

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

AMPHENOL CORP.,
Petitioner,

v.

PPC BROADBAND, INC.,
Patent Owner.

IPR2022-00721
Patent 9,225,083 B2

Before BART A. GERSTENBLITH, GEORGE R. HOSKINS, and
FRANCES L. IPPOLITO, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

HOSKINS, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

JUDGMENT
Final Written Decision
Determining All Challenged Claims Unpatentable
35 U.S.C. § 318(a)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
II.	BACKGROUND	2
A.	Real Parties-in-Interest and Related Proceedings.....	2
B.	The '083 Patent Specification.....	2
C.	The Challenged Claims of the '083 Patent	5
D.	Asserted Prior Art.....	7
E.	Asserted Grounds	8
F.	Testimonial Evidence.....	9
III.	ANALYSIS OF PETITIONER'S GROUNDS.....	9
A.	Statement of Law.....	9
B.	Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art	10
C.	Claim Construction.....	11
D.	Ground 1—Obviousness over Youtsey, Lionetto, and Horak.....	12
1.	Youtsey	12
2.	Lionetto	14
3.	Horak.....	16
4.	Claim 1.....	18
a)	Coaxial Cable Connector (Element 1[pre]).....	19
b)	Body Member (Limitation 1[a]).....	22
c)	Post Member (Limitation 1[b]).....	25
d)	Nut Member (Limitation 1[c]).....	27
e)	Grounding Member (Limitation 1[d]).....	29
(i)	Comparing the Claimed Grounding Member with Youtsey's O-Ring 84.....	30
(ii)	Summary of Petitioner's Contentions	34
(iii)	Differences Between Claim 1 and Youtsey, Lionetto, and Horak.....	35
(1)	Coupler-Body Electrical Grounding Path.....	35

(2) O-Ring.....	38
(iv) Scope of Prior Art—Grounding Paths in Coaxial Cable Connectors.....	40
(v) Motivation to Modify Youtsey in Light of Lionetto and Horak.....	47
(1) Petitioner’s First Motivation—Maintain Ground Shield in Loose Connector	47
(2) Petitioner’s Second Motivation—Crevice Susceptible to RFI	63
(3) Patent Owner’s First Disadvantage—Inferior Environmental Seal.....	64
(4) Patent Owner’s Second Disadvantage—Increased Resistance to Rotation.....	71
(5) Patent Owner’s Third Disadvantage—Increased Cost....	86
(6) Analysis and Conclusion as to Motivation to Modify Youtsey.....	87
(vi) Reasonable Expectation of Success	89
(vii) Objective Indicia of Nonobviousness.....	90
(viii) Weighing of Evidence and Conclusion as to Obviousness .	94
f) First Electrical Ground Path (Limitation 1[e]).....	94
g) Second Electrical Ground Path (Limitation 1[f]).....	96
h) Maintaining Second Electrical Ground Path in Unbroken State (Limitation 1[g]).....	96
i) Collateral Estoppel	97
j) Conclusion as to Claim 1	98
5. Claims 2–6, 8–19, 21–33, 35–43, 45–50, and 52–62	98
E. Ground 2—Obviousness over Tarrant and Bell.....	99
IV. SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS.....	99
V. ORDER.....	100

I. INTRODUCTION

Amphenol Corp. (“Petitioner”) filed a Petition (Paper 2, “Pet.”) pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §§ 311–319 for *inter partes* review of U.S. Patent No. 9,225,083 B2 (Ex. 1001, “the ’083 patent”), claims 1–6, 8–19, 21–33, 35–43, 45–50, and 52–62. We issued an Institution Decision (Paper 11, “Inst. Dec.”) instituting the petitioned review.

PPC Broadband, Inc. (“Patent Owner”) then filed a Patent Owner Response (Paper 17, “PO Resp.”) to the Petition. Petitioner filed a Reply (Paper 22, “Pet. Reply”) to the Patent Owner Response. Patent Owner filed a Sur-reply (Paper 27, “PO Sur-reply”) to the Reply.

Further, with prior authorization from the Board, Patent Owner filed an Identification of Improper New Arguments and Evidence in Petitioner’s Reply (Paper 24), then Petitioner filed a Joint Chart Regarding Arguments and Evidence in Petitioner’s Reply (Paper 25).¹

An oral hearing was held on July 20, 2023, for which the transcript was entered into the record (Paper 34, “Tr.”).

We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b)(4) and § 318(a). This Decision is a final written decision under 35 U.S.C. § 318(a) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.73 as to the patentability of claims 1–6, 8–19, 21–33, 35–43, 45–50, and 52–62 of the ’083 patent. We determine Petitioner has shown by a preponderance of the evidence that those claims are unpatentable.

