

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

L-3 COMMUNICATION HOLDINGS, INC. and
PREMIER UTILITY SERVICES, LLC,
Petitioners,

v.

POWER SURVEY, LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2014-00832 (Patent 8,482,274 B2)
Case IPR2014-00835 (Patent 8,536,856 B2)
Case IPR2014-00838 (Patent 8,598,864 B2)

Before KARL D. EASTHOM, KEVIN W. CHERRY, and
ROBERT J. WEINSCHENK, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

CHERRY, *Administrative Patent Judge*

DECISION¹
Denial of *Inter Partes* Review
37 C.F.R. § 42.108

¹ The Board exercises its discretion to issue one identical Decision in each case using this caption style. Unless otherwise authorized, the parties are not permitted to use this style.

IPR2014-00832 (Patent 8,482,274 B2)
IPR2014-00835 (Patent 8,536,856 B2)
IPR2014-00838 (Patent 8,598,864 B2)

I. INTRODUCTION

L-3 Communications Holdings, Inc. and Premier Utility Services, LLC (collectively, “Petitioners”) filed Petitions requesting *inter partes* review in each of the above-listed cases. *See* IPR2014-00832, Paper 2 (“Pet.”)²; IPR2014-00835, Paper 2; IPR2014-00838, Paper 2. Power Survey, LLC (“Patent Owner”) filed Preliminary Responses under 37 C.F.R. § 42.107(b). IPR2014-00832, Paper 7 (“Prelim. Resp.”); IPR2014-00835, Paper 7; IPR2014-00838, Paper 7. Because the dispositive issues are similar in the above-listed cases, we treat IPR2014-00832 (“the ’832 proceeding”) as representative of these three proceedings, which involve three of Patent Owner’s patents: U.S. Patent No. 8,482,274 B2 (“the ’274 patent”); U.S. Patent No. 8,536,856 B2 (“the ’856 patent”); and U.S. Patent No. 8,598,864 B2 (“the ’864 patent”) (collectively, “the Power Survey Patents”). We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 314, which provides that an *inter partes* review may not be instituted “unless . . . there is a reasonable likelihood that the petitioner would prevail with respect to at least 1 of the claims challenged in the petition.”

We determine that, based on the information presented in the Petitions and supporting evidence, Petitioners have failed to show that there is a reasonable likelihood that Petitioners would prevail with respect to at least one challenged claim. Accordingly, we decline to institute an *inter partes* review, as discussed below.

² Record citations refer to the record in IPR2014-00832, unless otherwise indicated.

IPR2014-00832 (Patent 8,482,274 B2)
IPR2014-00835 (Patent 8,536,856 B2)
IPR2014-00838 (Patent 8,598,864 B2)

A. *Related Proceedings*

The parties have identified the following related Petitions for *inter partes* review:

Related IPR Proceedings	
IPR Case No.	Involved U.S. Patent No.
IPR2014-00832	8,482,274
IPR2014-00834	8,482,274
IPR2014-00835	8,536,856
IPR2014-00836	8,536,856
IPR2014-00838	8,598,864
IPR2014-00839	8,598,864

The parties have identified the following district court case as being related: *Power Survey, LLC v. Premier Utility Services*, Civil Action No. 2:13-cv-05670-FSH-MAH (D.N.J., filed Sept. 23, 2013). Pet. 4; Prelim. Resp. 5.

B. *The Power Survey Patents*

The Power Survey Patents all relate generally to apparatuses and methods for detecting voltage anomalies in electric fields. Ex. 1003³, Abstract. The Power Survey Patents explain that large power distribution systems may occasionally generate undesirable or dangerous anomalies. *Id.* at col. 1, ll. 31–34. According to the Power Survey Patents, voltage anomalies can result when an object, such as a manhole cover, grating, or street light pole, becomes electrically energized through an electrically

³ Citations here are to the Specification of the '274 patent, which is representative.

IPR2014-00832 (Patent 8,482,274 B2)

IPR2014-00835 (Patent 8,536,856 B2)

IPR2014-00838 (Patent 8,598,864 B2)

conductive path between the network cabling of the power distribution system and the object, due to physical damage to the electrical insulation on the cable. *Id.* at col. 1, ll. 36–39. The Power Survey Patents note that these energized objects present dangers to people and animals in the area. *Id.* at col. 1, ll. 44–46.

