

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

IRONRIDGE INC.

Petitioner

v.

RILLITO RIVER SOLAR LLC d/b/a ECOFASTEN SOLAR

Patent Owner

---

Case to be Assigned

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF**

**Claims 36, 38, 40, 42, and 43 of**

**Patent No. 6,526,701**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. MANDATORY NOTICES UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.8.....	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/Back-up Counsel Information - 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3) .....	3
D. Service Information - 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4) .....	3
III. GROUNDS FOR STANDING - 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a) .....	4
IV. TECHNOLOGY BACKGROUND.....	4
V. OVERVIEW OF THE ‘701 PATENT .....	5
A. The Specification.....	5
B. The file history of the ‘701 patent.....	9
1. Originally Filed Claims Leading to Challenged Claim 36 .....	9
2. The patent applicant disclosed a Product Advertisement in an IDS. ....	10
3. The patent examiner rejected claims 1 and 4 over the Product Advertisement, but allowed the “side wall” claim. ....	11
4. The patent applicants acquiesced to the examiner’s findings and narrowed their claims for allowance without argument.....	12
VI. THE PATENT OWNER ADMITTED THAT THE PRODUCT ADVERTISEMENT WAS PRIOR ART DURING THE UNDERLYING LITIGATION .....	13
VII. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	14
A. Person of ordinary skill in the art.....	14
B. Claim construction .....	15
1. “Connecting Element” is subject to construction under 35 U.S.C § 112, para. 6.....	16
2. Construction under 35 U.S.C. § 112, para. 6.....	17

VIII. OVERVIEW OF CHALLENGE AND RELIEF REQUESTED .....	20
A. Statement of Precise Relief Requested .....	20
IX. OVERVIEW OF THE PRIMARY REFERENCES .....	23
A. Product Advertisement .....	23
B. Alley, U.S. Patent No. 5,613,328 .....	24
C. Stearns, U.S. Patent No. 5,609,326 .....	25
X. EXPLANATION OF HOW THE CONSTRUED CLAIMS ARE UNPATENTABLE – 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(4).....	26
A. Claims 36, 38, 40, 42, and 43 are obvious in view of the disclosure of the Product Advertisement as a base reference. ....	26
1. CHALLENGE NOS. 1-4: Claims 36, 38, 40, and 43 were obvious over the Product Advertisement in view of any of Taylor, Hablutzel, Funaki, or Nichols .....	26
a. Claim 36 would have been obvious over the Product Advertisement in view of any of Taylor, Hablutzel, Funaki, or Nichols.....	26
(1) The Product Advertisement discloses limitation 36(a) – “A roof mount, comprising:” .....	27
(2) The Product Advertisement discloses limitation 36(b) – “a base member including a protrusion extending from a first surface of the base member, the base member including a connecting element,” .....	27
(3) Product Advertisement discloses limitation 36(c) – “an attachment mount defining a hollowed region for receiving the protrusion to form a compression fitting, wherein a substantially leak proof assembly is formed when the attachment mount is coupled to the base member by the connecting element with a sealing material placed between the attachment mount and the base member and the connecting element extends through the sealing material, and” .....	29

(4)	Limitation 36(d) is taught by the combination of the Product Advertisement and any of Taylor, Funaki, Hablutzel, and Nichols.....	32
(a)	The Product Advertisement discloses a block spacer.....	32
(b)	CHALLENGE NO. 1: The combination of the Product Advertisement and Taylor discloses all elements of limitation 36(d) – “a spacer for extending the base member to a roof surface, the spacer including a side wall of the base member.” .....	33
(c)	CHALLENGE NO. 2: The combination of the Product Advertisement and Funaki disclose all elements of limitation 36(d) – “a spacer for extending the base member to a roof surface, the spacer including a side wall of the base member.” .....	37
(d)	CHALLENGE NO. 3: The combination of the Product Advertisement and Hablutzel disclose all elements of limitation 36(d) – “a spacer for extending the base member to a roof surface, the spacer including a side wall of the base member.” .....	39
(e)	CHALLENGE NO. 4: The combination of the Product Advertisement and Nichols discloses all elements of limitation 36(d) – “a spacer for extending the base member to a roof surface, the spacer including a side wall of the base member.” .....	43
b.	Claim 38 would have been obvious over Product Advertisement in view of any of Taylor, Hablutzel, Funaki, or Nichols. ....	44

c.	Claim 40 would have been obvious over the Product Advertisement in view of any of Taylor, Hablutzel, Funaki, or Nichols.....	45
d.	Claim 43 would have been obvious over the Product Advertisement in view of any of Taylor, Hablutzel, Funaki, or Nichols.....	46
2.	CHALLENGE #5: Claim 42 would have been obvious over the Product Advertisement in view of any of Taylor, Hablutzel, Funaki, or Nichols and in further view of Ford. ....	47
B.	Claims 36, 38, 40, 42, and 43 are obvious over Alley, US Patent No. 5,613,328 as a base reference.....	49
1.	CHALLENGE NOS. 6-9– Claims 36, 40, and 43 would have been obvious over Alley in view of any of Taylor, Funaki, Hablutzel, or Nichols .....	49
a.	Claim 36 would have been obvious over Alley in view of any of Taylor, Funaki, Hablutzel, or Nichols .....	50
(1)	Alley discloses limitation 36(a) – “A roof mount, comprising:” .....	50
(2)	Alley discloses limitation 36(b) – “a base member including a protrusion extending from a first surface of the base member, the base member including a connecting element,” .....	50
(3)	Alley discloses limitation 36(c) – “an attachment mount defining a hollowed region for receiving the protrusion to form a compression fitting, wherein a substantially leak proof assembly is formed when the attachment mount is coupled to the base member by the connecting element with a sealing material placed between the attachment mount and the base member and the connecting element extends through the sealing material,” .....	52

# 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.