

NOTE: This disposition is nonprecedential.

**United States Court of Appeals
for the Federal Circuit**

EVERSTAR MERCHANDISE CO. LTD.,
Appellant

v.

WILLIS ELECTRIC CO., LTD.,
Appellee

2021-1882

Appeal from the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Patent Trial and Appeal Board in No. PGR2019-00056.

Decided: April 12, 2022

BRENTON R. BABCOCK, Loeb & Loeb LLP, Los Angeles, CA, argued for appellant. Also represented by PRESTON HAMILTON HEARD, Womble Bond Dickinson (US) LLP, Atlanta, GA; BARRY J. HERMAN, Baltimore, MD; TYLER TRAIN, Irvine, CA.

PATRICK M. ARENZ, Robins Kaplan LLP, Minneapolis, MN, argued for appellee. Also represented by BRENDA L. JOLY.

Before LOURIE, DYK, and REYNA, *Circuit Judges*.

REYNA, *Circuit Judge*.

Appellant Everstar Merchandise Co. Ltd. appeals the Patent Trial and Appeal Board’s final written decision in a post grant review concluding that Everstar did not meet its burden to show the challenged claims unpatentable as obvious. In reaching its decision, the Board found Everstar failed to establish a motivation to combine the asserted prior art. We hold that the Board abused its discretion when it refused to consider whether cost reduction would have motivated a skilled artisan to combine the asserted prior art. Thus, we vacate and remand.

BACKGROUND

Appellee Willis Electric Company, Ltd. owns U.S. Patent No. 10,222,037 (the “’037 Patent”), titled “Decorative lighting with reinforced wiring.” The claimed novelty of the ’037 Patent is the use of internally reinforced wires in decorative net lights. As explained by the ’037 Patent, prior art decorative lighting used other methods for reinforcement like twisted pair wires, thicker wires, or externally supported wires. The ’037 Patent claims a different design that purportedly reduces material costs, bulk, and weight without sacrificing strength: a single wire reinforced with a strand of polymer material running internally along its axis.

On August 13, 2019, Everstar petitioned for post grant review of all claims of the ’037 Patent, alleging among other things that the claims are unpatentable as obvious over the combination of two prior art references, Kumada¹

¹ U.S. Patent No. 6,367,951 (“Kumada”), titled “Economical Net or Mesh Light Set,” discloses a prior art net light design. J.A. 1346–61.

EVERSTAR MERCHANDISE CO. LTD. v.
WILLIS ELECTRIC CO., LTD.

3

and Debladis '120.² Everstar argued in its petition that a person of ordinary skill in the art (“POSITA”) would be motivated to combine Kumada and Debladis '120 “if she were looking for known methods that could be used to increase the strength and durability of the decorative lighting products.” J.A. 194. Everstar asserted that Kumada “explains that the absence of any electrical wire within . . . ropes greatly reduces their cost and renders both the light set and its method of manufacture economical.” J.A. 173.

On November 27, 2019, Willis Electric filed a patent owner’s preliminary response, contending that Debladis '120 is non-analogous art as compared to Kumada and the '037 Patent. Willis Electric noted that a stated goal of Kumada is to “make it . . . cheaper to manufacture a net light” by “reducing the length of wires that need to be twisted,” J.A. 371, and that a stated benefit of Debladis '120 is to make a “lighter weight, compact automobile cable[] . . . without being expensive to manufacture,” J.A. 372.

On February 20, 2020, the Board instituted post grant review. *Everstar Merch. Co., Ltd. v. Willis Elec. Co., Ltd.*, No. PGR2019-00056, 2020 WL 862906, at *22 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 20, 2020). In its institution decision, the Board said:

The evidence of record supports Petitioner’s argument that the combination [of Kumada and Debladis '120] involves the ‘simple substitution of one known element for another to obtain the predictable and desirable result of a more durable wire.’ Pet. 30 [J.A. 194]. For example, both Kumada and Debladis '120 discuss *the desire to reduce manufacturing costs* for wiring having good

² U.S. Patent No. 8,692,120 B2 (“Debladis '120”), titled “Electrical control cable,” discloses a prior art design for an internally reinforced electrical wire. J.A. 1403–07.

mechanical strength and that is capable of maintaining an electrical connection, and it is undisputed that Debladis '120 teaches doing so by including an internal reinforcing strand and conductor strands in a wire.

Id. at *8 (emphasis added).

On June 15, 2020, Willis Electric filed a patent owner's response and addressed the Board's discussion of reduced cost as a potential motivation to combine Kumada with Debladis '120. *See* J.A. 568–69. Willis Electric argued that “Debladis '120 only recognizes a reduction in cost if there is excess copper in the wire that can be removed for signal transmission purposes,” and that Everstar “d[id] not argue that the amount of copper in the intermediate wires of Kumada would be reduced.” J.A. 568.

On September 15, 2020, Everstar filed a reply to Willis Electric's patent owner response. J.A. 636–69. Everstar argued that “a POSITA would be motivated to incorporate the polymer reinforced wire of Debladis '120 [with Kumada] in order to improve durability *and reduce cost.*” J.A. 656 (emphasis added). Everstar contended that “a POSITA would have been motivated to reduce costs by incorporating the internally reinforced wire of Debladis '120 into the net light system of Kumada,” as “[s]uch a combination would reduce the amount of total copper used in the system of Kumada, which would reduce the cost of the system and be compliant with the UL standards.” J.A. 657 (emphasis omitted).

On November 2, 2020, Willis Electric filed a patent owner's sur-reply, addressing the cost reduction argument on the merits. J.A. 702. Willis Electric also provided a list of reply arguments that it claimed were presented for the first time in Everstar's reply brief. J.A. 712–16. In particular, Willis Electric identified Everstar's motivation to combine theory based on a reduction in cost as an improperly raised, new argument. J.A. 713. Willis Electric

EVERSTAR MERCHANDISE CO. LTD. v.
WILLIS ELECTRIC CO., LTD.

5

argued that the new arguments and evidence should be rejected and not considered by the Board.

On February 18, 2021, the Board issued a final written decision and noted that the parties agreed on claim constructions and the fact that the asserted prior art, as a whole, discloses every claim element. *Everstar Merch. Co., Ltd. v. Willis Elec. Co., Ltd.*, No. PGR2019-00056, 2021 WL 653034, at *5–6 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 18, 2021). The only points of disagreement were (1) whether Debladis '120 is analogous art, and (2) whether a POSITA would have been motivated to combine Kumada with Debladis '120. *Id.* at *6.

With respect to motivation to combine, the only issue relevant on appeal, Everstar argued that a POSITA would have been motivated to combine Kumada with Debladis '120 to improve wire durability and to reduce material costs. However, the Board declined to consider cost reduction as a motivation to combine because it determined that Everstar failed to assert the theory in its petition. *Id.* at *12–13. Consequently, the Board focused its attention solely on whether a POSITA would have been motivated by a desire to improve wire durability. Viewed as such, the Board found that Everstar did not meet its burden to show a motivation to combine Kumada with Debladis '120. *Id.* at *9–12. The Board also explained that its determination was dispositive for all challenged claims. *Id.* at *13–17. Thus, the Board concluded that Everstar failed to show that any of the challenged claims are unpatentable as obvious. *Id.* at *17. Everstar appeals. We have jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1295(a)(4)(A).

STANDARD OF REVIEW

We review the Board's legal conclusions de novo and its factual findings for substantial evidence. *ACCO Brands Corp. v. Fellowes, Inc.*, 813 F.3d 1361, 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2016). Substantial evidence means "such relevant evidence as a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to

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.