

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

EDGE ENDO, LLC,
Petitioner

v.

MICHAEL SCIANAMBLO,
Patent Owner

Case No. IPR2018-01322
U.S. Patent No. 9,351,803

PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW

Mail Stop PATENT BOARD
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
Submitted Electronically via the PTAB E2E System

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
EXHIBIT LIST	v
I. MANDATORY NOTICES (37 C.F.R. §42.8)	1
A. Real Party in Interest (37 C.F.R. §42.8(b)(1))	1
B. Related Matters (37 C.F.R. §42.8(b)(2))	1
C. Lead and Back-Up Counsel (37 C.F.R. §42.8(b)(3)) and Service Information (37 C.F.R. §42.8(b)(4))	2
II. PAYMENT OF FEES (37 C.F.R. §42.103)	2
III. REQUIREMENTS FOR <i>INTER PARTES</i> REVIEW (37 C.F.R. §42.104)	3
A. Grounds for Standing (37 C.F.R. §42.104(a))	3
B. Identification of Challenge (37 C.F.R. §42.104(b)(1)-(2)) and Relief Requested (37 C.F.R. §42.22(a)(1))	3
IV. BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY OF THE '803 PATENT	5
A. Overview of the '803 Patent	5
B. Prosecution History of the '803 Patent	6
V. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	9
VI. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION (37 C.F.R. §42.104(B)(3))	9
A. "asymmetrical"	10
B. "polygonal shape"	12
VII. DETAILED EXPLANATION OF UNPATENTABILITY GROUNDS	12
A. Overview of the Prior Art.....	12
1. McSpadden.....	12
2. Rouiller.....	14

3.	Badoz.....	15
4.	Garman	16
B.	Ground 1: Claims 1, 3-6, 10-12, 15-17, and 21 are Anticipated by McSpadden Ground 2: Claim 10 is Obvious over McSpadden	18
1.	Independent claim 1	18
2.	Dependent claim 3.....	28
3.	Dependent claim 4.....	30
4.	Dependent claims 5, 6, 17, and 21	30
5.	Dependent claim 10.....	31
6.	Dependent claim 11.....	32
7.	Dependent claim 12.....	33
8.	Dependent claim 15.....	33
9.	Dependent claim 16.....	34
C.	Ground 3: Dependent Claims 13, 14, and 20 are Rendered Obvious Over McSpadden in View of Garman.....	35
D.	Ground 4: Claims 1, 3-6, 10-11, 16, 17, and 21 are Anticipated by Rouiller Ground 5: Claim 10 is Obvious over Rouiller	38
1.	Independent claim 1	38
2.	Dependent claim 3.....	43
3.	Dependent claim 4.....	45
4.	Dependent claims 5, 6, 17, 21	45
5.	Dependent claim 10.....	46
6.	Dependent claim 11.....	47
7.	Dependent claim 16.....	47

E.	Ground 6: Dependent claims 12-15 and 20 are Rendered Obvious by Rouiller in View of Garman.....	48
1.	Dependent claims 12-14 and 20.....	48
2.	Dependent claim 15.....	50
F.	Ground 7: Claims 1, 3-4, 10-12, and 16-17 are Obvious Over Badoz.....	50
1.	Independent claim 1	51
2.	Dependent claim 3.....	56
3.	Dependent claim 4.....	57
4.	Dependent claim 10.....	58
5.	Dependent claim 11.....	59
6.	Dependent claims 12 and 17	59
7.	Dependent claim 16.....	60
G.	Ground 8: Dependent claims 5-6, 13-15, and 20-21 are Rendered Obvious by Badoz in View of Garman	60
1.	Dependent claims 5, 6, and 21	61
2.	Dependent claims 13, 14, and 20	62
3.	Dependent claim 15.....	63
H.	No Secondary Considerations of Non-obviousness.....	64
VIII.	CONCLUSION.....	64

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases

Acclarent, Inc. v. Ford Albritton, IV,
Case IPR2017-00498, slip op. (PTAB July 10, 2017).....8

Alcon Research, Ltd. v. Apotex Inc.,
687 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2012)56

Amneal Pharms., LLC v. Supernus Pharms., Inc.,
IPR2013-00368, slip op. (P.T.A.B. Dec. 17, 2013)64

Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee,
136 S. Ct. 2131 (2016).....9

Edwards Lifesciences Corp. v. Boston Scientific Scimed Inc.,
Case IPR2017-01295, slip op. (PTAB Oct. 25, 2017)9

Google Inc. v. Blackberry Ltd.,
Case IPR2017-00914, slip op. (PTAB Sept. 11, 2017)9

King Pharms. v. Eon Labs.,
616 F.3d 1267 (Fed. Cir. 2010)*passim*

Limelight Networks, Inc. v. Akamai Techs., Inc.,
Case IPR2016-01711, slip op. (PTAB Mar. 6, 2017).....8

Santarus, Inc. v. Par Pharm., Inc.,
694 F.3d 1344 (Fed. Cir. 2012)57

Statutes

35 U.S.C. §102..... 3-5

35 U.S.C. §103.....3

35 U.S.C. §325.....8

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.