

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

R.J. REYNOLDS VAPOR COMPANY,
Petitioner,

v.

FONTEM HOLDINGS 1 B.V.,
Patent Owner.

Case No. **IPR2017-01641**
Patent No. **9,370,205**

**PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO PETITION FOR
INTER PARTES REVIEW**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. INTRODUCTION 1
- II. DISCUSSION 6
 - A. '205 Patent Priority Claim..... 6
 - B. Person of Ordinary Skill in The Art..... 7
 - C. '205 Patent Claims 8
 - D. Claim Construction 8
 - 1. “liquid supply” 9
 - E. The Petition Fails to Show a Reasonable Likelihood That the '205 Patent Claims Are Unpatentable..... 12
 - 1. Requirements for a priority claim 13
 - 2. The '576 PCT Application provides written description for the claims of the '205 Patent 15
 - a. The '576 PCT Application provides explicit written description for a vaporizing device comprising “a liquid supply” or “liquid absorbed in fiber material” in a tubular atomizer housing, as well as for a vaporizing device comprising no liquid 15
 - b. The '205 Patent claims do not need to recite every feature disclosed in the '576 PCT Application 19
 - c. A patent application’s written description is not limited to one embodiment where the specification expressly discloses other embodiments..... 28
 - d. The term “the invention” does not limit the disclosure of the '576 PCT Application to devices comprising a separate cigarette bottle assembly 33
 - e. Applicant’s amendments to the specification of the '521 Application do not limit the scope of the '576 PCT Application’s written description 37
 - f. Disclosure of a species can establish written description for an entire genus..... 44

g. Statements made during prosecution of an
unrelated application about an unrelated reference
do not limit the '576 PCT Application's written
description.....51

III. CONCLUSION.....53

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE.....54

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

<i>Absolute Software, Inc. v. Stealth Signal, Inc.</i> , 659 F.3d 1121 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	33, 34
<i>Anascape, Ltd. v. Nintendo of Am., Inc.</i> , 601 F.3d 133 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	41, 42
<i>Apple Inc. v. ContentGuard Holdings, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00457 , Paper 9, Decision Denying Institution of <i>Inter Partes</i> Review (P.T.A.B. June 30, 2015) (Ex. 2012)	21, 39
<i>Ariad Pharms, Inc v. Eli Lilly & Co.</i> , 598 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (en banc)	46, 47
<i>Bilstad v. Wakalopulos</i> , 386 F.3d 1116 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	44, 45, 47, 48, 50
<i>Carl Zeiss Stiftung v. Renishaw PLC</i> , 945 F.2d 1173 (Fed. Cir. 1991)	21
<i>Cordis Corp. v. Boston Scientific Corp.</i> , 188 F. App'x 984 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	passim
<i>Ethicon Endo-Surgery, Inc. v. U.S. Surgical Corp.</i> , 93 F.3d 1572 (Fed. Cir. 1996)	30
<i>Golight, Inc. v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.</i> , 355 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	19, 20, 34, 36
<i>Greene's Energy Group, LLC v. Oil States Energy Services, LLC</i> , IPR2014-00364, 2015 WL 2089119 (P.T.A.B. May 1, 2015)	20
<i>Hynix Semiconductor Inc. v. Rambus Inc.</i> , 645 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	28, 45, 46, 50
<i>ICU Med., Inc. v. Alaris Med. Sys.</i> , 558 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	27, 28

<i>Lockwood v. Am. Airlines, Inc.</i> , 107 F.3d 1565 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	51
<i>Research Corp. Technologies, Inc. v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , 627 F.3d 859 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	43, 44
<i>Revolution Eyewear, Inc. v. Aspex Eyewear, Inc.</i> , 563 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	3, 20, 23, 33
<i>Rexnord Corp. v. Laitram Corp.</i> , 274 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	47
<i>Rivera v. Int’l Trade Comm’n</i> , 857 F.3d 1315 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	25, 26, 27
<i>ScriptPro LLC v. Innovation Assoc. Inc.</i> , 833 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	20, 28, 29, 31, 37
<i>SRI Int’l v. Matsushita Elec. Corp. of Am.</i> , 775 F.2d 1107 (Fed. Cir. 1985)	3, 30
<i>Streck, Inc. v. Research & Diagnostic Sys. Inc.</i> , 665 F.3d 1269 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	47
<i>Ventana Med. Sys., Inc. v. Biogenex Labs, Inc.</i> , 473 F.3d 1173 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	20
STATUTES	
35 U.S.C. § 112	13, 21, 39
35 U.S.C. § 120	12, 14
35 U.S.C. § 325(d)	2
35 U.S.C. § 371	14
35 U.S.C. § 371(c)(1)-(5)	14
OTHER AUTHORITIES	
37 C.F.R. § 1.73	40

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.