

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

PARHELION, INC.
Petitioner

v.

STREAMLIGHT, INC.
Patent Owner

PGR Case No.: PGR2020-00062
U.S. Patent No. 10,378,702

PETITION FOR POST-GRANT REVIEW

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	MANDATORY NOTICES (37 C.F.R. § 42.8)	7
A.	Real Parties-in-Interest	7
B.	Related Matters.....	7
C.	Counsel and Service Information.....	7
D.	Power of Attorney	8
II.	PAYMENT OF FEES (37 C.F.R. § 42.15(b))	8
III.	SUMMARY OF REASONS WHY THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE UNPATENTABLE.....	8
IV.	BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY OF THE '702 PATENT	9
V.	THE PROSECUTION HISTORY OF THE '702 PATENT.....	12
VI.	REQUIREMENTS FOR POST GRANT REVIEW (37 C.F.R. § 42.204)...	16
A.	Grounds for Standing (37 C.F.R. § 42.204 (a))	16
B.	Identification of Challenged Claims and Specific Statutory Grounds (37 C.F.R. § 42.204 (b) (1)-(2))	16
C.	Claim Construction (37 C.F.R. § 42.204 (b) (3)).....	25
1.	“cylindrical lens”.....	26
2.	“plane of laser light”	27
3.	“or” recitations found in Claims 8, 18, 20, 21, 24, and 26	28
VII.	EFFECTIVE FILING DATE OF THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS	29
VIII.	HOW THE CLAIMS ARE UNPATENTABLE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.204 (b)(4)-(5)	30
A.	Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	30
B.	Ground 1: Anticipation of Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 18, 22, and 27 by Krietzman	30
1.	The Prior Art Krietzman Patent	30
2.	Application of Krietzman to the Challenged Claims.....	32
C.	Ground 2: Obviousness of Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 18, 22, 27, and 28 Over Krietzman in View of Goodrich and Gustafson.....	42
1.	Goodrich’s Cylindrical Lens.....	42
2.	Gustafson’s Multi-Position Switch	44
D.	Ground 3: Lack of Enablement of Claims 1, 10, 11, 22, 23, 26, 27, and 31 Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 112 (a).....	47

1.	The Full Scope of Claims 1, 10, 11, 22, 23, 26, 27, and 31 Encompasses Devices that Use a Cylindrical Lens to Provide a Plane of Laser Light that Illuminates Objects in a Smoke-Filled Room.....	47
2.	Requirements for Use of Planes of Laser Light to Illuminate Objects in Smoke-Filled Rooms	48
3.	The Full Scope of Claims 1, 10, 11, 22, 23, 26, 27, and 31 is Not Enabled.....	53
4.	The Full Scope of Claims 8, 18, 20, 21, 24, and 26 Encompasses Portable Lighting Devices that Include a Laser Module Attached to a Flexible Stalk	56
5.	Heat Dissipation Requirements for Laser Diodes	56
6.	Claims 8, 18, 20, 21, 24, and 26 Lack Enablement	57
IX.	THE GROUNDS ARE NOT REDUNDANT	62
X.	CONCLUSION.....	63

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Amgen, Inc. v. Chugai Pharm. Co.</i> , 927 F.2d 1200 (Fed. Cir. 1991).....	43
<i>Brown v. 3M</i> , 265 F.3d 1349, 60 USPQ2d 1375, (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	25
<i>Duncan Parking Techs., Inc. v. IPS Group, Inc.</i> , 914 F.3d 1347 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	44
<i>Eli Lilly & Co. v. Zenith Goldline Pharm., Inc.</i> , 471 F.3d 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	30
<i>In re Wands</i> , 858 F.2d 731 (Fed. Cir. 1988).....	43, 49
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	22
<i>Wm. Wrigley Jr. Co. v. Cadbury Adams USA LLC</i> , 683 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	30
<i>Wyeth & Cordis Corp. v. Abbot Labs.</i> , 720 F.3d 1380 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	43

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 102(a)(1).....	39, 40
35 U.S.C. § 112(a)	15, 21, 43, 51
35 U.S.C. § 282(b)	22
35 U.S.C. § 321(c)	14
35 U.S.C. §§ 321-329	6

Rules

37 C.F.R. § 42	6
37 C.F.R. § 42.10(b)	7
37 C.F.R. § 42.15(b)	7
37 C.F.R. § 42.204	14
37 C.F.R. § 42.204 (a).....	14
37 C.F.R. § 42.204 (b)	26

37 C.F.R. § 42.204 (b) (1).....	15
37 C.F.R. § 42.204 (b) (2).....	15
37 C.F.R. § 42.204 (b)(3).....	22
37 C.F.R. § 42.205	60
37 C.F.R. § 42.24	61
37 C.F.R. § 42.6	60
37 C.F.R. § 42.8	6

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.