

Filed: March 1, 2017

Filed on behalf of Meras Engineering, Inc.

By: Michelle E. Armond

Bridget A. Smith

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

2040 Main Street, 14th Floor

Irvine, CA 92614

Telephone: 949-760-0404

Facsimile: 949-760-9502

Email: BoxMERAS@knobbe.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MERAS ENGINEERING, INC.,

Petitioner,

v.

CH₂O, INC.,

Patent Owner.

Case No. IPR2017-01000

U.S. Patent No. RE45,550

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW
OF U.S. PATENT NO. RE45,550**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No.
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. MANDATORY NOTICES PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(a)(1).....	2
A. Real Party-In-Interest (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1))	2
B. Related Matters (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2)).....	2
C. Lead and Backup Counsel (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3)).....	3
D. Service Information (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4))	4
III. PAYMENT OF FEES PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.103	4
IV. REQUIREMENTS FOR REVIEW UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.104	4
A. Grounds for Standing (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a))	4
B. Claims and Statutory Grounds (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(1) & (b)(2))	5
C. Claim Construction (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(3)).....	6
D. Unpatentability of Construed Claims (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(4))	6
E. Supporting Evidence (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(5)).....	6
V. THERE IS MORE THAN A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT THE CLAIMS OF the RE550 PATENT ARE UNPATENTABLE.....	7
A. Legal Standard for Obviousness	7
B. The Purported Invention of the RE550 Patent	7
C. Overview of Iverson (Ex. 1002).....	8
D. Overview of Miller (Ex. 1003).....	9
E. Overview the Prosecution History of the RE550 Patent.....	10
1. Original Prosecution of the '266 Patent.....	11
2. Reexamination Proceedings for '266 Patent.....	11

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(cont'd.)

	Page No.
3. Reissue Proceedings on '266 Patent Resulting In The RE550 Patent.....	14
F. Overview of Prior Litigation Involving Iverson	15
G. This IPR Is Not Redundant In View of the Prior Patent Office Proceedings	16
H. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	19
I. Claim Construction	19
J. Ground: Claims 1, 5-10, and 13-27 Are Obvious Over Iverson In View of Miller.....	20
1. Differences Between The Prior Art And The RE550 Patent.....	20
a. “a drip irrigation network comprising intermittent water flow and designed to supply irrigation water . . . to plants” (Claims 1, 10).....	20
b. “discharge emitters” (Claims 1, 10)	21
c. “HEDP” (Claim 8).....	22
2. Claims 1 and 10 Are Obvious Because CH ₂ O Admits that Iverson Does Not Require Solely A “Fast” Reaction	23
3. Claims 13 and 22 Are Obvious Because Iverson Discloses A Concentration of Chlorine Dioxide Within the Claimed Range.....	24
4. Claims 10[e2], 14-19, 21, and 23-26 Are Obvious Because The Claimed Concentrations Could Readily Have Been Achieved Through Routine Experimentation	26

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(cont'd.)

	Page No.
5. Reasons to Combine Iverson and Miller.....	29
a. Drip Irrigation Systems And Emitters	30
b. Use Of The Phosphonate HEDP.....	31
c. Additional Reasons To Combine Iverson And Miller	32
6. Claim Charts	33
K. Secondary Considerations, Even if Considered, Fail to Overcome the <i>Prima Facie</i> Evidence of Obviousness	63
VI. CONCLUSION.....	64

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page No(s).
<i>In re Aller</i> , 220 F.2d 454 (C.C.P.A. 1955)	27, 28, 29
<i>Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee</i> , 136 S. Ct. 2131 (2016).....	19
<i>In re Geisler</i> , 116 F.3d 1465 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	25, 27
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	7
<i>KSR Int’l v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	7
<i>Leapfrog Enters. v. Fisher-Price</i> , 485 F.3d 1157 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	63
<i>Newell Cos. v. Kenney Mfg.</i> , 864 F.2d 757 (Fed. Cir. 1988)	63
<i>In re Peterson</i> , 315 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	25, 27
<i>Purdue Pharma v. Epic Pharma</i> , 811 F.3d 1345 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	22
<i>Stamps.com v. Endicia</i> , 437 F. App’x 897 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	63
<i>In re Woodruff</i> , 919 F.2d 1575 (Fed. Cir. 1990)	25, 27

OTHER AUTHORITIES

35 U.S.C. § 102	1, 5
35 U.S.C. § 103	5, 6, 7

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.