

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

COOPER CROUSE-HINDS, LLC  
Petitioner

v.

CMP PRODUCTS LIMITED,  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2018-00994  
Patent 8,872,027

---

Filed: August 15, 2018

**PATENT OWNER CMP PRODUCTS LIMITED'S PRELIMINARY  
RESPONSE**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No.
I. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF THE RESPONSE .....	1
II. THE '027 PATENT .....	5
A. STATE OF THE INDUSTRY PRIOR TO THE INVENTION .....	5
B. THE DISCLOSURE OF THE '027 PATENT .....	8
C. SUMMARY OF THE PROSECUTION HISTORY OF THE '027 PATENT .....	12
III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	17
1. "Cable Gland" .....	17
2. "Plurality of Cores of Cable" .....	19
3. "Elongated Dispenser" .....	20
4. "Resin Well" .....	21
IV. THE PETITION FAILS TO ASSERT A BASIS FOR INSTITUTING A TRIAL.....	22
A. PETITIONER MUST DEMONSTRATE A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD IT WOULD PREVAIL .....	22
B. THE BOARD MUST TAKE INTO ACCOUNT WHETHER SUBSTANTIALLY THE SAME PRIOR ART OR ARGUMENTS WERE CONSIDERED BY THE PTO .....	22
C. THE LAW ON OBVIOUSNESS .....	24
D. THE LEVEL OF SKILL IN THE ART .....	25
V. GROUND 1: THE COMBINATION OF <i>BABIARZ</i> AND <i>EVERITT</i> FAILS TO RENDER CLAIMS 1, 2, 4 AND 10-13 OBVIOUS.....	26
A. THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN <i>BABIARZ</i> AND <i>EVERITT</i> AND THE CLAIMED INVENTIONS.....	26
1. <i>Babiarz</i> .....	26

- 2. The CHICO SpeedSeal Product Manual .....30
- 3. *Everitt*.....33
- B. THE COMBINATION OF *BABIARZ* AND *EVERITT* FAILED TO DISCLOSE MULTIPLE ELEMENTS OF CLAIMS 1, 2, 4 AND 10-13.....39
  - 1. The Combination Does Not Disclose “at least one flexible barrier member having at least one respective aperture therethrough adapted to stretch to engage a plurality of cores of a cable...” Claim Element 1[7].....40
  - 2. The Combination of *Babiarz* and *Everitt* Does Not Disclose a “Curable Liquid Component” in a cable gland Claim Element 1[1] .....42
  - 3. The Combination of *Babiarz* And *Everitt* Would Not Disclose or Teach the Recited “Second Barrier Apparatus” or “Dispenser Apparatus” Claim Element 1[6] .....44
- C. PETITIONER PROVIDES NO RATIONALE TO COMBINE *BABIARZ* AND *EVERITT* .....45
- D. PETITIONERS’ HINDSIGHT ANALYSIS WOULD NOT HAVE MOTIVED ONE OF ORDINARY SKILL TO COMBINE *BABIARZ* WITH *EVERITT* .....48
- VI. GROUND 2 FAILS TO PROVIDE ANY RATIONALE BASIS TO RENDER CLAIM 5 OBVIOUS.....49
- VII. GROUND 3: THE COMBINATION OF *BABIARZ*, *EVERITT*, AND *WIDMAN* FAIL TO TEACH OR DISCLOSE THE ELEMENTS OF CLAIMS 14-19 OF THE ‘027 PATENT .....50
  - A. THE SCOPE AND CONTENT OF *WIDMAN*.....50
    - 1. *Widman*’s Membrane (Like *Everitt*) Fails to Disclose the Claimed “flexible barrier member...” .....50
    - 2. *Widman* Does not Disclose a Curable Liquid Component to Expel Air .....51

- 3. *Widman* Does Not Disclose an Aperture that Engages the Cores of a Cable .....52
- B. PETITIONER FAILS TO PROVIDE ANY RATIONALE TO COMBINE *BABIARZ*, *EVERITT* AND *WIDMAN*.....54
- C. PETITIONER FAILS TO DEMONSTRATE HOW THE COMBINATION OF *WIDMAN*, *BABIARZ* AND *EVERITT* RENDER OBVIOUS ELEMENTS OF CLAIMS 14-19.....56
  - 1. There is No Disclosure of the “flexible barrier member” or “engaging a plurality of cores of a cable” Claim Elements 14[8], 16[2] and 16[3].....56
  - 2. *Widman*, *Babiarz* and *Everitt* Do Not Teach Dispensing a Curable Liquid to Expel Air from the Cable Gland Claim Elements 14[10], 16(preamble) and 16[1].....57
- D. THE NATIONAL ELECTRIC CODE (“NEC”) DOES NOT PROVIDE A MOTIVATION FOR ARRIVING AT THE CLAIMED INVENTIONS .....59
- VIII. GROUND 4: THE COMBINATION OF *3M* AND *WIDMAN* FAIL TO RENDER CLAIMS 1, 2, 4, 14 AND 16-19 OBVIOUS .....60
  - A. THE *3M* PRODUCT CATALOG.....60
  - B. THERE IS NO RATIONALE TO COMBINE *3M* WITH *WIDMAN* .....61
  - C. THE COMBINATION OF *3M* AND *WIDMAN* FAILS TO DISCLOSE ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS OF CLAIMS 1, 2, 4, 14 AND 16-19 .....62
- IX. GROUND 5: THE COMBINATION OF *3M*, *WIDMAN* AND *DUNN* FAILS TO RENDER CLAIM 5 OBVIOUS .....64
- X. GROUND 6: THE COMBINATION OF *3M*, *WIDMAN* AND *EVERITT* FAILS TO RENDER CLAIMS 10-13 AND 15 OBVIOUS.....64
- XI. SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS WEIGH AGAINST A FINDING OF OBVIOUSNESS .....64
  - A. CROUSE-HINDS COPIED CMP PRODUCTS’ CABLE GLANDS .....65
  - B. INDUSTRY PRAISE WEIGHS IN FAVOR OF NON-OBVIOUSNESS.....66

XII. CONCLUSION.....68

# 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.