

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MÖLNLYCKE HEALTH CARE AB
Petitioner

v.

SMITH & NEPHEW, INC.
Patent Owner.

Case: PGR2018-00035

U.S. Patent No. 9,642,750 B2

PETITION FOR POST-GRANT REVIEW

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. Introduction	1
II. Mandatory Notices (37 C.F.R. § 42.8).....	3
A. Real Parties-In-Interest	3
B. Related Matters	3
C. Notice Of Lead And Backup Counsel And Service Information.....	4
III. Grounds For Standing (37 C.F.R. § 42.204(a)).....	4
IV. Identification Of Challenged Claims And Specific Statutory Grounds (37 C.F.R. § 42.204(b)(1)-(2))	5
V. Effective Filing Date Of The Challenged Claims And Eligibility For Post-Grant Review	6
VI. Background And Summary Of The '750 Patent	8
A. Summary Of The '750 Patent's Specification.....	9
B. Summary Of Prosecution History	10
VII. Claim Construction And Level Of Skill In The Art.....	11
A. Proposed Claim Constructions	12
1. "Unobstructed Visualization"	12
2. "Duct Wall"	12
3. "Partition Wall"	13
B. Level Of Skill In The Art	13
VIII. Grounds Of Unpatentability	14
A. Ground 1 – Claims 18-24 Are Invalid Because The Written Description Of The '750 Patent Does Not Satisfy 35 U.S.C. § 112	14
1. Written Description Legal Standard.....	14

2. Claim 18 Does Not Satisfy 35 U.S.C. § 112.....	16
3. Claims 18-24 Must Find Written Description Support In Figures 15A-D And The Accompanying Text.....	18
4. (18.1) The “attachment portion adapted to be attached to a wound cover member”	21
5. (18.2) The “suction device”	22
a. (18.2.1) The “suction device” Requires A “fluid inlet” In The “attachment portion”	22
b. (18.2.2) The “suction device” Also Requires “a fluid outlet”	24
c. (18.2.3)The “suction device” Requires “a connection portion adapted to . . . provide a fluid communication between said fluid inlet and said fluid outlet”	27
6. (18.3) The “connection portion”	29
a. (18.3.1) There Is No Written Description Support For A “connection portion” That Includes “an inspection portion that is transparent to thereby facilitate the positioning of said suction device relative to said wound cover member”	30
b. (18.3.2) The “connection portion” Must Include A “duct wall” That “at least partially defines a connection duct from said inlet to said outlet”	32
c. (18.3.3) There Is No Disclosure Of “a duct wall” That Includes An “inspection portion”	33
d. (18.3.4) There Is No Disclosure That Supports “a partition wall extending at least partially from said duct wall”	35
7. Claim 18 Was Copied From An Application For A Completely Different Invention, Which Explains The Lack Of Written Description Support In The ’750 Patent	37
8. Dependent Claims 19-24 Suffer From The Same Infirmities, And Are Also Invalid	41

...

B. Ground 2: Claims 1-17 Are Invalid Under 35 U.S.C. § 112(a) For Lack Of Written Description	41
1. The '750 Patent Does Not Provide Written Description Support For The “unobstructed visualization” Limitation In Claims 1-17.....	43
2. There Is No Support For “an intermediate wall extending perpendicularly from the downwardly extending material to partition the first channel from the second channel” In Claims 1-17.....	44
C. Ground 3: Claims 1-4 And 6-17 Are Anticipated By The Public Sale And/Or Public Disclosure Of SensaTRAC	46
1. An air conduit exits within the dome of the port in the SensaTRAC device;	83
2. The air conduit is located within an intermediate wall that extends perpendicularly from the wall separating the dome from the tube fitting in the port; and.....	83
3. The intermediate wall partitions the central opening of the port (first channel) from the air conduit (second channel).....	83
D. Ground 4: Claims 1-4 And 6-17 Would Have Been Obvious Over SensaTRAC	98
E. Ground 5: Claim 5 Would Have Been Obvious Over SensaTRAC In View Of <i>Hu</i>	99
F. Ground 6: Claims 1-4 And 6-17 Would Have Been Obvious Over SensaTRAC In View Of <i>Vess</i>	102
G. Ground 7: Claim 5 Would Have Been Obvious Over SensaTRAC In View Of <i>Vess</i> And In Further View Of <i>Hu</i>	107
H. Ground 8: Claims 1-4 And 6-17 Would Have Been Obvious Over SensaTRAC In View Of <i>Hirsch</i>	108
I. Ground 9: Claim 5 Would Have Been Obvious Over SensaTRAC In View Of <i>Hirsch</i> In Further View Of <i>Hu</i>	115
J. Ground 10: Claims 1-4 And 6-17 Would Have Been Obvious Over SensaTRAC In View Of <i>Vess</i> And In View Of <i>Hirsch</i>	116

K. Ground 11: Claim 5 Would Have Been Obvious Over SensaTRAC In
View Of *Vess* And In View Of *Hirsch* And In Further View Of *Hu*.....116

L. Ground 12: Claims 1-17 Are Invalid Under 35 U.S.C. § 112(b)
Because The Term “Unobstructed” Is Indefinite116

 1. The Specification Never Mentions Or Explains The Term
 “Unobstructed”117

IX. Conclusion119

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.