¹ We address the issues raised by Papers 24 and 25 below, but only to the extent that we rely in this Decision on arguments and evidence found in Petitioner’s Reply that Patent Owner asserts is improper.

II. BACKGROUND

A. *Real Parties-in-Interest and Related Proceedings*

Petitioner identifies itself (i.e., Amphenol Corp.), Times Fiber Communications, Inc., and Holland Electronics, LLC, as real parties-in-interest. *See* Pet. 93. Patent Owner identifies itself (i.e., PPC Broadband, Inc.) and Belden Inc. as real parties-in-interest. *See* Paper 4, 1.

There are three related IPR proceedings challenging patents related to the '083 patent. *See* Pet. 93; Paper 4, 1. They are: IPR2022-00718 (U.S. Patent No. 10,965,063 B2); IPR2022-00719 (U.S. Patent No. 10,446,983 B2); and IPR2022-00720 (U.S. Patent No. 10,038,284 B2).

There is a related U.S. District Court litigation in which Patent Owner has asserted these four patents against Petitioner. *See PPC Broadband, Inc. v. Amphenol Corp. and Times Fiber Comm'ns, Inc.*, No. 1:21-cv-00654 (D. Del.); Pet. 93; Paper 4, 1. The Court has stayed the litigation “until the [Patent Trial and Appeal Board (PTAB)] has issued a final written decision on each IPR.” *PPC Broadband v. Amphenol*, Docket Nos. 43 and 45.

B. *The '083 Patent Specification*

The '083 patent is directed to the field of connectors for coaxial cables. *See* Ex. 1001, 1:30–32. It particularly concerns such a connector comprising an electrically conductive member, for maintaining an electrical grounding path through the connector that provides a shield against outside electromagnetic interference (“EMI”) with signals being conveyed by the connected coaxial cables. *See id.* at code (57), 1:32–34, 1:46–60.

Figure 1A of the '083 patent is reproduced below.




FIG. 1A
The '083 Patent, Figure 1A.

Figure 1A is a sectional side view of connector 100 for coaxial cable 10.
See id. at 4:28–29, 5:5–7.

Coaxial cable 10 includes protective outer jacket 12, conductive grounding shield 14, interior dielectric 16, and center conductor 18. *See id.* at 5:7–9. Protective outer jacket 12 protects the other components of coaxial cable 10 from damage caused by exposure to dirt or moisture, and from corrosion. *See id.* at 5:15–18. Grounding shield 14 may be comprised of conductive materials that are suitable for providing an electrical ground connection, to prevent external electromagnetic noise from reaching center conductor 18. *See id.* at 5:22–36. Center conductor 18 is a conductive material that propagates electrical signals down the length of coaxial cable 10. *See id.* at 5:9; *see also* Pet. 2 (“[A] coaxial cable includes . . . a copper wire 3 through which the data signals travel[.]”).

Connector 100 includes interface port 20, coupling member 30, post 40, connector body 50, fastener member 60, and two conductive

members such as o-rings 70 and 80. *See* Ex. 1001, 5:49–50, 6:14–21. When connector 100 is fully assembled onto coaxial cable 10, port 20 is received within first end 32 of coupling member 30 via the port’s threaded exterior surface 24, and lip 36 of coupling member 30 rotatably engages flange 46 of post 40. *See id.* at Figs. 1A, 2, 3, 5:49–58, 6:27–43, 7:30–37.

Conductive member 70 functions to extend the grounding shield provided by shield 14 of coaxial cable 10 across the body of connector 100, in the following fashion. First, post 40 is inserted between shield 14 and dielectric 16 of coaxial cable 10, to ensure effective electrical contact between post 40 and shield 14. *See id.* at 7:43–58, 13:7–19. Second, conductive member 70 is in physical contact between post 40 and coupling member 30, to ensure an effective electrical path therebetween. *See id.* at 6:65–7:16, 7:39–43, 9:54–64, 11:3–12. Conductive member 70 additionally functions to “form[] a seal proximate the mating edge of the post 40,” “thereby providing a physical barrier to unwanted ingress of moisture and/or other environmental contaminates.” *Id.* at 10:49–55, 10:64–11:1.