The Power Survey Patents describe a sensor system that can receive electric field measurements from one or more “sensor probes.” *Id.* at col. 2, ll. 25–28. The Power Survey Patents explain that, based on the electric field data, the system can identify a voltage anomaly in the electric field and then send a signal to an indicator for alerting a user to the presence of the voltage anomaly in the electric field. *Id.* at col. 2, ll. 28–35.

C. Illustrative Claim

The independent claims of the Power Survey Patents include apparatus claims and method claims. Claim 1 of the '274 patent is illustrative of the claimed subject matter.

1. A mobile apparatus mounted to a motor vehicle for detecting an electric field, comprising:

at least one sensor probe, coupled to an electrically non-interfering support frame mounted to the vehicle, that generates a signal corresponding to an electric field detected by the at least one sensor probe as the sensor probe moves past a plurality of conductive objects proximate a street, wherein the at least one sensor probe comprises two or more electrodes, and wherein the two or more electrodes are each separated by a rigid insulator;

a processor, coupled to the at least one sensor probe, that digitizes the signal to form electric field data represented as a plurality of time domain samples, produces field strengths of each of the at least one sensor probes using the plurality of time

IPR2014-00832 (Patent 8,482,274 B2)

IPR2014-00835 (Patent 8,536,856 B2)

IPR2014-00838 (Patent 8,598,864 B2)

domain samples, and analyzes the field strengths to identify a line frequency voltage anomaly in the electric field, wherein the electric field data is analyzed based on an expected frequency pertaining to the line frequency voltage anomaly and wherein the voltage anomaly is generated by leakage of electric power from a power grid to at least one energized object in the plurality of conductive objects proximate the street; and

an indicator, coupled to the processor, that alerts a user to a presence of the voltage anomaly in the electric field and indicates that at least one conductive object proximate the street is energized to a potentially harmful level.

Ex. 1003, col. 25, l. 53–col. 26, l. 13.

IPR2014-00832 (Patent 8,482,274 B2)

IPR2014-00835 (Patent 8,536,856 B2)

IPR2014-00838 (Patent 8,598,864 B2)

D. References Relied Upon

The following alleged prior art is relied upon by the Petitioners:

Name	Reference	Alleged Date	Proceeding Used	Exhibit⁴
Sarnoff Report	Sarnoff Corporation, Report: <i>A Sensor System for Detecting Stay Voltages on Covers, Grates, Light Poles, and Other Structures.</i>	2002	832, 835, 838	Ex. 1009
IEEE 644	IEEE Standard 644-1994: <i>IEEE Standard Procedures for Measurement of Power Frequency Electric and Magnetic Fields From AC Power Lines</i>	Dec. 13, 1994	832	Ex. 1010
Brigham	E.O. BRIGHAM, THE FAST FOURIER TRANSFORM	1974	832, 835, 838	Ex. 1008
Greene	US 6,002,348	Dec. 14, 1999	832, 835, 838	Ex. 1006
Harris	US 6,230,105 B1	May 8, 2001	832, 835, 838	Ex. 1007

⁴ The Exhibit numbers for the individual references are the same for all of the Petitions where that particular reference is used.

IPR2014-00832 (Patent 8,482,274 B2)

IPR2014-00835 (Patent 8,536,856 B2)

IPR2014-00838 (Patent 8,598,864 B2)

E. The Asserted Grounds

The three Petitions raise the following grounds of unpatentability:

IPR2014-00832		
Claims	Ground of Unpatentability	References Relied Upon
1–4	§ 103(a)	Sarnoff Report, IEEE 644, and Brigham
5	§ 103(a)	Sarnoff Report, IEEE 644, Brigham, and Greene
8	§ 103(a)	Sarnoff Report, IEEE 644, Brigham, and Harris
IPR2014-00835		
Claims	Ground of Unpatentability	References Relied Upon
1–4	§ 103(a)	Sarnoff Report and Brigham
5	§ 103(a)	Sarnoff Report, Brigham, and Greene
8	§ 103(a)	Sarnoff Report, Brigham, and Harris
IPR2014-00838		
Claims	Ground of Unpatentability	References Relied Upon
1–5	§ 103(a)	Sarnoff Report and Brigham
8	§ 103(a)	Sarnoff Report, Brigham, and Harris

