

IN THE 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. PGR2018-\_\_\_\_\_

U.S. Patent 9,644,368

**PETITION FOR POST-GRANT REVIEW**

## Table of Contents

I. Introduction .....	7
II. Mandatory Notices (37 C.F.R. §42.8).....	7
A. Real Parties in Interest (37 C.F.R. §42.8(b)(1)).....	7
B. Related Matters (37 C.F.R. §42.8(b)(2)).....	8
C. Lead and Backup Counsel, and Service Information (37 C.F.R. §§42.8(b)(3), 42.8(b)(4) and 42.10(a)).....	9
D. Power of Attorney .....	10
E. Payment of Fees .....	10
III. Eligibility for Post-Grant Review .....	10
A. There is no support in the ‘368 patent or priority documents for the claimed limitations of a fire retardant infused foam “configured to pass testing mandated by the UL 2079.”.....	13
B. There is no support in the ‘368 patent or priority documents for an expansion joint system absent an intumescent material.....	19
C. None of the written description or the priority applications provide written description support for foam including the fire retardant with “a density when installed in a range of 200-700 kg/m <sup>3</sup> .” .....	22
D. The written description and the priority applications improperly seek to incorporate the UL 2079 Tests by reference, and thus fail to provide what is asserted by Emseal to be written description support for elements in each of claims 1-17.....	23
E. During prosecution, the application which became the ‘368 patent contained a claim which had an effective filing date after March 16, 2013 and thus the ‘368 patent is available for post-grant review. ....	26
F. The effective filing date of claims 1-17 is after March 16, 2013, thus making the ‘368 patent eligible for post-grant review. ....	27
IV. Right to File and Grounds for Standing (37 C.F.R. §§42.201, 42.202, 42.204(a)).....	28
V. Identification of Challenge under 37 C.F.R. §42.204(b) and Relief Requested as to Each Claim .....	28
VI. Background and Summary of the ‘368 Patent .....	30

A.	Summary of the ‘368 Patent Written Description.....	30
B.	Summary of the Prosecution History .....	31
VII.	Claim Construction (37 C.F.R. §42.204(b)(3)).....	33
A.	“capable of withstanding exposure”.....	34
B.	“to pass testing mandated by UL 2079.”.....	35
VIII.	Grounds of Unpatentability (37 C.F.R. §42.204(b)(4)-(5)).....	39
A.	Ground 1: Claims 1-17 lack written description support under §112 for the claimed element “foam ... is configured to pass testing mandated by UL 2079.” .....	42
B.	Ground 2: Claims 1-17 lack written description support under §112 for an expansion joint system absent an intumescent material.....	45
1.	The specification of the ‘368 patent, and of every application to which the ‘368 claims priority, only discloses expansion joint systems having an intumescent material.....	47
2.	Because the intumescent layer is unswervingly taught to be a part of the invention, the failure to include it as a limitation in the independent claims renders them invalid for lack of adequate written description. ....	51
C.	Ground 3: Claims 1-17 lack written description support under §112 because the UL 2079 cannot be incorporated by reference to augment the disclosure.....	52
1.	Claims 1-17 lack written description support under §112 for the claimed expansion joint system because the UL 2079 Tests is essential material that is non-patent literature, and thus cannot be incorporated by reference. ....	53
2.	Even if incorporation by reference of the non-patent literature was permitted, the UL 2079 Tests document provides no singular definition of “to pass” and it provides no definition of “withstand exposure/maintain fire resistance.” .....	55
D.	Ground 4: Claims 1-17 lack written description support under §112 as to an expansion joint system having foam with “a density when installed in a range of about 200 kg/m <sup>3</sup> to about 700 kg/m <sup>3</sup> .” .....	57
E.	Ground 5: Claims 1-17 lack written description support under §112 as to the expansion joint system “capable of withstanding exposure/ maintain	

fire resistance upon exposure to a temperature of about 540° C. at about five minutes.”.....	59
F. Ground 6: Claims 1-17 are indefinite under §112(a) because, as rejected during prosecution, the meaning of “pass testing mandated by UL 2079” is vague and indefinite.....	62
G. Ground 7: Claims 1-17 are indefinite under §112 as to the expansion joint system “... at about five minutes.” .....	64
H. Ground 8: Claims 8-17 are indefinite under §112(a) as to the system “configured to maintain fire resistance.” .....	65
I. Ground 9: Claims 1-17 lack enablement under §112(a). .....	66
1. <i>Wands</i> Factor 8 favors a finding of non-enablement. ....	68
2. <i>Wands</i> factors 4 and 1 favor a finding of non-enablement. ....	69
3. <i>Wands</i> factors 7 and 2 favor a finding of non-enablement .....	71
4. <i>Wands</i> factors 5 and 6 favor a finding of non-enablement. ....	71
5. <i>Wands</i> factor 3 favors a finding of non-enablement. ....	72
J. Ground 10: Because the ‘368 patent is not entitled to claim priority prior to May 15, 2014, claims 1-17 are anticipated by U.S. Patent 8,341,908.	73
IX. Conclusion.....	84

## Exhibit List

<b>Exhibit</b>	<b>Description</b>
1001	U.S. Patent 9,644,368 B1
1002	US Endodontics, LLC v. Gold Standard Instruments, LLC, PGR2015-00019, Paper 54 (Dec. 28, 2016).
1003	U.S. Appl. No. 14/278,210 as filed May 15, 2014.
1004	U.S. Appl. S/N 14/540,514 Notice of Allowance and Fee(s) Due (November 3, 2016).
1005	American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language, Fifth Edition. Copyright 2011 by Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Publishing Company (“withstand”).
1006	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.
1007	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).
1008	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).
1009	U.S. Provisional Patent Application No. 61/116,453.
1010	U.S. Patent 8,341,908, issued January 1, 2013 to Hensley et al.
1011	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 District of New Hampshire (McAuliffe).
1012	U.S. Patent 8,365,495 to Witherspoon Issued on February 5, 2013.
1013	U.S. Patent 8,739,495 to Witherspoon Issued on June 3, 2014.
1014	U.S. Appl. No. 14/278,210 Amendment and Response to Non-Final Office Action (April 6, 2015).
1015	U.S. Appl. No. 13/721,855 as filed December 12, 2012.
1016	Dow Corning® 790 Silicone Building Sealant Product Information (2005).
1017	U.S. Appl. No. 13/721,855 Amendment and Response to Non-Final Office Action (December 9, 2013)
1018	U.S. Appl. No. 14/278,210 Amendment and Response to Non-Final Office Action (August 18, 2016).

# 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.