

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

RICETEC, INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

BASF SE,  
Patent Owner.

---

PGR2021-00113 (Patent 11,096,345 B2)  
PGR2021-00114 (Patent 11,096,346 B2)

---

Record of Oral Hearing  
Held: December 13, 2022

---

Before ULRIKE W. JENKS, TINA E. HULSE, and  
ROBERT A. POLLOCK, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

PGR2021-00113 (Patent 11,096,345 B2)  
PGR2021-00114 (Patent 11,096,346 B2)

APPEARANCES:

ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER:

GERARD NORTON, ESQ.  
RYAN MILLER, ESQ.  
HOWARD S. SUH, ESQ.  
Fox Rothschild, LLP  
Princeton Pike Corporate Center  
997 Lenox Drive  
Lawrenceville, New Jersey 08648  
(609) 896-3600 (Norton)  
gnorton@foxrothschild.com  
rmiller@foxrothschild.com  
hsuh@foxrothschild.com

ON BEHALF OF THE PATENT OWNER:

RICHARD McCORMICK, ESQ.  
YANG-ZI YANG, ESQ.  
LISA FERRI, ESQ.  
Mayer Brown, LLP  
1221 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10020  
212-506-2382 (McCormick)  
rmccormich@mayerbrown.com  
yyang@mayerbrown.com  
astreff@mayerbrown.com

The above-entitled matter came on for hearing on Tuesday,  
December 13, 2022, commencing at 1:00 p.m. EDT, via Video-conference.

PROCEEDINGS

- - - - -

1:00 p.m.

1  
2  
3  
4 USHER: Good afternoon. You are here for PGR 2021-00113 and 114  
5 with Judge Hulse, Jenks and Pollock. Our IT person is a man and he will be  
6 here to assist us with any technical issues that we have.

7 Please speak loud and clear when it's your turn to speak so that the  
8 court reporter can hear you. After the hearing is over please stay on the line  
9 because the court reporter might have questions about spellings. Thank you  
10 and have a great day.

11 JUDGE HULSE: Good morning, everyone. I'm Judge Hulse. With  
12 me online are Judges Jenks and Pollock. Unfortunately, Judge Pollock is  
13 unable to appear by video today, but we assure you he's there and he can hear  
14 and he can see you. This a consolidated final hearing in PGR2021-00113  
15 and PGR2021-00114.

16 I'd like to start with appearances, please, starting with Petitioner.

17 MR. NORTON: Yes. Judges Jenks, Hulse and Pollock, this Gerard  
18 Norton from Fox Rothchild representing the Petitioner RiceTec. And with  
19 me I have my partners Howard Suh and Ryan Miller.

20 JUDGE HULSE: Welcome.

21 And for Patent Owners?

22 MR. McCORMICK: Yeah, good afternoon, Your Honors. Richard  
23 McCormick from the Mayer Brown law firm representing Patent Owner  
24 BASF. I have with me today Lisa Ferri and Yang-zi Yang from my firm as  
25 well.

1 JUDGE HULSE: Great, thank you. Welcome everyone. As we stated  
2 in our hearing order, each party will have 60 minutes of time to present their  
3 arguments. We'll start with Petitioner and then hear Patent Owner's response.  
4 And then assuming both parties reserve time, we'll hear Petitioner's rebuttal  
5 and finally Patent Owner's surrebuttal.

6 Please remember to be explicit when you're referring to any slides on  
7 the screen so that our transcript is clear. I'll be timing you and we'll give you  
8 a five-minute and a one-minute warning. Does anyone have any questions?

9 MR. NORTON: No.

10 MR. McCORMICK: No thank you.

11 JUDGE HULSE: All right. Thanks.

12 MR. SUH: And, Your Honor -- I'm sorry. And, Your Honor, this  
13 Howard Suh on behalf of Petitioners. I will be arguing, and good morning or  
14 good afternoon depending on where the judges are. I'd like to start by  
15 sharing the screen with respect to some slides that we prepared.

16 JUDGE HULSE: Great. And, Mr. Suh, will you be reserving any  
17 time?

18 MR. SUH: I will. I will be reserving five minutes if that's  
19 appropriate?

20 JUDGE HULSE: Okay. You may begin.

21 MR. SUH: Now, can anyone -- can -- I just want to make sure can  
22 everyone see the slide that's on on the screen?

23 JUDGE HULSE: Yes, yes.

24 MR. SUH: Okay, good. So, Your Honors, I just want to put some  
25 perspective and background with respect to these particular proceedings.

1 Last August when Petitioner filed its petitions for cancellation of the  
2 challenged claims it raised five particular grounds.

3 Ground one was the lack of written description. Ground two was the  
4 lack of enablement. Ground three was anticipation based upon prior art,  
5 which was actually RiceTec's prior published applications the Hinga and the  
6 Hinga2013 publications. And grounds four and five were to obviousness  
7 based upon the combination of the Hinga references and other prior art  
8 references.

9 Now, Patent Owners' response in these proceedings were that they  
10 failed to substantively address any of these particular grounds. They had six  
11 opportunities to do so, including their preliminary response, their surreply to  
12 their preliminary response. They submitted a declaration by one expert, Dr.  
13 Burgos. They formally put in their actual response after the Board actually  
14 instituted these proceedings. And then they submitted another expert's  
15 declaration replacing Dr. Burgos, and finally they put in another surreply.

16 And in all those papers they did not substantively address any of the  
17 particular grounds. Instead, they chose to actually focus only on the grounds  
18 of standing, namely that the challenged claims are not PGR eligible because  
19 they are entitled to the filing date of their parent CIP Mankin Line. So  
20 therefore, based upon that and the way that the issues have been framed in  
21 these proceedings, there's really essentially a single issue for the PTAB to  
22 decide, and that is a priority issue.

23 Are the challenged claims adequately described and enabled by the  
24 Mankin CIP parent application? And the reason why I emphasize describe  
25 and enabled is because in order to prove priority Patent Owner has to prove  
26 both written description and enablement.

# 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.