II. BACKGROUND

A. Sarnoff Report

All of Petitioners’ grounds of unpatentability in these Petitions rely on the Sarnoff Report. The Sarnoff Report is a report by the Sarnoff Corporation (“Applicant”)—the original applicant for the Power Survey patents—regarding a study conducted by the Sarnoff Corporation to detect stray voltages in the Consolidated Edison (“Con Ed”) power system in New

IPR2014-00832 (Patent 8,482,274 B2)

IPR2014-00835 (Patent 8,536,856 B2)

IPR2014-00838 (Patent 8,598,864 B2)

York City. Ex. 1009, 1. The Sarnoff Report discusses various tests and potential solutions to the problem of detecting stray voltages in the Con Ed power distribution system. *Id.* at 2–11.

B. Prosecution History of the Power Survey Patents

The '274 patent issued on July 9, 2013, from application number 13/618,696 (“the '696 application”), which was filed on September 14, 2012. Ex. 1003. The '856 patent issued on September 17, 2013, from application number 13/618,718 (“the '718 application”), which was filed on September 14, 2012. IPR2014-000835, Ex. 1002. The '696 and '718 applications are both continuations of application number 12/321,484 (“the '484 application”), which was filed on January 21, 2009. IPR2014-000838, Ex. 1001; IPR2014-000835, Ex. 1002, col. 1, ll. 9–23; Ex. 1003, col. 1, ll. 9–22. The '864 patent issued on December 13, 2013, from the '484 application. IPR2014-000838, Ex. 1001.

The '484 application is, in turn, a continuation-in-part of application number 11/224,909 (“the '909 application”). IPR2014-000838, Ex. 1001, col. 1, ll. 9–19. The '909 application was filed on September 13, 2005. IPR2014-000838, Ex. 1001; IPR2014-000835, Ex. 1002; Ex. 1003. On July 24, 2007, the '909 application issued as U.S. Patent No. 7,248,054 B2. Ex. 1002.

On December 13, 2005, as part of the prosecution of the '909 application, Applicant, filed an Information Disclosure Statement (“IDS”) under 37 C.F.R. § 1.97. Ex. 2001. The IDS states that “Applicant[] by making citation of the enclosed documents make[s] no statement or

IPR2014-00832 (Patent 8,482,274 B2)
 IPR2014-00835 (Patent 8,536,856 B2)
 IPR2014-00838 (Patent 8,598,864 B2)

admission as to whether they have or have not been made public and whether they are or are not prior art.” Ex. 2001, 2.

The IDS contains the following disclosure:

OTHER CITATIONS - NON-PATENT DOCUMENTS		
EXAMINER'S INITIALS	CITE NO.	Include name of the author (in Capital Letters), title of the article (when appropriate), title of the item(book, magazine, journal, serial, symposium, catalog, etc.), date, page(s), volume-issue number(s), publisher, city and/or country where published
		SARNOFF CORPORATION, "Advanced Stray Voltage Anomaly Detection System," Proposal No. 2003121, Dated July 24, 2002, 10 Pages.
		SARNOFF CORPORATION, "A Sensor System for Detecting Stray Voltages on Covers, Grates, Light Poles and Other Structures," Report, Dated: ca. 2002, 23 Pages.

Ex. 2001, 3; Ex. 1013, 11. The above section of the IDS identifies two non-patent documents authored by Applicant, one ten-page proposal entitled “Advanced Stray Voltage Anomaly Detection System,” Proposal No. 2003121, dated July 24, 2002, and the Sarnoff Report, the 23-page document Petitioners assert is prior art in their Petitions. *Id.*

On September 18, 2006, the Examiner of the '909 application issued an office action (“the Office Action”) rejecting a number of the pending claims as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b) and 103(a) as anticipated by the Sarnoff Report or rendered obvious by the Sarnoff Report in combination with other references. Ex. 1013, 3–7.

