

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

C&D ZODIAC, INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

B/E AEROSPACE, INC.,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2017-01275  
Patent 9,073,641 B2

---

Before JENNIFER S. BISK, SCOTT A. DANIELS, and  
RICHARD H. MARSCHALL, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

BISK, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

FINAL WRITTEN DECISION  
*35 U.S.C. § 318(a) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.73*

## I. INTRODUCTION

C&D Zodiac, Inc. (“Petitioner”), filed a petition to institute an *inter partes* review of claims 1, 3–10, and 12–17 of U.S. Patent No. 9,073,641 B2 (Ex. 1001, “the ’641 patent”). Paper 2 (“Pet.”). 35 U.S.C. § 311. B/E Aerospace, Inc. (“Patent Owner”), filed a Preliminary Response. Papers 6, 7 (“Prelim. Resp.”).<sup>1</sup> Upon consideration of the Petition and Preliminary Response, we instituted an *inter partes* review pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 314, as to claims 1, 3–10, and 12–17. Paper 12 (“Inst. Dec.”).

Subsequent to institution, Patent Owner filed a Patent Owner Response (Paper 20, 21, “PO Resp.”)<sup>2</sup> and Petitioner filed a Reply to Patent Owner’s Response (Paper 28, “Reply”). Patent Owner filed a Motion to Exclude (Paper 34, “Mot. Exclude”), Petitioner filed an Opposition to Patent Owner’s Motion (Paper 37, “Opp.”), and Patent Owner filed a Reply (Paper 38, “PO Reply to Mot. Exclude”). Patent Owner also filed two unopposed Motions to Seal. Papers 8, 22.

On June 28, 2018, in response to the Board’s Orders instituting on Ground 2 based on the Supreme Court’s decision in *SAS Institute Inc. v. Iancu*, 138 S. Ct. 1348 (2018), Petitioner filed a Request for Partial Adverse Judgment against itself with respect to Ground 2, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.73(b). *See* Paper 30 (modifying institution decision to institute on all challenged grounds presented in Petition); Paper 33 (Petitioner’s Request for

---

<sup>1</sup> Patent Owner filed two versions of the Preliminary Response: Paper 6, to which access is restricted to the parties and the Board; and Paper 7, a publicly available, redacted version of Paper 6.

<sup>2</sup> Patent Owner filed two versions of the Patent Owner Response: Paper 20, to which access is restricted to the parties and the Board; and Paper 21, a publicly available, redacted version of Paper 20.

IPR2017-01275  
Patent 9,073,641 B2

Partial Adverse Judgment as to Ground 2). We granted Petitioner’s Request for Partial Adverse Judgment on July 5, 2018. Paper 36 (granting adverse judgment as to Ground 2).

On August 3, 2018, we held an oral hearing. Paper 40 (“Tr.”).<sup>3</sup>

This Final Written Decision is entered pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 318(a). For the reasons that follow, we determine that Petitioner has demonstrated by a preponderance of the evidence that claims 1, 3–10, and 12–17 of the ’641 patent are unpatentable.

#### A. Related Matters

Patent Owner asserted the ’641 patent along with related patents, U.S. Patent Nos. 9,444,742, 9,365,292, 9,434,476, and D764,031, against Petitioner in *B/E Aerospace, Inc. v. Zodiac Aerospace, Inc.*, No. 2:14-cv-01417 (E.D. Tex.) (the “district court litigation”), that is currently stayed. Pet. 2; Paper 5, 2. All five of these patents claim priority to a U.S. application that issued as U.S. Patent No. 8,590,838 (“the ’838 patent”), which patent was the subject of Case IPR2014-00727 between Petitioner and Patent Owner. In the final written decision in that case, the Board held that claims 1, 3–7, 9, 10, 12–14, 16–19, 21, 22, 24–29, 31, and 33–37 had been proven unpatentable, and claims 8, 20, 30, and 38 had not been proven unpatentable. IPR2014-00727, Paper 65. Both sides appealed, and the Court of Appeals affirmed. *See B/E Aerospace, Inc. v. C&D Zodiac, Inc.*, 709 F. App’x 687, 2017 WL 4387223 (Fed. Cir. Oct. 3, 2017).

---

<sup>3</sup> The oral hearing included related proceedings, IPR2017-01276 and PGR2017-00019. Paper 40.

Each of the additional four related patents identified above is the subject of a petition for an *inter partes* or post-grant review filed by Petitioner. *See* Cases IPR2017-01273 (involving Patent 9,434,476); IPR2017-01274 (involving Patent 9,365,292); IPR2017-01276 (involving Patent 9,440,742); PGR2017-00019 (involving Patent D764,031).

### B. The '641 Patent

The '641 patent relates to space-saving aircraft enclosures, including lavatories, closets, and galleys. Ex. 1001, 1:15–20, 2:14–19. Figure 2 of the '641 patent is reproduced below.




Figure 2, reproduced above, illustrates enclosure 10, such as a lavatory, positioned aft of aircraft cabin 12. Ex. 1001, 4:1–3, 4:8–13. The lavatory has walls that define interior lavatory space 30. *Id.* at 4:15–24. Forward wall 28 of the lavatory is described as “substantially not flat in a

vertical plane” and “disposed immediately aft of and adjacent to or abutting the exterior aft surface of” passenger seat 16. *Id.* at 4:15–24. In particular, the forward wall is shaped to provide recess 34, which accommodates the partially-reclined backrest of the passenger seat, as shown in Figure 2. *Id.* at 4:24–28. In addition, the forward wall is shaped to also provide second, lower recess 100, which accommodates “at least a portion of an aft-extending seat support 17.” *Id.* at 4:31–36.

The ’641 patent contrasts the embodiment of Figure 2 with a prior art configuration shown in Figure 1, which is reproduced below.

**FIG. 1**  
(Prior Art)




Figure 1, reproduced above, illustrates “a prior art installation of an [aircraft] lavatory immediately aft of and adjacent to an aircraft passenger seat.” Ex. 1001, 3:65–67. In the depiction of the prior art in Figure 1, a forward wall of the lavatory (double-lined structure immediately aft of seat) is flat and in a vertical plane.

As can be seen by comparing FIG. 1 and FIG. 2, the recess 34 and the lower recess 100 combine to permit the passenger seat 16 to be positioned farther aft in the cabin than would be possible if the lavatory enclosure 10 included a conventional flat and

# 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.