Conductive member 80 also functions to extend the grounding shield provided by shield 14 of coaxial cable 10 across the body of connector 100, in the following fashion. First, connector body 50 makes physical and electrical contact with shield 14 of coaxial cable 10. *See id.* at 14:40–52. Second, conductive member 80 is “positioned in a location so as to . . . effectuate electrical contact between the connector body 50 and coupling member 30,” to ensure an effective electrical path therebetween. *Id.* at 6:19–26, 11:37–55, 11:59–12:3. Conductive member 80 additionally functions to provide “a physical seal” between connector body 50 and

coupling member 30, “thereby providing a physical barrier to unwanted ingress of moisture and/or other environmental contaminants.” *Id.* at 6:19–26, 11:55–59.

The embodiment of Figure 1A includes conductive member 70 and conductive member 80. *See id.* at Fig. 1A. In one alternative embodiment, conductive member 70 may be used without conductive member 80. *See id.* at Figs. 7A and 7B, 9:52–64. In another alternative embodiment, conductive member 80 may be used without conductive member 70. *See id.* at Figs. 8A and 8B, 11:43–66.

Patent Owner refers to the ’083 patent’s disclosure relating to conductive member 80 as the “coupler-body” embodiment, because member 80 is disposed between and electrically connects coupling member 30 and connector body 50 to extend the grounding shield through those components. *See, e.g.*, PO Resp. 1, 6–7.

C. The Challenged Claims of the ’083 Patent

The Petition challenges claims 1–6, 8–19, 21–33, 35–43, 45–50, and 52–62 of the ’083 patent, which include four independent claims 1, 18, 31, and 45. *See* Pet. 1; Ex. 1001, 15:40–16:55, 16:61–18:41, 18:50–20:52, 20:57–21:21, 21:24–22:50, 22:56–23:27. We reproduce illustrative claim 1 here, with Petitioner’s labeling scheme (*see* Pet. 96–97 (Claims App.)):

1. [pre] A coaxial cable connector for coupling an end of a coaxial cable, the coaxial cable having a center conductor surrounded by a dielectric, the dielectric being surrounded by a conductive grounding shield, the conductive grounding shield being surrounded by a protective outer jacket, the connector comprising:
 - [a] a conductive body member including a forward body end portion and an opposing rearward body end portion,

- [a][i] the rearward body end portion configured to receive a portion of the coaxial cable,
- [a][ii] the forward body end portion having a forward facing body portion that comprises a forwardmost surface of the conductive body member and a conductive member outer body contact portion of a surface extending at least partially in a radial direction when the connector is assembled;
- [b] a post member configured to engage the conductive body member, wherein the post member is not integral with the conductive body member,
 - [b][i] the post member having a forward end including a flange and
 - [b][ii] a rearward end, the rearward end configured to be inserted into a portion of the coaxial cable around the dielectric and under at least a portion of the conductive grounding shield thereof to make electrical contact with the conductive grounding shield of the coaxial cable;
- [c] a conductive nut member configured to rotate relative to the post member and the conductive body member, the conductive nut member including
 - [c][i] a forward nut end portion configured to be coupled to an interface port,
 - [c][ii] a rearward nut end portion, and an internal lip, the internal lip having a forward lip surface facing the forward nut end portion and a rearward lip surface facing the rearward nut end portion;
- [d] a conductive metal ring grounding member including
 - [d][i] a nut contact portion configured to be electrically coupled to the conductive nut member and
 - [d][ii] a body contact portion configured to at least partially encircle a portion of the conductive body member and be electrically and physically coupled to the conductive member outer body contact portion of

the conductive body member without contacting the forward facing body portion of the conductive body member so as to form a nut-body electrical circuit between the conductive nut member and the conductive member outer body contact portion of the conductive body member, extend electromagnetic shielding from the coaxial cable through the connector, and inhibit RF [radio frequency] ingress into the connector when the connector is assembled;

[e] wherein the flange of the post member is configured to electrically contact the internal lip of the conductive nut member so as to form a first electrical ground path between the post member and the conductive nut member, and

[f] wherein the conductive metal ring grounding member forms a second electrical ground path between the conductive body member and the conductive nut member when the connector is assembled; and

[g] wherein the conductive metal ring grounding member is configured to maintain the second electrical ground path in an unbroken state, where the conductive metal ring grounding member is in electrical contact with the conductive body member and the conductive nut member, even when the first electrical ground path is in a broken state, where the flange of the post member is not in electrical contact with the internal lip of the conductive nut member.

Ex. 1001, 15:40–16:37.

D. Asserted Prior Art

Petitioner relies principally on the following five references. *See* Pet. 1.

