

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SCHUL INTERNATIONAL COMPANY, LLC.,

Petitioner,

v.

EMSEAL JOINT SYSTEMS, LTD.,

Patent Owner.

Case No. PGR2017-00053

U.S. Patent 9,528,262 B2

PETITIONER'S REPLY

Table of Contents

I. INTRODUCTION.....	8
A. Petitioner’s Reply is Timely.....	8
B. Emseal’s Background Discussion is Misleading	8
C. Emseal Makes a Critical Misstatement Regarding Fire-Retardant Operation.	10
II. 35 U.S.C. §325(d) Does Not Apply.....	11
III. The prosecution history is irrelevant as to providing written description support.	12
IV. Claim Construction	12
V. Ground 1.....	12
A. Nothing in the ‘9,495 Patent provides support for foam, alone, being “configured to pass testing mandated by UL2079.”	13
1. The original claims of the ‘9,495 patent do not support foam alone being “configured to pass testing mandated by UL2079” because a joint system having both fire retardant infused foam and a water resistant layer was claimed, and the functionality is discussed with respect to the joint system, not with respect to the foam.....	13
2. The examiner did not consider functional abilities of the foam alone during prosecution of the ‘9,495 patent because only functional features of the expansion joint system as a whole were claimed.	15
B. Nothing in the common specification of the ‘262 patent or alleged priority documents provide the required support.	15
1. The fact that the foam is fire retardant and provides fire resistance does not mean the foam alone has the claimed functional features.	16
2. The “resultant composite” does not refer to the foam alone.....	17
C. The claims of continuation applications cannot provide written description support because a continuation cannot add new matter.	18

VI. Ground 2.....	19
A. <i>ICU Medical</i> applies to continuation applications which introduce claims unsupported by the written description at filing because written description is evaluated as of the filing date sought.	19
B. The Board has agreed that the specification provides no support for the structure of an expansion joint which omits the intumescent layer.	23
C. Emseal advances multiple misleading arguments.....	23
VII. Ground 3.....	24
A. Emseal opens with yet another misleading and irrelevant argument.....	25
B. There is no inherent support provided by the specification	25
C. Both Emseal and the Board cite to the UL2079 non-patent literature to provide written description support, demonstrating that it is essential material.	26
VIII. Ground 4.....	27
A. Discussion of the joint being “compressed” is not necessarily the same as the joint “installed” because while the expansion joint is compressed when installed, it is compressed in other instances too.	27
B. The remainder of Emseal’s Response to Ground 4 is a series of flawed and/or misleading arguments and misstatements of law.....	28
IX. Ground 5.....	30
A. The USPTO has found that this claim element is without written description support.	30
B. The Board and Emseal improperly assume that these limitations are related to UL2079, rendering them superfluous.....	31
X. Ground 6.....	32
A. The USPTO has found this claim term indefinite.	32
B. The Board and Emseal assume that these limitations are related to UL2079, rendering them superfluous.	33
C. Emseal again misleads.....	33
XI. Ground 7.....	33
XII. Ground 8.....	34

XIII. Conclusion.....35

PETITIONER'S UPDATED EXHIBIT LIST

Exhibit	Description
1001	U.S. Patent 9,528,262 B1
1002	US Endodontics, LLC v. Gold Standard Instruments, LLC, PGR2015-00019, Paper 54 (Dec. 28, 2016).
1003	U.S. Appl. S/N 14/540,514 Specification, Abstract, Claims and Drawings as filed November 13, 2014.
1004	U.S. Appl. S/N 14/540,514 Amendment and Response to Final Office Action Filed Concurrently with a Request for Continued Examination (August 31, 2016).
1005	U.S. Appl. S/N 14/540,514 Notice of Allowance and Fee(s) Due (November 3, 2016).
1006	American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language, Fifth Edition. Copyright 2011 by Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Publishing Company (“withstand”).
1007	Underwriter Laboratories, Inc.’s UL 2079 Tests for Fire Resistance of Building Joint Systems, Fourth Edition of October 21, 2004, as revised through June 30, 2008.
1008	Original Complaint, Emseal Joint Systems, Ltd. v. Schul International Co., LLC and Steven R. Robinson; In the United States District Court for the District of New Hampshire (McAuliffe).
1009	Original Complaint, Cause No. 1:14-CV-00359; Emseal Joint Systems, Ltd. v. Willseal, LLC, Ion Management, LLC, Brian J. Iske, and Steven R. Robinson; In the United States District Court for the District of New Hampshire (Barbadoro).
1010	U.S. Provisional Patent Application 61/116,453.
1011	U.S. Patent 8,341,908, issued January 1, 2013 to Hensley et al.
1012	Amended Complaint, Cause No. 1:14-CV-00358; Emseal Joint Systems, Ltd. v. Willseal, LLC, Ion Management, LLC, Brian J. Iske, and Steven R. Robinson; In the United States District Court for the

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.