

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ALBAAD MASSUOT YITZHAK, LTD. AND ALBAAD USA, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

EDGEWELL PERSONAL CARE BRANDS, LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2017-00693
Patent 9,192,522 B2

PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE
PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.107(a)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. BACKGROUND	4
III. GROUND 1 – THE PETITION FAILS TO DEMONSTRATE A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT WADA ANTICIPATES ANY OF THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS.....	7
A. The Petition Fails to Demonstrate a Reasonable Likelihood that Wada Teaches Elements 1f and 9f in Challenged Independent Claims 1 and 9 (and challenged dependent claims 2, 4, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14).....	8
B. The Petitioner Fails to Demonstrate a Reasonable Likelihood that Wada Teaches Elements 1g, 9g, 22k, 27j, 34i, and 39g in Reference to Challenged Independent Claims 1, 9, 22, 27, 34, 39 (and dependent claims 2, 4, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 23, 25, 28, 29, 31, 33, and 35-37).....	11
1. The Petitioner’s First Argument Fails Because Wada’s Pledget Does Not Teach a Tapered Tip Having “a Length that is Less Than Said First Lengths of Said Plurality of Cuts”.....	12
2. The Petitioner’s Alternative “Obviousness” Argument Fails As Well.....	16
3. The Petition Fails To Demonstrate A Reasonable Likelihood That Wada Anticipates Challenged Claim 4, 25, 31 and 37	19
IV. GROUND 2 – THE PETITION FAILS TO DEMONSTRATE A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT WADA AND SO-CALLED “COMMON SENSE APPLICATION OF ROUTINE ENGINEERING PRINCIPLES” RENDER THE CLAIMS OBVIOUS.....	23
A. The Petitioner’s Argument for Claim 1 Fails to Comply with the Clarity Requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b), and is Only Supported by its Expert's Conclusory Statements.....	24

B.	The Petitioner’s Argument for Claims 22, 27, 29, 33, and 34 Fails to Comply with the Clarity Requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b) Because These Five Claims Lack the Claim Element at Issue	26
C.	The Petition Fails To Provide Any Analysis Explaining Why the Skilled Artisan Would be Motivated To Combine the Cited References Relative to Claims 4, 25, 31, and 37	27
V.	GROUND 3 – THE PETITION FAILS TO ESTABLISH A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT CLAIMS 15, 18, AND 21 ARE OBVIOUS IN LIGHT OF WADA AND HANKE.....	30
A.	Wada Fails to Teach the Pledget’s Tapered Tip Length is Less than the First Length of Cuts Defining the Applicator’s Petals.....	30
B.	Hanke Fails To Teach The Claimed Ejection Force	31
C.	The Petition Fails to Provide Any Motivation For Combining Hanke with Wada; In fact, Hanke Teaches Away From Wada	32
VI.	GROUND 4 – THE PETITION FAILS TO DEMONSTRATE A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT WADA AND SO-CALLED “COMMON SENSE” ENGINEERING PRINCIPLES RENDER AS OBVIOUS CLAIMS 15, 18, and 21	35
A.	The Cited References in Ground 4 Also Fail To Teach Claimed Ejection Force.....	35
B.	The Petition Again Lacks Any Analysis Supporting a Motivation To Combine Cited References	36
VII.	GROUND 5 – THE PETITION FAILS TO DEMONSTRATE A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT WADA, HANKE, AND VOSS RENDER AS OBVIOUS CHALLENGED CLAIM 16.....	37
VIII.	THE BOARD SHOULD NOT INSTITUTE <i>INTER PARTES</i> REVIEW.....	38

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
FEDERAL CASES	
<i>Avaya Inc., Dell Inc., Sony Corporation of America, and Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Network-1 Security Solutions Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00071, Paper 103 (PTAB May 22, 2014)	10
<i>Cutsforth, Inc. v. Motivepower, Inc.</i> 636 Fed. Appx. 575 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	18
<i>Ex parte Levy</i> , 17 U.S.P.Q.2d 1461 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1990).....	10
<i>Front Row Technologies, LLC v. MLB Advanced Media, L.P.</i> , IPR2015-01932, Paper 7 (PTAB Mar. 25, 2016)	28
<i>Hockerson-Halberstadt, Inc. v. Avia Group Int'l</i> , 222 F.3d 951 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	14
<i>In re Chitayat</i> , 408 F.2d 475 (CCPA 1969).....	14
<i>In re Gordon</i> , 733 F.2d 900 (Fed. Cir. 1984)	34
<i>In re Magnum Oil Tools Int'l, Ltd.</i> , 829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	37
<i>In re Rijckaert</i> , 9 F.3d 1531 (Fed. Cir. 1993)	10
<i>In re Wright</i> , 569 F.2d 1124 (CCPA 1977).....	14
<i>Jackel Int'l Ltd. v. Admar Int'l, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00979, Paper 7 (PTAB Oct. 1, 2015)	33
<i>Kartri Sales Co., Inc. v. Zahner Design Group, Ltd.</i> , IPR2016-01327, Paper 10 (PTAB Jan. 3, 2017)	18

KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.,
550 U.S. 398 (2007)36

Nautilus Hyosung Inc. v. Diebold, Inc.,
IPR2016-00633, Paper 9 (PTAB Aug. 22, 2016)33, 37

Nystrom v. TREX Co, Inc.,
424 F.3d 1136 (Fed. Cir. 2005)14, 22

*Securus Technologies, Inc. v. Global Tel*Link Corp.*,
IPR2016-00267, Paper 8 (PTAB Jun. 3, 2016)33

Spectrum Brands, Inc. v. Assa Abloy AB,
IPR2015-01563, Paper 7 (PTAB Jan. 15, 2016)28

Zepp Labs, Inc. v. Blast Motion, Inc.,
IPR2016-00672, Paper 8 (PTAB Aug. 29, 2016)18

ZTE Corp. v. ContentGuard Holdings, Inc.,
IPR2013-00137, Paper 58 (PTAB Jul. 1, 2014)10

REGULATIONS

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (“MPEP”), Ninth Ed., Rev. 07.2015,
Last Rev. Nov. 2015, § 2112 (IV), p. 2100-50..... 10

MPEP § 2125 (II), p. 2100-66 14

MPEP § 2143.01(V), p. 2100-16434

MPEP § 2144, p. 2100-167..... 18

MPEP § 2145(X)(2), p. 2100-196.....33

MPEP § 2141(III), p. 2100-13236, 37

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.