axes.”	31
5.	Claim 26 – Opower lacks “forming the lasing media sections to be symmetric with respect to one or more of the longitudinal axes.”	31
6.	Claim 28 – Opower lacks “forming one of the lasing media sections so that its thickness at a first longitudinal position is at least 15% different than one of the lasing media sections at a second longitudinal position.”	33
F.	GROUND 2: Claims 11, 14, 24, 26, and 28 are Not Anticipated by Vitruk.....	33
1.	Claims 11 and 14 – Vitruk lacks “the lasing media sections being shaped to have continuous variations in thickness along the longitudinal axis....”	33
2.	Claim 11 and 14 – Vitruk lacks “the first inner surface and the second inner surface being shaped along the longitudinal axis to have continuous variation in the inter-electrode gap.”	36
3.	Claim 14 – Vitruk lacks “the thickness of one of the lasing media sections at a first longitudinal position along the	

	longitudinal axis is at least 10% different than the thickness of one of the other lasing media sections at a second longitudinal position along the longitudinal axis.”	36
4.	Claims 24, 26, and 28 – Vitruk lacks “varying the thickness of the lasing media sections to have continuous variations for portions of one or more sections of the set of lasing media sections along their respective longitudinal axes.”	37
5.	Claim 26 – Vitruk lacks “forming the lasing media sections to be symmetric with respect to one or more of the longitudinal axes.”	37
6.	Claim 28 – Vitruk lacks “forming one of the lasing media sections so that its thickness at a first longitudinal position is at least 15% different than one of the lasing media sections at a second longitudinal position.”	38
G.	GROUND 3: Claims 11, 14, 24, 26, and 28 are Not Obvious over Opower and/or Vitruk	38
1.	No Motivation to Combine	38
2.	Claims 11 and 14 – Opower and/or Vitruk do not teach or render obvious “the lasing media sections being shaped to have continuous variations in thickness along the longitudinal axis....”	41
3.	Claim 11 and 14 – Opower and/or Vitruk do not teach or render obvious “the first inner surface and the second inner surface being shaped along the longitudinal axis to have continuous variation in the inter-electrode gap.”	42
4.	Claim 14 – Opower and/or Vitruk do not teach or render obvious “the thickness of one of the lasing media sections at a first longitudinal position along the longitudinal axis is at least 10% different than the thickness of one of the other lasing media sections at a second longitudinal position along the longitudinal axis.”	44

5.	Claims 24, 26, and 28 – Opower and/or Vitruk do not teach or render obvious “varying the thickness of the lasing media sections to have continuous variations for portions of one or more sections of the set of lasing media sections along their respective longitudinal axes.”	45
6.	Claim 26 – Opower and/or Vitruk do not teach or render obvious “forming the lasing media sections to be symmetric with respect to one or more of the longitudinal axes.”	46
7.	Claim 28 – Opower and/or Vitruk do not teach or render obvious “forming one of the lasing media sections so that its thickness at a first longitudinal position is at least 15% different than one of the lasing media sections at a second longitudinal position.”	47
V.	CONCLUSION.....	48

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.