Name	Reference	Publication Date	Exhibit No.
Youtsey	US 6,042,422	Mar. 28, 2000	1007
Lionetto	US 4,929,188	May 29, 1990	1008
Horak	US 3,879,102	Apr. 22, 1975	1009
Tarrant	US 5,083,943	Jan. 28, 1992	1010
Bell	US 5,882,226	Mar. 16, 1999	1011

Petitioner asserts each reference qualifies as prior art to the '083 patent by virtue of their respective publication dates preceding the '083 patent's earliest claimed priority date of November 24, 2004, by more than one year. *See* Pet. 10, 57. Patent Owner does not dispute this assertion, and we find it is supported by the evidence. *See* Ex. 1001, code (63); Ex. 1007, code (45); Ex. 1008, code (45); Ex. 1009, code (45); Ex. 1010, code (45); Ex. 1011, code (45).

E. Asserted Grounds

Petitioner asserts the following two grounds of unpatentability for the challenged claims. *See* Pet. 1.

Ground	Claims Challenged	35 U.S.C. § ²	References
1	1–6, 8–19, 21–33, 35–43, 45–50, 52–62	103(a)	Youtsey, Lionetto, Horak
2	1–6, 8–19, 21–33, 35–43, 45–50, 52–62	103(a)	Tarrant, Bell

² The Leahy-Smith America Invents Act (“AIA”) included revisions to 35 U.S.C. § 103 that became effective in March 2013. The '083 patent was filed in October 2014, but asserts priority to several parent applications filed before March 2013. In this Decision, we assume the asserted priority (which has not been challenged) is correct, so we cite to the pre-AIA version of § 103. None of the disputes resolved by this Decision are affected by the AIA revisions to § 103.

F. Testimonial Evidence

Petitioner relies on the testimony of James Dickens, Ph.D. (Exs. 1005, 1026, 2041, 2044). Patent Owner relies on the testimony of Charles A. Eldering, Ph.D. (Exs. 1027, 2001, 2042).

III. ANALYSIS OF PETITIONER’S GROUNDS

A. Statement of Law

Petitioner bears the burden of proving unpatentability of the challenged claims, and this burden of persuasion never shifts to Patent Owner. *See Dynamic Drinkware, LLC v. Nat’l Graphics, Inc.*, 800 F.3d 1375, 1378 (Fed. Cir. 2015). Petitioner must prove unpatentability by a preponderance of the evidence. *See* 35 U.S.C. § 316(e); 37 C.F.R. § 42.1(d).

A patent claim is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) if the differences between the claimed subject matter and the prior art are such that the subject matter, as a whole, would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the claimed invention pertains. *See KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S. 398, 406 (2007). The question of obviousness is resolved on the basis of underlying factual determinations including: (1) the scope and content of the prior art; (2) any differences between the claimed subject matter and the prior art; (3) the level of ordinary skill in the art; and (4) objective indicia of nonobviousness, if made available in the record as Patent Owner has done in this case. *See Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 17–18 (1966). “While the sequence of these questions might be reordered in any particular case,” *KSR*, 550 U.S. at 407, the Federal Circuit has explained that an obviousness determination can be made only after consideration of all of the

Graham factors. See, e.g., *Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.*, 688 F.3d 1342, 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2012).

B. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art

Petitioner’s witness, Dr. Dickens, opines that a person having ordinary skill in the art pertaining to the ’083 patent would have had either: (1) “a bachelor’s degree in mechanical or electrical engineering, or a related field, and three to four years of industry experience”; or (2) “a master’s degree in mechanical or electrical engineering, or a related field, and one to two years of industry experience.” Pet. 9; Ex. 1005 ¶ 12; Ex. 1026 ¶ 270. Dr. Dickens adds that this person “also would have been familiar with coaxial cables and connectors and/or the components and underlying technology used therein.” Pet. 9; Ex. 1005 ¶ 12.

Patent Owner’s witness, Dr. Eldering, opines that a person of ordinary skill in the art would have had “at least a bachelor’s degree in engineering and several years of experience in the cable and telecommunications industry relating to the design, manufacture, or utilization of coaxial cable connectors in communications systems.” Ex. 2001 ¶ 27; Ex. 2042 ¶ 213. Dr. Eldering further opines that “[b]achelor’s degrees in engineering require basic coursework in physics and mechanics, and experience in the cable and telecommunications industry will result in use of the knowledge obtained in those courses as applied to particular engineering problems which occur with coaxial cable connectors.” Ex. 2001 ¶ 27. Dr. Eldering also states that “[a]lthough [his] definition of a [person of ordinary skill in the art] differs slightly from that offered by Dr. Dickens, adoption of [Dr. Dickens’]

definition would not change any of the analysis or opinions offered” by Dr. Eldering. *Id.* ¶ 29.

