

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

BRIDGEPORT FITTINGS, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

ARLINGTON INDUSTRIES, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case: PGR2018-00005
U.S. Patent No.: 9,553,415

**PATENT OWNER ARLINGTON INDUSTRIES, INC.'S
PRELIMINARY RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.207(a)**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	NOTICE OF COUNSEL.....	3
III.	RELATED MATTERS	4
IV.	THE '415 PATENT	6
A.	Background of Arlington's Duplex Connector Technology.....	6
B.	Summary of the Claimed Subject Matter.....	12
V.	OVERVIEW OF THE ASSERTED PRIOR ART	17
A.	The '831 Patent	17
B.	Bridgeport's 3838ASP Connector.....	19
C.	The '290 Patent	22
D.	UL and NEMA Standards	23
VI.	LEGAL STANDARDS.....	23
A.	Claim Construction	23
B.	Indefiniteness.....	25
C.	Anticipation	26
D.	Obviousness.....	27
VII.	BRIDGEPORT'S PETITION FAILS TO ESTABLISH A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF SUCCESS WITH RESPECT TO CLAIM 1.....	29
A.	Ground 1: Claim 1 Is Definite.....	30
1.	The Claim Limitation "an end stop at the outbound end of . . ." Is Definite.....	30
2.	The Claim Limitation "a snap ring on said nose portion of said connector body" Is Definite.	34

B.	Grounds 2-4: Bridgeport's Anticipation and Obviousness Grounds Are Predicated on Erroneous Claim Constructions That Are Contrary to the Language of Claim 1 and Entirely Divorced from the Specification	36
1.	Construction of "an end stop at the outbound end" in Claim 1	37
2.	Construction of "an arcuate edge on said end stop" in Claim 1	41
C.	Ground 2: The '831 Patent Does Not Anticipate Claim 1	45
D.	Ground 3: Bridgeport's 3838ASP Connector Does Not Anticipate Claim 1.....	48
E.	Ground 4: A Combination of the '290 and the '831 Patents Does Not Render Claim 1 Obvious.....	51
F.	Ground 5: Claim 1 Is Not Obvious over Grounds 2-4 in Further View of UL and NEMA Standards.....	53
VIII.	THE BOARD SHOULD EXERCISE ITS DISCRETION TO DENY INSTITUTION OF GROUNDS 2, 3, AND 5 BECAUSE THEY ARE HORIZONTALLY AND VERTICALLY REDUNDANT.....	57
IX.	CONCLUSION	59

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>In re Am. Acad. of Sci. Tech. Ctr.</i> , 367 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	23
<i>Apple, Inc. v. Contentguard Holdings, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00358, 2015 WL 9899010 (July 2, 2015).....	53
<i>Arendi S.A.R.L. v. Apple Inc.</i> , 832 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	27, 52
<i>Arlington Indus., Inc. v. Bridgeport Fittings, Inc.</i> , No. 3:01-cv-00485 (M.D. Pa.).....	5
<i>Arlington Indus., Inc. v. Bridgeport Fittings, Inc.</i> , No. 3:02-cv-0134 (M.D. Pa.).....	5
<i>Arlington Indus., Inc. v. Bridgeport Fittings, Inc.</i> , No. 3:06-CV-1105, 2015 WL 2131626 (M.D. Pa. May 7, 2015)	6
<i>Arlington Indus., Inc. v. Bridgeport Fittings, Inc.</i> , No. 3:06-cv-1105 (M.D. Pa.) (Ex. 2007).....	5
<i>BASF Corp. v. Johnson Matthey Inc.</i> , 875 F.3d 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	25
<i>Broadcom Corp. v. Emulex Corp.</i> , 732 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	27, 52
<i>Cephalon, Inc. v. Abraxis Bioscience, LLC</i> , No. 2014-1411, 2015 WL 3756870 (Fed. Cir. June 17, 2015).....	38
<i>CFMT, Inc. v. Yieldup Int'l Corp.</i> , 349 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	27, 52, 55
<i>Comaper Corp. v. Antec, Inc.</i> , 596 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	39, 40, 44

<i>In re Cortright,</i> 165 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	24
<i>In re Crish,</i> 393 F.3d 1253 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	26
<i>Dana Corp. v. Am. Axle & Mfg., Inc.,</i> 279 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	26
<i>In re Donohue,</i> 766 F.2d 531 (Fed. Cir. 1985)	26
<i>In re Enhanced Sec. Research, LLC,</i> 739 F.3d 1347 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	27
<i>Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co.,</i> 535 U.S. 722 (2002).....	25
<i>In re Gordon,</i> 733 F.2d 900 (Fed. Cir. 1984)	28
<i>Invitrogen Corp. v. Biocrest Manufacturing, L.P.,</i> 424 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	25
<i>Iron Grip Barbell Co. v. USA Sports, Inc.,</i> 392 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	28
<i>In re Kramer,</i> 925 F.2d 1479 (Fed. Cir. 1991)	28
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.,</i> 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	27
<i>In re Lee,</i> 277 F.3d 1338 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	28
<i>Liberty Mut. Ins. Co. v. Progressive Casualty Ins. Co.,</i> CBM-2012-00003, Paper 7 (Oct. 25, 2012)	57, 58
<i>Medicines Co. v. Hospira, Inc.,</i> 827 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	26

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.