

Inter Partes Review of U.S. Patent No. 7,510,327

Filed on behalf of Global Strategies, Inc.

By: Daniel H. Landau (dlandau@hayes-soloway.com)

Todd A. Sullivan (tsullivan@hayes-soloway.com)

Hayes Soloway P.C.

4640 E. Skyline Drive

Tucson, AZ 85718

Tel: (520) 882-7623

Fax: (520) 882-7643

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

INTERBULK USA, LLC d/b/a INTERBULK EXPRESS,
Petitioner

v.

GLOBAL STRATEGIES, INC.,
Patent Owner

Case IPR 2018-01197
Patent 7,510,327

Issued: March 31, 2009

Filed: March 14, 2005

Title: HIGH STRENGTH RIBBON-WOVEN DISPOSABLE BAG
FOR CONTAINING REFUSE

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Background.....	2
	A. Related Matters Under 37 C.F.R. §42.8(b)(2).....	2
	B. Brief Description Of The ‘327 Patent.....	3
	C. Request To Strike From The Petition.....	3
III.	Disclaimer Of Claims 17-20 Under 35 U.S.C. 253(a).....	4
IV.	Claim Construction.....	4
	A. Legal Overview.....	4
	B. “ribbons of flat polypropylene sheet devoid of low melting temperature bonding layers between the crossed ribbons”.....	5
	C. “wherein the stitch count for said bag is 100 per inch”.....	6
V.	Grounds Raised In The Petition.....	7
VI.	The Petition Fails To Demonstrate A Reasonable Likelihood Of Prevailing In Showing The Unpatentability Of Any Of The Challenged Claims.....	7
	A. The Petition Relies on Prior Art That is the Same as or Substantially the Same as Prior Art Considered in the Original Prosecution.....	8
	B. The Petition Fails To Show That Claims 1-12, 14, And 16 Are Obvious Over The Combination Of Slawinski, Chen, Planeta ‘665, And Abele As Alleged In Ground 1.....	12
	C. The Petition Fails To Show That Claims 13 And 15 Are Obvious Over The Combination Of Slawinski, Chen, Planeta ‘665, Abele, And Planeta ‘979 As Alleged In Ground 2.....	22
	D. The Petition Fails To Show That Claims 17-20 Are Obvious Over The Combination Of Slawinski, Chen, Hansen, And Planeta ‘665 As Alleged In Ground 3.....	26
VII.	Conclusion.....	27

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Ashland Oil, Inc. v. Delta Resins & Refractories, 776 F. 2d 281, 294 (Fed. Cir. 1985) 18

CCS Fitness, Inc. v. Brunswick Corp., 288 F.3d 1359, 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2002). 5

Cultec, Inc. v. Stormtech LLC, IPR2017-00777 10, 11

Global Strategies, Inc. v. InterBulk USA, LLC d/b/a InterBulk Express, No. 1:17-cv-12166-RGS (D. Mass) 3

In re Am. Acad. of Sci., 367 F.3d 1359, 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2004) 4

In re Bass, 314 F.3d 575, 577 (Fed. Cir. 2002) 4

In re GPAC Inc., 57 F.3d 1573, 1577-78 (Fed. Cir. 1995) 18

In re Wertheim, 541 F.2d 257, 263, 191 USPQ 90, 97 (CCPA 1976) 22

Intelligent Bio-Sys., Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd., 821 F.3d 1359, 1367-68 (Fed. Cir. 2016)..... 20

Jones v. Hardy, 727 F.2d 1524, 1530, 22 USPQ 1021, 1026 (Fed. Cir. 1984) 10

Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc., 688 F.3d 1342, 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2012) 20

Schering Corp. v. Geneva Pharms., Inc., 339 F.3d 1373, 1377 (Fed. Cir. 2003) ... 16

Stratoflex, Inc. v. Aeroquip Corp., 713 F.2d 1530, 218 USPQ 871 (Fed. Cir. 1983) 10

Unified Patents, Inc. v. Berman, IPR2016-01571 11

W.L. Gore & Assoc., Inc. v. Garlock, Inc., 721 F.2d 1540, 220 USPQ 303 (Fed. Cir. 1983), *cert. denied*, 469 U.S. 851 (1984) 25

Inter Partes Review of U.S. Patent No. 7,510,327

Rules

37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b) 4
37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(2) 3
37 C.F.R. § 42.107 2
37 C.F.R. §42.107(e) 4
37 C.F.R. §42.8(b)(2)..... 2
MPEP 2141.02(I)..... 10
MPEP 2141.02(II) 10
MPEP 2141.02(VI)..... 25
MPEP 2163.(I)(A) 21
Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48756, 48766 (Aug. 14, 2012) 4

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 103 7, 9
35 U.S.C. § 253(a)..... 4
35 U.S.C. § 313 2
35 U.S.C. § 314(a) (2013) 8
35 U.S.C. § 325(d)..... 1, 10
35 U.S.C. §314(a)..... 7, 27
35 U.S.C. §325(d)..... 1

Inter Partes Review of U.S. Patent No. 7,510,327

EXHIBIT LIST (37 C.F.R. § 42.63(e))

Exhibit	Description
Exhibit 2001	Stipulation of Dismissal of Related Litigation
Exhibit 2002	Statutory Disclaimer of Claims 17-20
Exhibit 2003	Website Describing Valeron Manufacturing Process

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.