

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

HEINEKEN N.V.,
Petitioner

v.

ANHEUSER-BUSCH INBEV S.A.,
Patent Owner

Case IPR2018-01663
Patent 9,944,453

**PATENT OWNER'S SURREPLY TO PETITIONER'S REPLY TO PATENT
OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	ii
I. THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION UNDER SECTION 325(D).....	1
II. PARALLEL PROCEEDING IN THE ITC WARRANTS DENIAL	3
III. CONCLUSION.....	3

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

PAGE(S)

CASES:

Becton, Dickinson & Co. v. Braun Melsungen AG,
IPR2017-01586 (PTAB Dec. 15, 2017).....1

Shenzhen Silver Star Intelligent Tech. Co., Ltd. v. iRobot Corp.,
IPR2018-00761 (PTAB Sept. 5, 2018).....3

STATUTES & OTHER AUTHORITIES:

USPTO, PTAB Trial Prac. Guide at 10 (Aug. 2018 Update),
https://www.uspto.gov/sites/default/files/documents/2018_Revised_Trial_Practice_Guide.pdf3

Patent Owner submits this Surreply to Petitioner's Reply (Paper 8).

I. The Board Should Deny Institution Under Section 325(d)

Petitioner contends ABI's Response did not address the *Becton* factors.

Becton, Dickinson & Co. v. Braun Melsungen AG, IPR2017-01586, Paper 8 at 17-18 (PTAB Dec. 15, 2017) (informative). However, ABI demonstrated that factors (a)-(b)—similarities and cumulative nature of the art—are met because five of the seven references cited in the Petition—Butterworth, Brady, Keisuke, Richter, and Schmidt—were disclosed to the USPTO or used as bases of rejections. *See* Preliminary Response, Sections II.C, IV.C. *Becton* factor (c)—the extent of evaluation during prosecution and extent of overlapping arguments—is met because Butterworth was cited by the Examiner in six Office Actions (including actions issued after the Peirsman Declaration was filed) (Preliminary Response at II.C, IV.C), Richter was cited in three Actions and deemed in the Notice of Allowance to be the closest prior art (Preliminary Response at Sections II.C, IV.C; Exh. 1003 at 1009, 1193), and Schmidt was cited in one Action (Prelim. Response at 6); as such, these five references were thoroughly evaluated during examination and either meritoriously overcome or were deemed irrelevant. *See id.* Additionally, *Becton* factor (d) was met because the Petition relies on Butterworth, Richter, and Schmidt in substantially the same manner as relied on during prosecution (*i.e.*, Butterworth and Richter for a delaminable bottle and Schmidt for a pressurized gas) (*id.*)).

Moreover, Petitioner's baseless accusations that the Peirsman Declaration is "misleading" cannot overcome the fact that the Examiner carefully considered the Butterworth reference. As explained in the Peirsman Declaration and attested to by ABI's Expert, Butterworth's Embodiment 4 is not enabled because the resulting bottle would have a wall thickness less than 100 μm and, thus, would not have sufficient mechanical strength to dispense a beverage using pressurized gas. *See* Exh. 1003 at 488-494; Preliminary Response at Section V.A.1.a.i; Exh. 2001, ¶¶ 103-106, 124-144. Petitioner's Expert does not point to any evidence of either experience with or testing performed on dispensing blow-molded containers with a wall thickness less than 100 μm . (Exh. 1002, ¶¶ 54-60; Exh. 2001, ¶¶ 130-138). Instead, Dr. Reitman relies solely on references that do not teach a bag-in-container subject to the same stresses as the claimed invention. (Exh. 1002, ¶¶ 58-67). As such, Reitman's opinions are unsubstantiated and do not rise to the level of additional evidence and facts which warrant reconsideration.

Petitioner's further contention that the counterpart WO 99/03668 to Brady was disclosed after allowance is irrelevant. This publication was filed concurrently with a Request for Continued Examination, thereby withdrawing the allowance pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(d) and, thus, was available as a basis for rejection. Moreover, contrary to Heineken's assertions, Uhlig discloses a source of pressurized gas, an opening in the cap, and dispensing by applying pressure to an

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.