

Filed on behalf of Dresser, LLC

By: Herbert D. Hart III

David Z. Petty

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.

500 W. Madison St., 34th Floor

Chicago, IL 60661

Tel: 312-775-8000

Fax: 312-775-8100

E-mail: hhart@mcandrews-ip.com
dpetty@mcandrews-ip.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

VRG CONTROLS, LLC
Petitioner,

v.

DRESSER, LLC
Patent Owner

Case No. IPR2019-00618
Patent No. 8,141,843

PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction	1
II.	Summary of the 843 patent and the asserted prior art references.....	3
	A. The 843 Patent.....	3
	B. The asserted prior art references	8
III.	Claim Construction	11
IV.	No review should be instituted on any of Grounds 1-3	12
	A. The Board should decline to institute under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d) because Davenport was previously before the Office.....	13
	1. Davenport was expressly considered during examination (<i>Becton</i> Factors 1 and 2)	16
	2. The Examiner evaluated Davenport during prosecution and found the challenged claims patentable (<i>Becton</i> Factor 3)	17
	3. The same arguments were considered during prosecution (<i>Becton</i> Factor 4).....	17
	4. Petitioner has not argued that the Examiner erred in evaluating Davenport (<i>Becton</i> Factor 5).....	18
	5. No additional facts presented in the Petition favor institution (<i>Becton</i> Factor 6)	18
	B. Ground 1: Davenport does not anticipate the challenged claims because it does not disclose every limitation.....	20
	1. Davenport does not disclose a ball plate including a plurality of orifices, as recited in claims 1 and 17.....	21
	a) Petitioner failed to identify any structure of Davenport as a ball plate	21
	b) The Office found the ball plate limitations to distinguish over Davenport.....	23
	c) The faces 44 and 46 of Davenport are not plates	24

2.	Davenport does not disclose a ball plate located in a transverse passage, as recited in claim 1.....	27
3.	Petitioner failed to identify in Davenport a shoe member, as recited in claims 1, 17, and 24.....	31
a)	Petitioner failed to explain how Davenport discloses each element of the shoe member limitation.....	32
b)	Davenport does not disclose a shoe member alignable with the downstream flow passage of the body	35
C.	Ground 2: the combination of Davenport and Partridge does not render the challenged claims obvious.....	38
1.	The combination of Davenport with Partridge does not teach or suggest all the limitations of dependent claims 19-21	40
2.	Petitioner failed to explain <i>why</i> a person of ordinary skill in the art would have combined Davenport and Partridge	40
3.	Petitioner’s obviousness argument relied on impermissible hindsight	43
4.	Petitioner failed to show a reasonable expectation of success.....	44
5.	The cited section of Petitioner’s expert declaration likewise failed to establish obviousness	45
D.	Ground 3: the combination of Fechner in view of Leinen, Durco, Carlson, and/or Neles does not render the challenged claims obvious	47
1.	Fechner in view of Leinen, Durco, Carlson, and/or Neles does not disclose every limitation of the challenged claims.....	48
a)	The combination of Fechner and Leinen and/or Durco does not teach or suggest the ball plate of claims 1 and 17.....	48

b)	The combination of Fechner and Carlson does not teach each element of the shoe member limitation of claims 1, 17, and 24.....	51
2.	Petitioner improperly asked the Board to choose among a variety of possible combinations of prior art.....	53
3.	Petitioner failed to explain why a person of ordinary skill would have combined the references as proposed	54
a)	Independent claims 1, 17, and 24	55
b)	Dependent claims 2, 4, 6, 11, 18-21, 23, and 25	59
4.	Petitioner failed to show a reasonable expectation of success.....	62
5.	The cited section of Petitioner’s expert declaration likewise failed to establish obviousness	62
V.	Conclusion.....	68

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

<i>3-D Matrix, Ltd. v. Menicon Co., Ltd.</i> , IPR2014-00398, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 1, 2014).....	44, 62
<i>Actelion Pharma, Ltd. v. Icos Corp.</i> , IPR2015-00561, Paper 50 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 3, 2016).....	44, 62
<i>Arkon Resources, Inc. v. Nation Products, Inc.</i> , IPR2016-01663, Paper 12 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 23, 2017)	23, 34
<i>Arris Group, Inc. v. TQ Delta, LLC</i> , IPR2016-00428, Paper 8 (P.T.A.B. June 22, 2016)	41
<i>Becton, Dickinson & Co. v. B. Braun Melsungen AG</i> , IPR2017-01586, Paper 8 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 15, 2017)	15
<i>BSP Software, LLC v. Motio, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00307, Paper 10 (P.T.A.B. Nov. 29, 2013).....	42, 57
<i>Cardiac Pacemakers, Inc. v. St. Jude Medical, Inc.</i> , 381 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	44
<i>Cultec, Inc. v. StormTech LLC</i> , IPR2017-00777, Paper 7, at 13 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 22, 2017)	14
<i>Duo Security Inc. v. StrikeFroce Tech., Inc.</i> , IPR2017-01064, Paper 7 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 16, 2017).....	57
<i>Edmund Optics, Inc. v. Semrock, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00583, Paper 9 (P.T.A.B. Sep. 19, 2014).....	54
<i>Facebook, Inc. v. Sound View Innovations, LLC</i> , IPR2017-00998, Paper 13 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 5, 2017).....	12
<i>Free-Flow Packaging International, Inc. v. Automated Packaging Systems, Inc.</i> IPR2016-00445, Paper 8 (P.T.A.B. June 22, 2016)	19
<i>Grain Processing Corp. v. American Maize-Prods. Co.</i> , 840 F.2d 902 (Fed. Cir. 1988).....	43
<i>HTC Corp. v. Lemaire Illumination Techs., LLC</i> , IPR2019-00090, Paper No. 7 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 12, 2019)	41
<i>I-MAK, Inc. v. Gilead Pharmasset LLC</i> IPR2018-00122, Paper 10 (P.T.A.B. May 21, 2018)	19

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.