

NOTE: This disposition is nonprecedential.

United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit

IN RE: ROBERT D. KROSS,
Appellant

2020-1056

Appeal from the United States Patent and Trademark
Office, Patent Trial and Appeal Board in No. 13/275,400.

Decided: August 11, 2020

EDWIN DAVID SCHINDLER, Huntington, NY, for appel-
lant.

MARY L. KELLY, Office of the Solicitor, United States
Patent and Trademark Office, Alexandria, VA, for appellee
Andrei Iancu. Also represented by THOMAS W. KRAUSE,
AMY J. NELSON, FARHEENA YASMEEN RASHEED.

Before PROST, *Chief Judge*, NEWMAN and O'MALLEY,
Circuit Judges.

O'MALLEY, *Circuit Judge*.

Appellant Robert D. Kross (“Kross”) appeals the Patent
Trial and Appeal Board’s (“Board’s”) determination that
claims 31–50 of Kross’s patent application, No. 13/275,400

(“the ’400 Application”), would have been obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). For the reasons explained below, we *affirm* the Board’s decision.

BACKGROUND

The ’400 Application relates generally to non-gelatin viscoelastic printing plates and the use of such plates in monotype printing. A monotype print is typically made by pressing a piece of paper against an inked surface. A stated objective of the purported invention is to provide a reusable, durable, and readily-cleanable gel printing plate that artists may be able to use “without a need for a press or other type of pressure tool.” J.A. 19. Kross contends that the purported invention overcomes the problems of “cracking, splitting and just plain ‘falling apart,’” which are inherent in printing plates made of gelatin. Appellant’s Br. 8.

It is undisputed that claim 31, reproduced below, is representative.

A printing method using a non-gelatin, viscoelastic gel printing plate, comprising the steps of:

applying a layer of paint to a non-gelatin, viscoelastic gel printing plate comprising a viscoelastic gel composition having a viscoelastic polymer selected from the group consisting of a hydrogenated poly-isoprene/butadiene polymer, poly(styrene-butadiene-styrene), poly(styrene-butadiene)_n, poly(styrene-iso-prene-styrene), poly-(styrene-iso-prene)_n, poly(styrene-ethylene-propylene), poly(styrene-ethylene-propylene-styrene)_n, poly(styrene-ethylene-butylene-styrene)_n, poly(styrene-ethylene-butylene), poly(styrene-ethylene-propylene)_n, poly(styrene-ethylene-butylene)_n, polystyrene, polybutylene, poly(ethylene-propylene), poly(ethylene-butylene), polypropylene, polyethylene, polyurethane, polyethylene and silicone, and

IN RE: KROSS

3

a combination thereof, and a plasticizing oil, said viscoelastic gel composition excludes gelatin and has a smooth surface formed as a sheet and shaped for use as said non-gelatin, viscoelastic gel printing plate;

laying over said non-gelatin, viscoelastic gel printing plate a surface onto which said layer of paint for creating a print is to be transferred; and,

transferring at least a portion of said layer of paint from said non-gelatin, viscoelastic gel printing plate to said surface via pressure for producing said print,

said method for producing said print using said non-gelatin printing plate being capable of being performed either with a pressure tool, without said pressure tool and solely with the pressure being applied by a hand of a person, or with both said pressure tool and the pressure being applied by the hand of a person.

J.A. 34–35. Claim 39, the other independent claim on appeal, further recites limitations requiring the production of a second print. J.A. 4, 36–37. The examiner rejected claims 31–50 as obvious over at least one of five combinations of prior art references. Kross appealed to the Board, which affirmed the examiner’s rejections.

In its decision affirming the examiner’s rejections, the Board noted that this was the third time it was reviewing “similar claims” based on the ’400 Application. J.A. 2. It rejected Kross’s argument that the purported invention represents a new use for a known material and meets a long-felt and unmet need of solving the cracking problems that were a hallmark of gelatin plates. J.A. 6. The Board concluded that a person of skill in the art “would have expected . . . that the properties of the viscoelastic gel compositions” described in the prior art “would likely address the

[same] problems.” J.A. 6–7. The Board found that the examiner’s rejections were consistent with prior findings of fact and conclusions of obviousness addressing Kross’s now-cancelled, similar claims for the ’400 Application. J.A. 6.¹ For example, the Board had previously found that the prior art recognized the splitting and cracking problem with gelatin, and that this would have prompted a person of skill in the art “to consider materials having similar properties, but less prone to splitting,” such as the viscoelastic materials claimed by Kross. J.A. 271. Accordingly, the Board credited the examiner’s findings, noting that a person of skill in the art would have a “reasonable expectation of successfully solving a known problem using known properties of a known material.” J.A. 7 (citing *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 493 (Fed. Cir. 1991)). The Board also rejected Kross’s arguments directed to objective indicia of non-obviousness. J.A. 7–9.

On appeal, Kross challenges the Board’s conclusions with respect to one prior art reference combination: Singular Impressions,² Taylor,³ and Chen.⁴ Singular Impressions discloses monotype printing using a glass or metal printing plate, but not a gel printing plate. J.A. 587. It teaches that “[i]n its purest and simplest form, a monotype

¹ The Board noted that Kross’s previously rejected claims differed from his current claims only in their inclusion of a washing step and requirements of reusing the plates and application of pressure by hand. J.A. 4.

² Printout of Singular Impressions, the monotype process, <http://americanart.si.edu/exhibitions/online/monotypes/video.html>. as captured by the WaybackMachine on April 14, 2009.

³ Printout of <http://marytaylorart.com/FAQ/FAQGelatinPrint.htm> as captured by WaybackMachine on October 19, 2009.

⁴ U.S. Patent No. 7,159,259.

IN RE: KROSS

5

is made by drawing with printer's ink or oil paint on a smooth surface such as glass or a metal plate." *Id.* It also teaches that the image can be transferred to paper using hand pressure. *Id.* By contrast, Taylor discloses how to prepare gelatin printing plates for use in monotype printing. J.A. 588. Chen, on the other hand, discloses non-gelatin, gel polymers, primarily for use in medical devices. J.A. 599. The parties agree that Chen does not disclose the use of these materials in the context of printing. The parties also agree that a fourth prior art reference, Germain,⁵ discloses the problems with using gelatin printing plates. J.A. 177–182; J.A. 306–312.

Kross timely filed a notice of appeal. We have jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1295(a)(4).

DISCUSSION

"We review Board decisions in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)." *HTC Corp. v. Cellular Comm'ns Equip., LLC*, 877 F.3d 1361, 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2017). Under the APA, "we review the Board's legal conclusions de novo and its factual findings for substantial evidence." *Id.* "Substantial evidence . . . means such relevant evidence as a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support a conclusion." *Consol. Edison Co. v. NLRB*, 305 U.S. 197, 229 (1938). Obviousness is a question of law based on underlying factual findings. *Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp. v. Hospira, Inc.*, 874 F.3d 724, 728 (Fed. Cir. 2017). In an obviousness analysis, factual findings include, *inter alia*, the scope and content of the prior art, level of ordinary skill in the art, the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art, and motivation to combine. *Randall Mfg. v. Rea*, 733 F.3d 1355, 1362

⁵ Finda Germain, Gelatin Printmaking-Monotype Prints, <https://youtube.com/DyOJG-TEWf8>, YouTube video and comments dated May 11, 2008.

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.