On December 28, 2006, Applicant submitted a response to the Office Action (“Response”). Ex. 1013, 24–34. In that Response, Applicant amended the pending claims that had been rejected and argued that these amended claims were now patentable over the references that the Examiner had relied upon. *Id.* In the section of the Response entitled “Remarks,” Applicant began by presenting a summary of the pending rejections. *Id.* at 32. Applicant stated that certain claims were “rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by a publication entitled ‘A Sensor System for

IPR2014-00832 (Patent 8,482,274 B2)

IPR2014-00835 (Patent 8,536,856 B2)

IPR2014-00838 (Patent 8,598,864 B2)

Detecting Stray Voltages on Covers, Grates, Light Poles and Other Structures [i.e., the Sarnoff Report].” *Id.* Applicant then presented arguments asserting that the Sarnoff Report failed to disclose certain limitations of the amended claims. *Id.* at 32–33. In addition, Applicant explained that

[i]n the Sarnoff reference [i.e., Sarnoff Report], the feasibility of developing a sensor/detector system configured to identify the presence of dangerous stray voltages is examined. More particularly, the Sarnoff reference discloses preliminary tests conducted by Applicant[] for purposes of identifying the challenges associated with developing the sensor/detector system, which is described in detail and enabled solely by the specification of Applicant[’s] claimed invention. Although the results of the preliminary tests disclosed in the Sarnoff reference provide useful insight and guidance in the development of the robust stray voltage detection apparatus of Applicant[’s] claimed invention, it severely lacks the essential processing details necessary to successfully enable and implement Applicant[’s] claimed invention. For instance, the ‘desirability’ to provide a sensor/detector system that could be mounted on a vehicle to allow for drive-by inspection of dangerous stray voltages is disclosed in the Sarnoff reference, however, the processing requirements necessary for effectively employing a mobile sensor/detector system are not disclosed.

Id. at 33.

None of the parties to this proceeding have identified any other portions of the prosecution history of the ’909 application or any related applications that discuss the Sarnoff Report.

IPR2014-00832 (Patent 8,482,274 B2)

IPR2014-00835 (Patent 8,536,856 B2)

IPR2014-00838 (Patent 8,598,864 B2)

III. ANALYSIS

A. *Issue*

All of Petitioners' proposed obviousness combinations rely on the Sarnoff Report. The dispositive issue at this stage of the proceeding is whether Petitioners have established that the Sarnoff Report is prior art for purposes of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

B. *Legal Standard*

“Under §103, the scope and content of the prior art are to be determined; differences between the prior art and the claims at issue are to be ascertained; and the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art resolved. Against this background the obviousness or nonobviousness of the subject matter is determined.” *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 17–18 (1966). “Before answering *Graham*'s ‘content’ inquiry, it must be known whether a patent or publication is in the prior art under 35 U.S.C. Sec. 102, — a legal question.” *Panduit Corp. v. Dennison Mfg. Co.*, 810 F.2d 1561, 1568 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Under § 102, “[a] person shall be entitled to a patent unless . . . the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country . . . more than one year prior to the date of the application for patent . . .” 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit has held that “public accessibility” is the touchstone in determining whether a reference is a “printed publication” under § 102(b). *In re Hall*, 781 F.2d 897, 898–99 (Fed. Cir. 1986). “A reference is publicly accessible ‘upon a satisfactory showing that such document has been disseminated or otherwise made available to the extent that persons interested and ordinarily skilled in the subject matter or art exercising

IPR2014-00832 (Patent 8,482,274 B2)
IPR2014-00835 (Patent 8,536,856 B2)
IPR2014-00838 (Patent 8,598,864 B2)

reasonable diligence, can locate it” *Kyocera Wireless Corp. v Int’l Trade Comm’n*, 545 F.3d 1340, 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2008) (quoting *SRI Int’l, Inc. v. Internet Sec. Sys. Inc.*, 511 F.3d 1186, 1194 (Fed. Cir. 2008)).

