

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

JOHNS MANVILLE CORPORATION AND JOHNS MANVILLE, INC.
Petitioners

v.

KNAUF INSULATION, INC. AND KNAUF INSULATION SPRL
Patent Owners

Case No. IPR2018-00805

PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW

OF

U.S. PATENT NO. 9,469,747

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
A.	Summary of Reasons for Requested Relief	1
B.	The '747 Patent	2
1.	Overview	2
2.	Priority Date	2
3.	Prosecution History	4
II.	IDENTIFICATION OF CHALLENGES	6
A.	Challenged Claims	6
B.	Statutory Grounds for Challenges	6
III.	PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	7
IV.	LEGAL STANDARDS	8
A.	Anticipation	8
B.	Obviousness	8
V.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	10
A.	“Consists Essentially Of”	11
B.	“Amine or Amine Reactant”	15
VI.	IDENTIFICATION OF HOW THE CLAIMS ARE UNPATENTABLE....	17
A.	Ground #1: Claims 1, 4, 7, 9, 16, 21, 25, 33 and 38-40 Are Anticipated by Swift.....	17
1.	Brief Summary of Swift.....	17
2.	Claim 1	18
3.	Claim 4, Limitation “in which curing of the binder is carried out by passing the batt through at least one zone of a curing oven at a temperature within the range 230° C.-300° C. with an oven residence time in the range 30 seconds to 20 minutes” ...	25
4.	Claim 7, Limitation “in which the acid precursor comprises an inorganic salt”	26

5.	Claim 9, Limitation “in which the carbohydrate reactant of the binder solution consists essentially of dextrose”	26
6.	Claim 16, Limitation “in which the cured binder comprises melanoidins”	27
7.	Claim 21, Limitation “in which the cured binder is substantially water insoluble”	28
8.	Claim 25, Limitation “in which the reaction of the binder upon curing is essentially a Maillard type reaction”	28
9.	Claim 33, Limitation “in which the acid precursor comprises an ammonium salt”	28
10.	Claim 38, Limitation “in which the glass fibre thermal insulation product has a thickness of greater than 15 mm and less than 350 mm”	29
11.	Claim 39, Limitation “in which the glass fibre thermal insulation product has a thermal conductivity λ of less than 0.05 W/mK and greater than 0.02 W/mK”	29
12.	Claim 40, Limitation “further comprising compressing the cured bans [sic, batts] in a pack”	30
B.	Ground #2: Claims 1, 4, 7, 9, 16, 21, 25, 33 and 38-40 Are Obvious over Swift.	30
1.	It Would Have Been Obvious to One of Ordinary Skill in the Art to Use MAP as a Nitrogen-Containing Reactant in the Binder.....	30
2.	It Would Have Been Obvious to One of Ordinary Skill in the Art to Manufacture “A Glass Fibre Thermal Insulation Product which Comprises less than 99% by Weight and more than 80% by Weight Glass Fibres” As in Claim 1.....	32
3.	Swift Renders Claim 4 Obvious	33
4.	Swift Renders Claim 9 Obvious	34
C.	Ground #3: Claims 1, 4, 7, 9, 16, 21, 25, 33, 38-40, 44 and 47-49 are Obvious over Swift (Ex. 1003) in view of Gogek (Ex. 1004).	35

1.	Brief Summary of Gogek (Ex. 1004).....	36
2.	Overarching Reasons to Combine Gogek and Swift	36
3.	Claims 1, 4, 7, 9, 16, 21, 25, 33 and 38-40.....	40
4.	Claim 44	43
5.	Claim 47, Limitation “in which the acid precursor comprises an ammonium salt”	49
6.	Claim 48, Limitation “wherein the ammonium salt comprises an ammonium sulphate salt”	49
7.	Claim 49, Limitation “wherein the ammonium salt comprises an ammonium phosphate salt”	50
D.	Ground #4: Claims 1, 4, 7, 9, 16, 21, 25, 33 and 38-40 are Obvious over Swift (Ex. 1003) in view of Worthington (Ex. 1005).....	50
1.	Brief Summary of Worthington (Ex. 1005).....	51
2.	Overarching Reasons to Combine Worthington and Swift	51
3.	Claims 1, 4, 7, 9, 16, 21, 25, 33 and 38-40.....	53
VII.	CONCLUSION.....	55
VIII.	MANDATORY NOTICES	56
A.	Real Party in Interest	56
B.	Related Matters.....	56
C.	Fee	56
D.	Service Information.....	57
E.	Power of Attorney	57
F.	Standing.....	57

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Atlas Powder Co. v. E.I. du Pont De Nemours & Co.</i> , 750 F.2d 1569 (Fed. Cir. 1984)	12
<i>ClearValue, Inc. v. Pearl River Polymers, Inc.</i> , 668 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	25, 26
<i>Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee</i> , 136 S. Ct. 2131 (2016).....	11
<i>Ex parte Davis</i> , 80 U.S.P.Q. 448 (Pat. Off. Bd. App. 1949).....	11
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co. of Kansas City</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	9
<i>In re Guess</i> , 347 Fed.Appx. 558 (Fed. Cir. June 9, 2009)	26
<i>In re Herz</i> , 537 F.2d 549 (C.C.P.A. 1976).....	11, 12, 13
<i>In re Hilmer</i> , 359 F.2d 859 (C.C.P.A. 1966)	3
<i>Ineos USA LLC v. Berry Plastics Corp.</i> , 783 F.3d 865 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	19, 25, 26
<i>In re Janakirama-Rao</i> , 317 F.2d 951 (C.C.P.A. 1963).....	12, 14
<i>Johns Manville Corporation v. Knauf Insulation, Inc.</i> , IPR No. 2015-01402 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 19, 2016)	39
<i>Kennametal, Inc. v. Ingersoll Cutting Tool Co.</i> , 780 F.3d 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	8
<i>Ex Parte Knauf Insulation, Inc.</i> , No. 2016-006369 (P.T.A.B. Sep. 30, 2016)	51

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.