

Petition for Post-Grant Review
of U.S. Patent No. 9,879,471

Filed on behalf of EMI PORTA OPCO, LLC

By: Edward L. Bishop
Bishop Diehl & Lee, Ltd.
1475 East Woodfield Road, Suite 800
Schaumburg, IL 60173
Ph: 847-969-9123
Fax: 847-969-9124
email: ebishop@bdl-iplaw.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

EMI PORTA OPCO, LLC,
Petitioner

v.

WOODFOLD MANUFACTURING, INC.,
Patent Owner

U.S. Patent 9,879,471 Appln. No. 15/171,478 filed June 2, 2016
Issued January 30, 2018
Title: REINFORCED FOLDING DOOR AND HINGE ASSEMBLY

Petition for Post-Grant Review
Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 321-328 and 37 C.F.R. § 42.200 et seq.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	COMPLIANCE WITH REQUIREMENTS FOR POST-GRANT REVIEW	1
A.	Certification of Petitioner’s Standing Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.201	1
B.	Time for Filing Petition for Post-Grant Review Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.202	1
C.	Identification of Challenge Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.204(b) and Relief Requested	2
D.	Eligibility of Challenged Claims for Post-Grant Review	3
E.	Mandatory Notices Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8	4
	1. Real Parties in Interest	4
	2. Related Matters	4
	3. Lead and Back-up Counsel	4
	4. Service on Petitioner	5
F.	Fee for Post-Grant Review Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.15(b)	5
II.	SUMMARY OF ’471 PATENT DISCLOSURE AND ALLEGED INVENTIONS	6
III.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.204(b)(4)	11
IV.	LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	11
V.	EFFECTIVE FILING DATE OF CHALLENGED CLAIMS	11
A.	Effective Filing Date of Claims 1-5	12
B.	Effective Filing Date of Claims 6 and 7	13
VI.	SUMMARY AND RELEVANCE OF THE PRIOR ART	15
A.	<i>Dixon</i> – U.S. Patent No. 3,232,333	15
B.	<i>Dagenais</i> – U.S. Patent No. 3,901,302	16
C.	<i>Lamarre</i> – U.S. Patent No.4,081,881	17
D.	<i>Ceron</i> – U.S. Patent No. 4,284,118	18

E.	<i>Marontate</i> – U.S. Patent No. 4,922,987	19
F.	<i>Prudhomme</i> – French Publication No. 2 638 778	20
VII.	IT IS MORE LIKELY THAN NOT THAT AT LEAST ONE OF THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS OF THE ‘471 PATENT IS UNPATENTABLE.....	22
A.	Ground 1: Claims 1, 3 and 5 Are Anticipated under § 102(a)(1) by U.S. Patent No. 4,081,881 (“Lamarre”)	22
B.	Ground 2: Claims 2, 4, 6 and 7 Are Obvious Under § 103(a) Over Lamarre Alone Or In View Of Marontate.....	34
C.	Ground 3: Claims 1 and 5 Are Anticipated Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a)(1) over French Publication No. 2 638 778 (“ <i>Prudhomme</i> ”) ...	48
D.	Ground 4: Claims 3, 4 and 6 Are Unpatentable Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over <i>Prudhomme</i> In View of <i>Marontate</i>	56
E.	Ground 5: Claims 1, 3, and 4 Are Unpatentable Under §103 Over <i>Marontate</i> In View Of <i>Ceron</i>	67
VIII.	CERTIFICATION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.24(d).....	74
IX.	CONCLUSION.....	75

PETITIONER'S EXHIBIT LIST

EXHIBIT	DESCRIPTION
1001	U.S. Patent Number 9,879,471 to Lewis <i>et al.</i> (the '471 Patent)
1002	File history of '471 Patent (U.S. Patent Application No. 15/171,478)
1003	U.S. Provisional Patent Application No. 62/235,455
1004	U.S. Patent No. 3,232,333 ("Dixon")
1005	U.S. Patent No. 3,901,302 ("Dagenais")
1006	U.S. Patent No. 4,081,881 ("Lamarre")
1007	U.S. Patent No. 4,284,118 ("Ceron")
1008	U.S. Patent No. 4,922,987 ("Marontate")
1009	French Publ'n No. 2 638 778 ("Prudhomme")
1010	Certified English Translation of French Publ'n No. 2 638 778

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Hyatt v. Boone, 146 F.3d 1348, 1354-55 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....12

KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. 398, 421 (2007).....36

Lockwood v. Am. Airlines, Inc., 107 F.3d 1565, 1571 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....12

Tronzo v. Biomet, Inc., 156 F.3d 1154, 1158 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....12

Tronzo, 156 F.3d at 115812

Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar, 935 F.2d 1555, 1563 (Fed. Cir. 1991).....12

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 102.....2

35 U.S.C. § 102(a)(1)..... passim

35 U.S.C. § 103..... 2, 47, 56

35 U.S.C. § 120.....12

35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 10375

35 U.S.C. 102(a)(1).....15

Section 3(n)(1) of the America Invents Act. Leahy–Smith America Invents Act,
Pub. L. No. 112-29, § 3(n)(1), 125 Stat. 284, 293 (2011).....3

Other Authorities

37 C.F.R. § 42.15(b)5

37 C.F.R. § 42.2011

37 C.F.R. § 42.202.....1

37 C.F.R. § 42.204(b)2

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.