Whether a reference is a printed publication is a legal question based on underlying factual determinations. *Id.* The party seeking to introduce the reference “should produce sufficient proof of its dissemination or that it has otherwise been available and accessible to persons concerned with the art to which the document relates and thus most likely to avail themselves of its contents.” *In re Wyer*, 655 F.2d 221, 227 (CCPA 1981).

“However, section 102 is not the only source of section 103 prior art.” *Riverwood Int’l Corp. v. R.A. Jones & Co.*, 324 F.3d 1346, 1354 (Fed. Cir. 2003). “Valid prior art may be created by the admissions of the parties.” *Id.* (citing *In re Fout*, 675 F.2d 297, 300 (CCPA 1982)).

C. Discussion

Petitioners raise a number of related arguments in support of their contention that the Sarnoff Report is prior art. All of them center on alleged admissions made by Applicant during prosecution of the ’909 application.

First, Petitioners assert that Applicant admitted during prosecution of the ’909 application that the Sarnoff Report is a printed publication under 35 U.S.C. § 102 by calling the Sarnoff Report a “publication” in the Response to the Office Action discussed above. Pet. 23. Specifically, Petitioners note that Applicant stated that certain claims “are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by **a publication** entitled ‘A Sensor System for Detecting Stray Voltages on Covers, Grates, Light Poles and

IPR2014-00832 (Patent 8,482,274 B2)

IPR2014-00835 (Patent 8,536,856 B2)

IPR2014-00838 (Patent 8,598,864 B2)

Other Structures[.]’” Pet. 23 (quoting Ex. 1013, 32) (emphasis added by Petitioners).

Patent Owner argues that, when read in context, this statement is not an admission. Prelim. Resp. 8–10. We agree with Patent Owner. Indeed, as Patent Owner notes, Petitioners actually give this statement its correct meaning when Petitioners state that “[Applicant] further argued for patentability over ‘the other *alleged* prior art references,’ implying that [the Sarnoff Report] was the primary *alleged prior-art reference alleged by the examiner.*” Pet 23 (quoting Ex. 1013, 32–33 (emphasis added by Board, emphasis by Petitioners omitted)). We agree with Patent Owner that Applicant’s statement, which was made at the beginning of the “Remarks” section and summarized the Examiner’s rejections, merely suggests that the Examiner was alleging that the Sarnoff Report is a publication, not that Applicant was acknowledging or admitting as much. Given the location of this statement and Applicant’s explicit reference elsewhere in the Response to “other alleged prior art,” Ex. 1013, 33, we agree with Patent Owner that merely calling the Sarnoff Report a “publication,” when read in context, does not amount to an admission that it is a prior art printed publication.

Second, Petitioners argue that the Sarnoff Report is Applicant’s own publication, so Applicant was in the best position to know whether the Sarnoff Report is a printed publication. Pet. 23–24. Patent Owner submits that the fact that the Sarnoff Report is Applicant’s own document is irrelevant because it does not alter Petitioners’ burden of proof. Prelim. Resp. 11–12.

IPR2014-00832 (Patent 8,482,274 B2)

IPR2014-00835 (Patent 8,536,856 B2)

IPR2014-00838 (Patent 8,598,864 B2)

In essence, Petitioners' argument is that we should interpret Applicant's silence as an admission because Petitioners contend that Applicant was in the best position to rebut the Examiner's contention that the Sarnoff Report is prior art. However, even if we consider Applicant's silence to be evidence, we do not find this evidence to be probative of whether the Sarnoff Report is a printed publication under § 102(b). "As the Supreme Court has recognized, '[i]n most circumstances silence is so ambiguous that it is of little probative force.'" *AZ v. Shinseki*, 731 F.3d 1303, 1321 (Fed. Cir. 2013) (quoting *United States v. Hale*, 422 U.S. 171, 176 (1975)). "When evaluating whether the failure to make a statement may be probative of a material fact, the underlying test is, *would it have been natural for the person to make the assertion in question?*" *Id.* (citation and quotation marks omitted). In other words, "the inference of assent may be made only when no other explanation is equally consistent with silence." *Id.* (citation and quotation marks omitted); *see also United States v. Flecha*, 539 F.2d 874, 877 (2d Cir. 1976) ("Silence is not evidence of an admission, unless there are circumstances which render it more reasonably probable that a man would answer the charge made against him than that he would not.") (citation omitted).

