

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

CULTEC, INC.,
Petitioner

v.

STORMTECH LLC,
Patent Owner

Case IPR2017-00777
Patent 9,255,394

**Patent Owner's Preliminary Response
to Petition for *Inter Partes* Review
of U.S. Patent No. 9,255,394**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Preliminary Statement	1
II.	The Patent Office Already Considered the Art and Arguments of Grounds 1-4	2
III.	The Board Should Deny Institution of Grounds 1-4 Because They Do Not Disclose or Suggest Crest Sub-Corrugations Terminating Below the Chamber Top as Recited in Claims 1-17.....	4
	A. Ground 1 Provides Nothing More Than an Incomplete Basis for Modifying <i>Cobb</i>	6
	B. The Board Should Deny Institution on Ground 2 Because <i>Fouss</i> Does Not Disclose or Suggest Sub-Corrugations Terminating Below the Chamber Top	9
	C. Ground 3 Fails to Provide a Basis for Institution Because <i>Ellis</i> Does Not Disclose or Suggest Sub-Corrugations Terminating Below the Chamber Top	12
	D. The Board Should Deny Institution on Ground 4 Because Petitioner Provides No Explanation for Combining <i>Cobb</i> , <i>Fouss</i> , and <i>Ellis</i>	15
IV.	The Board Should Deny Institution of Grounds 1-4 Because They Do Not Disclose or Suggest Valley Sub-Corrugations Terminating Above the Base as Recited in Claims 11 and 17-20	18
	A. Petitioner’s Referential Argument Does Not Account for the Language of Claim 18	19
	B. The Petition’s References Do Not Disclose or Suggest Terminating Valley Sub-Corrugations at an Elevation Above the Base	20
V.	The Board Should Not Institute Review on the Basis of Grounds 3 and 4 Because <i>Ellis</i> Is Nonanalogous Art	23
VI.	The Board Should Deny Institution of All Grounds Because <i>Cobb</i> Is Not Prior Art	27

- A. The Inventors Conceived the Claimed Invention Prior to *Cobb*'s Priority Date..... 28
 - 1. Claim 1 29
 - 2. Claim 2 37
 - 3. Claim 3 38
 - 4. Claim 4 39
 - 5. Claim 5 40
 - 6. Claim 6 41
 - 7. Claim 7 42
 - 8. Claim 9 43
 - 9. Claim 11 44
 - 10. Claim 12 45
 - 11. Claim 13 46
 - 12. Claim 14 47
 - 13. Claim 15 55
 - 14. Claim 16 56
 - 15. Claim 17 57
 - 16. Claim 18 58
 - 17. Claim 20 66
- B. The Inventors Reduced to Practice Claims 1-7, 9, 11-18, and 20 Before *Cobb* 67
- VII. The Board Should Exercise Its Discretion to Deny Redundant Grounds That Are Not Distinguished..... 68
- VIII. Conclusion 70

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**Page(s)****Federal Cases**

<i>Arendi S.A.R.L. v. Apple Inc.</i> , 832 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2016), <i>cert. denied sub nom. Google Inc. v. Arendi S.A.R.L.</i> , No. 16-626, 2017 WL 1040877 (U.S. Mar. 20, 2017)	8
<i>Coleman v. Dines</i> , 754 F.2d 353 (Fed. Cir. 1985)	28
<i>Fox Grp., Inc. v. Cree, Inc.</i> , 700 F.3d 1300 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	67
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co. of Kansas City</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	16, 22
<i>In re Bigio</i> , 381 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	23
<i>In re Clay</i> , 966 F.2d 656 (Fed. Cir. 1992)	23, 25
<i>In re Ellis</i> , 476 F.2d 1370 (C.C.P.A. 1973)	24
<i>In re ICON Health & Fitness, Inc.</i> , 496 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	25
<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	9
<i>In re Klein</i> , 647 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	23
<i>In re Van Os</i> , 844 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	16
<i>In re Wood</i> , 599 F.2d 1032 (C.C.P.A. 1979)	23

<i>Innovation Toys, LLC v. MGA Entm't, Inc.</i> , 637 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	23
<i>Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.</i> , 688 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	26
<i>Kridl v. McCormick</i> , 105 F.3d 1446 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	28
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	passim
<i>Pfaff v. Wells Elecs., Inc.</i> , 525 U.S. 55 (1998).....	27
<i>Plas-Pak Indus., Inc. v. Sulzer Mixpac AG</i> , 600 F. App'x 755 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	6
<i>Singh v. Brake</i> , 222 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	28
<i>Slip Track Sys., Inc. v. Metal-Lite, Inc.</i> , 304 F.3d 1256 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	28
<i>Teva Pharm. Indus. Ltd. v. AstraZeneca Pharm. LP</i> , 661 F.3d 1378 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	67
<i>Trivascular, Inc. v. Samuels</i> , 812 F.3d 1056 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	26
<i>Unigene Labs., Inc. v. Apotex, Inc.</i> , 655 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	16
Board Authority	
<i>2Wire, Inc. v. TQ Delta LLC</i> , IPR2015-00240, Paper 18 (P.T.A.B. May 29, 2015)	15
<i>Berk-Tek LLC v. Belden Techs. Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00057, Paper 21 (P.T.A.B. May 14, 2013)	69
<i>Conopco, Inc. v. Procter & Gamble Co.</i> , IPR2013-00505, Paper 9 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 12, 2014).....	69

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.