UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

GoFire, Inc.,
Petitioner,

v.

Canopy Growth Corporation,
Patent Owner.

Case PGR2020-00044
Patent No. 10,327,479

Mail Stop PATENT BOARD
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Submitted Electronically via the Patent Review Processing System

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.207

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. OVERVIEW OF THE '479 PATENT 4

III. PROSECUTION HISTORY OF THE '479 PATENT 7

A. Non-Final Office Action 7

B. Response to Non-Final Office Action 8

C. Final Office Action 9

D. First Examiner Interview 10

E. Response to Final Office Action 11

F. Second Examiner Interview and Supplemental Response 14

G. Notice of Allowance 14

IV. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART 15

V. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION 15

VI. PETITIONER'S EXPERT DECLARATIONS AND CLAIM CHART ARE IMPROPERLY INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE INTO THE PETITION 16

A. Petitioner's Expert Declarations are Improperly Incorporated by Reference 16

B. Petitioner's Claim Chart is Improperly Incorporated by Reference 18

VII. THE BOARD SHOULD EXCERSIZE ITS DISCRETION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 325(D) TO DENY INSTITUTION OF THE PETITION 19

A. Factors (a), (b), & (d) – The Same Art and Arguments Used in the Petition were Previously Presented to the Office 21

1. Factor (a): Petitioner uses the same art that was substantively considered during prosecution 22

DOCKET ALARM Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

2. Factor (d): Petitioner largely repeats the same arguments made by the Examiner during prosecution 25

B. Factors (c), (e), and (f) – Petitioner Has Not Persuasively Shown that the Office Committed Material Error When Allowing the Claims 26

1. Factor (e): Petitioner failed to persuasively demonstrate that the Examiner misapprehended or overlooked teachings from the prior art when allowing the claims 27

a. The Examiner did not overlook any teaching in Woodbine or the cited art 27

b. The Examiner did not misapprehend any teaching in Woodbine or the cited art 28

2. Factor (f): The declarations from Petitioner's experts do not warrant reconsideration of the prior art 30

C. Denying Institution is Consistent with the Board's Previous Decisions 33

VIII. PETITIONER FAILED TO DEMONSTRATE THAT IT IS MORE LIKELY THAN NOT THAT ANY OF THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE UNPATENTABLE 36

A. Grounds 1-7: Petitioner Failed to Specify Where Each Element of the Challenged Claims are Found in the Prior Art by Relying on the Rejected Theory of Invalidity Estoppel 37

1. The Federal Circuit rejected Petitioner's "Invalidity Estoppel" Theory 39

2. Petitioner failed to establish it is more likely than not that the claims are invalid by relying on the Examiner's invalidity and obviousness analysis 40

a. Petitioner improperly relies on the Examiner's rejection of independent claim 1 in from the Final Office Action to allege invalidity of claim 1 41

DOCKET ALARM Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

b. Petitioner improperly relies on the Examiner's obviousness rationale to support its obviousness combinations in grounds 3-7 43

B. Grounds 1 and 2: Petitioner relies on legally flawed inherency arguments to argue that Claims 1-6, 7-9, 13, 14, 17, 18, and 19 are Anticipated by *Woodbine* 45

1. "a unique payload identifier that is unique to the payload reservoir".....45

a. Woodbine does not explicitly disclose "a unique payload identifier that is unique to the payload reservoir" 45

b. Woodbine does not inherently disclose "a unique payload identifier that is unique to the payload reservoir" 47

2. "Authenticate" and "compare" claim elements 50

C. Grounds 3-7: Petitioner Failed to Demonstrate That It Is More Likely Than Not That the Challenged Claims are Obvious Over the Alleged *Woodbine-Hawes*, *Woodbine-Frija*, *Woodbine-Conley*, and *Woodbine-Bowen* Combinations.....53

1. Ground 3: Petitioner Has Not Established that the Proposed *Woodbine-Hawes* Combination Renders Obvious Claims 1-6, 7-9, 13, 14, 17, and 19-21 55

2. Ground 4: Petitioner Has Not Established that the Proposed *Woodbine-Frija* Combination Renders Obvious Claims 1-6, 7-9, 13, 14, 17, and 19-21 57

3. Ground 5: Petitioner Has Not Established that the Proposed *Woodbine-Conley* Combination Renders Obvious Claims 1-6, 7-9, 13, 14, 17, and 19-21 60

4. Ground 6: Petitioner Has Not Established that the Proposed *Woodbine-Bowen* Combination Renders Obvious Claims 1-6, 7-9, 13, 14, 17, and 19-21 62

D. Ground 7: Petitioner Failed to Demonstrate That It Is More Likely Than Not That the Challenged Claims are Unpatentable

DOCKET ALARM Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

Over the Same Combinations Noted by the Examiner in the Final Office Action.....65

IX. CONCLUSION.....65

DOCKET ALARM Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKET ALARM

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.