We do not believe that Petitioners have shown that such circumstances exist in this case as to create an admission by silence. Petitioners failed to identify any cases placing Applicant under an obligation to raise every possible argument before the Examiner. On the contrary, it is recognized that positions often are taken during patent prosecution out of convenience and expedience, and, therefore, such positions are not

IPR2014-00832 (Patent 8,482,274 B2)

IPR2014-00835 (Patent 8,536,856 B2)

IPR2014-00838 (Patent 8,598,864 B2)

necessarily given preclusive effect. *See Quad Envtl. Techs. v. Union Sanitary Dist.*, 946 F.2d 870, 873–74 (Fed. Cir. 1991) (holding “[i]t is improper to convert [the] simple expedient of ‘obviation’ [of a double patenting rejection] into an admission or acquiescence or estoppel on the merits”).⁵ The situation here is similar. It was certainly reasonable for Applicant to choose to make only one of several alternative arguments available to it during prosecution of the ’909 application. Petitioners have not shown that this was an instance where Applicant would have necessarily responded to the Examiner’s assertion that the Sarnoff Report is prior art. Thus, Petitioners have failed to show that that Applicant’s choice to amend the claims and make a successful argument that the Sarnoff Report failed to disclose the limitations of the amended claims, rather than contest the status of the Sarnoff Report as a prior art reference, constitutes an admission by silence.⁶

⁵ The reissue recapture case cited by Petitioners does not convince us otherwise. *See* Pet. 26 (citing *Hester Indus. v. Stein*, 142 F.3d 1472 (Fed. Cir. 1998)). Petitioners have not cited any cases that hold that the presumptions that exist to prevent the abuse of the reissue process also create estoppel as to underlying facts in other contexts. We decline to extend these presumptions beyond their normal bounds.

⁶ Indeed, this is also consistent with the Federal Circuit’s repeated warnings about interpreting claims based on a silence during the course of the prosecution. *See, e.g., Salazar v. Procter & Gamble Co.*, 414 F.3d 1342, 1345 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (“an applicant’s silence regarding statements made by the examiner during prosecution, without more, cannot amount to a ‘clear and unmistakable disavowal’ of claim scope”); *DeMarini Sports, Inc. v. Worth, Inc.*, 239 F.3d 1314, 1326–27 (Fed. Cir. 2001) (refusing to rely on ambiguity surrounding examiner’s silence or patentee’s lack of argument during prosecution to construe claim term).

IPR2014-00832 (Patent 8,482,274 B2)
IPR2014-00835 (Patent 8,536,856 B2)
IPR2014-00838 (Patent 8,598,864 B2)

Third, Petitioners contend that Applicant “admitted that [the Sarnoff Report] constituted § 102(b) prior art by admitting that the document was dated in 2002, two years prior to the earliest possible priority date for the ’274 patent.” Pet. 24. Petitioners further argue that Applicant cited the publication on an IDS and stated that the publication was a report from “ca 2002.” Pet. 24 (citing Ex. 1013, 12). In response, Patent Owner argues that “the IDS explicitly eschewed such an admission” by containing the disclaimer discussed above. Prelim. Resp. 2 (quoting Ex. 2001, 2); *see also* Prelim. Resp. 7–8. Patent Owner further asserts that, as a matter of law, the listing of a document in an IDS—even where the document date precedes the critical date—is not an admission that the disclosed reference is prior art. Prelim. Resp. 2, 7–8 (citing *ResQNet.com, Inc. v. Lansa Inc.*, 594 F.3d 860, 866 (Fed. Cir. 2010); 37 C.F.R. § 1.97(h); MPEP § 2001.04).

