

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

MOSO NORTH AMERICA, INC. AND MOSO INTERNATIONAL B.V.,  
Petitioner,

v.

DASSO INTERNATIONAL, INC.,  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2019-00184  
U.S. Patent 8,709,578

---

**PATENT OWNER DASSO INTERNATIONAL, INC.'S CORRECTED  
PRELIMINARY RESPONSE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.107(a)**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	i
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	iii
TABLE OF EXHIBITS .....	v
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. TECHNOLOGY OVERVIEW .....	2
III. SUMMARY OF THE PETITIONERS’ PROPOSED GROUNDS FOR REVIEW.....	3
IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	4
A. The Governing Claim Construction Standard.....	4
B. Construction of Specific Terms .....	6
1. slots .....	6
2. plurality of slots penetrating through said bamboo strip substantially in a direction of thickness defined by said bamboo strip – Claims 1 and 8 .....	7
3. a state of disorder in a cross-section defined by said bamboo scrimber – Claims 2 and 9 .....	9
V. THE SCOPE AND CONTENT OF THE PRIOR ART .....	10
A. Li (Ex. 1004) .....	10
B. Fujiwara (Ex. 1005).....	15
C. Plaehn (Ex. 1006).....	16
D. ThermoWood Handbook (Ex. 1007).....	17
E. Viitaniemi (Ex. 1008).....	18
VI. LEGAL FOUNDATION .....	18

A.	Anticipation .....	18
B.	Non-obviousness .....	19
VII.	PETITIONERS’ DO NOT DEMONSTRATE THAT THEY ARE MORE LIKELY THAN NOT TO PREVAIL ON ANY CHALLENGED CLAIM OF THE ’578 PATENT. ....	20
A.	Li does not disclose “bamboo strips . . . formed with a plurality of slots.” .....	20
B.	Fujiwara does not disclose “bamboo strips . . . formed with a plurality of slots.” .....	23
C.	Li does not disclose “modified through heat-treatment so that at least a part of hemicelluloses in said bamboo strips is pyrolyzed.” .....	26
A.	All of Petitioners’ proposed grounds of challenge require the disclosure of “bamboo strips . . . formed with a plurality of slots” by either Li or Fujiwara, and “modified through heat-treatment so that at least a part of hemicelluloses in said bamboo strips is pyrolyzed” by Li. ....	27
1.	Ground 1: Claims 1, 4-8, 10, and 11 are not anticipated by Li. ....	27
2.	Ground 2: Claims 1, 3-8, and 10-12 are not obvious over Li in view of Fujiwara.....	29
3.	Ground 3a: Claims 2 and 9 are not obvious over Li in View of Plaehn.....	30
4.	Ground 3b: Claims 2 and 9 are not obvious over Li in view of Fujiwara and Plaehn.....	31
5.	Ground 5a: Claims 13-15 are not obvious over Li in view of Viitaniemi and/or the ThermoWood® Handbook.....	32
6.	Ground 5b: Claims 13-15 are not obvious over Li in view of Fujiwara and Viitaniemi and/or the ThermoWood® Handbook. ....	33
VIII.	CONCLUSION .....	34

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>Continental Can Co. v. Monsanto Co.</i> , 948 F.2d 1264, 1269 (Fed. Cir. 1991) .....	19
<i>Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee</i> , __ U.S. __, 136 S. Ct. 2131 (2016) .....	5
<i>Finisar Corp. v. DirecTV Group, Inc.</i> , 523 F.3d 1323, 1334 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....	19, 28
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1, 17-18, 148 USPQ 459, 467 (1966) .....	20
<i>In re Hodges</i> , 882 F.3d 1107 (Fed. Cir. 2018) .....	5
<i>In re Robertson</i> , 169 F.3d 743, 745 (Fed. Cir. 1999) .....	19
<i>In re Smith Int'l, Inc.</i> , 871 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2017) .....	5
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398, 399 (2007) .....	20
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Proxyconn, Inc.</i> , 789 F.3d 1292 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....	4, 6
<i>Monsanto Tech. LLC v. E.I. DuPont de Nemours &amp; Co.</i> , 878 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2018) .....	4
<i>Net Money, Inc., v. Verisign, Inc.</i> , 545 F.3d 1359, 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....	19, 28
<i>Trivascular, Inc. v. Samuels</i> , 812 F.3d 1056 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	5
<i>Wasica Fin. GmbH v. Cont'l Auto. Sys.</i> , 853 F.3d 1272, 1284 (Fed. Cir. 2017) .....	19

### Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 102 .....	19, 28
-----------------------	--------

**Other Authorities**

83 Fed. Reg. 51,340, 51,359 (Oct. 11, 2018).....4

*Office Patent Trial Practice Guide,*

77 Fed. Reg. 48,756 (Aug. 14, 2012) .....4

**Rules**

37 C.F.R. § 100(b) .....4

37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b) .....4

# 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.