We agree with the Patent Owner that the IDS filed in connection with the ’909 application does not constitute an admission that the Sarnoff Report is prior art. The IDS expressly states that the submission of the IDS is not an admission that any item listed therein is prior art. *See* Ex. 2001, 2. Moreover, the Federal Circuit has repeatedly held that the submission of a reference on an IDS does not constitute an admission that a cited reference falls within the legal definition of prior art. *See ResQNet.com, Inc. v. Lansa Inc.*, 594 F.3d 860, 866 (Fed. Cir. 2010); *Abbott Labs. v. Baxter Pharm. Prod., Inc.*, 334 F.3d 1274, 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2003); *Riverwood Int’l Corp.*, 324 F.3d at 1355. As for the date included on the document and in the IDS, the IDS only states that the document is “Dated: ca. 2002.” This may suggest the date that the document was created, or perhaps, it may relate to a

IPR2014-00832 (Patent 8,482,274 B2)
IPR2014-00835 (Patent 8,536,856 B2)
IPR2014-00838 (Patent 8,598,864 B2)

date the Sarnoff Report was circulated to select employees of Sarnoff Corporation. It does not establish, by itself, with a reasonable likelihood, that this was the date that the document was “publicly accessible.”

Fourth, Petitioner argues that “nowhere in its response to the office action does [Applicant] suggest that the document is somehow not, as the examiner asserted, a prior art publication under § 102(b).” Pet. 24. Petitioners contend that, “[t]o the contrary, rather than arguing that the reference was not a publication, [Applicant] amended its then-pending claims to overcome the reference” and made extensive arguments regarding patentability. Pet. 24. Patent Owner responds that this same type of situation was considered in *ResQNet* and found to be insufficient to establish that a reference was a printed publication. Prelim Resp. 3, 10–11.

We agree with Patent Owner that choosing to respond to a rejection by amending the claims, rather than proving that a reference is not prior art, does not amount to an admission that the reference is prior art. As Patent Owner notes, the Federal Circuit considered a similar situation in *ResQNet* and found it did not amount to an admission. In *ResQNet*, ResQNet submitted manuals to the Patent Office in an IDS and then amended the claims of its patent in response to a rejection by the examiner based on those manuals rather than arguing that the manuals were not prior art. 594 F.3d at 865–66. The Federal Circuit held that ResQNet did not admit that the manuals were prior art by these actions where no other evidence of public availability was provided. *Id.* at 866.

Finally, Petitioners argue that, “under the totality of the circumstances, [Applicant] treated the reference as a prior-art printed

IPR2014-00832 (Patent 8,482,274 B2)
IPR2014-00835 (Patent 8,536,856 B2)
IPR2014-00838 (Patent 8,598,864 B2)

publication, and put the public on notice that the reference constituted a prior-art printed publication.” Pet. 26–27. The foregoing analysis considers the totality of the circumstances as set forth by the Petition and Patent Owner’s response thereto. On this record, Petitioners fail to show that the Sarnoff Report qualifies as prior art. Consequently, Petitioners have not shown a reasonable likelihood that they would prevail in these Petitions.

IV. CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing discussion, we determine that, on this record, Petitioners have failed to show that the Sarnoff Report qualifies as prior art. Each of the grounds of unpatentability alleged by Petitioners rely on the Sarnoff Report. Thus, we conclude that Petitioners have failed to show a reasonable likelihood of success on any ground of unpatentability raised in these three Petitions. Accordingly, the following Petitions hereby are denied: IPR2014-00832 (Patent 8,482,274 B2); IPR2014-00835 (Patent 8,536,856 B2); and IPR2014-00838 (Patent 8,598,864 B2).

V. ORDER

It is hereby ORDERED that the Petitions filed in IPR2014-00832, IPR2014-00835, and IPR2014-00838, are *denied*, and no trial is instituted.

IPR2014-00832 (Patent 8,482,274 B2)

IPR2014-00835 (Patent 8,536,856 B2)

IPR2014-00838 (Patent 8,598,864 B2)

PETITIONER:

Daniel J. Goettle

John P. Donohue, Jr.

Baker & Hostetler LLP

dgoettle@bakerlaw.com

jdonohue@bakerlaw.com

PATENT OWNER:

Jon E. Wright

Ross G. Hicks

Michael B. Ray

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.

jwright-ptab@skgf.com

rhicks-ptab@skgf.com

mray-ptab@skgf.com