In the Institution Decision, we concluded that the differences in the levels of ordinary skill in the art proposed by Drs. Dickens and Eldering are insubstantial and do not impact the analysis of the issues presented. *See* Inst. Dec. 27. Patent Owner agrees with that conclusion. *See* PO Resp. 15. Petitioner does not address this issue in its post-institution briefing.

Based on the record presented, we now find as we did in the Institution Decision that both witness’s proposals are consistent with the level of ordinary skill in the art reflected by the ’083 patent and the prior art of record. *See* Inst. Dec. 27–28. Therefore, we adopt and apply both proposals in this Decision. *See id.* at 28.

C. Claim Construction

We interpret the ’083 patent claims “using the same claim construction standard that would be used to construe the claim in a civil action under 35 U.S.C. 282(b).” 37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b). This “includ[es] construing the claim in accordance with the ordinary and customary meaning of such claim as understood by one of ordinary skill in the art and the prosecution history pertaining to the patent.” *Id.*

Petitioner “adopts the plain meaning” of the challenged claims “and submits that no claim term requires construction.” Pet. 10. Patent Owner similarly does not proffer any express claim constructions. *See, e.g.,* PO Resp. 6–7 (discussing the challenged claims generally).

Based on our review of the entire record, we determine no explicit construction of any claim term is needed to resolve the issues presented in

this Decision. *See Realtime Data, LLC v. Iancu*, 912 F.3d 1368, 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2019) (“The Board is required to construe ‘only those terms . . . that are in controversy, and only to the extent necessary to resolve the controversy.’”) (quoting *Vivid Techs., Inc. v. Am. Sci. & Eng’g, Inc.*, 200 F.3d 795, 803 (Fed. Cir. 1999)).

D. Ground 1—Obviousness over Youtsey, Lionetto, and Horak

In Ground 1, Petitioner argues claims 1–6, 8–19, 21–33, 35–43, 45–50, and 52–62 of the ’083 patent are unpatentable as having been obvious over Youtsey, Lionetto, and Horak. *See* Pet. 1, 10–57; Ex. 1005 ¶¶ 35–156; Ex. 1026 ¶¶ 275–332. Patent Owner opposes. *See* PO Resp. 1–3, 8–64, 68–80; Ex. 2001 ¶¶ 80–128, 157–180, 187–196; Ex. 2042 ¶¶ 211–295.

We conclude a preponderance of the evidence supports Petitioner’s assertions as to all challenged claims. We begin our analysis with brief summaries of Youtsey, Lionetto, and Horak, then we address the parties’ contentions as to obviousness.

1. Youtsey

Youtsey discloses a coaxial cable end connector. *See* Ex. 1007, code (54). Figure 3 of Youtsey is reproduced below.




FIG. 3
Youtsey, Figure 3.

Figure 3 is a cross-sectional view of coaxial cable connector 10 crimped on to the end of coaxial cable 12. *See id.* at 2:33–35, 2:49–52.

Coaxial cable 12 “is of a type commonly used in the cable television industry,” and includes: central conductor 20; inner insulation layer 22; outer conductor 24; and outer insulation layer 26. *Id.* at 2:63–67.

Connector 10 includes: outer barrel 14; inner tube 28; female receptacle 30; and first and second o-rings 82 and 84. *See id.* at 3:1–2, 5:45–49.

Coaxial cable 12 is inserted into connector 10 via an open end of outer barrel 14, shown at the right in Figure 3. *See id.* at 5:57–58. As part of this insertion process, inner tube 28 of connector 10 is sandwiched between outer conductor 24 and inner insulation layer 22 of coaxial cable 12. *See id.* at Fig. 3, 5:58–61. Then, outer barrel 14 is crimped on to outer insulation layer 26 of coaxial cable 12, “to thereby fixedly grip the outer conductor 24 and the outer insulation 26 between the outer barrel 14 and the inner tube 28, thus fixing the connector 10 to the coaxial cable 12.” *Id.* at 5:65–6:5.

Due to the receipt of inner tube 28 between outer conductor 24 and inner insulation layer 22 of coaxial cable 12, “the outer conductor [24] is electrically connected to the female receptacle 30 via the inner tube 28.” *Id.* at Fig. 3, 5:61–65, 6:19–21. In turn, female receptacle 30 has internal threads 72 to engage external threads on another coaxial cable connector 16 and its associated coaxial cable 18, as shown in Figure 1. *See id.* at 2:49–60, 5:23–25. In this way: “[O]nce the connectors 10 and 16 are matingly engaged, the outer conductors [24] of the cables 12 and 18 will be in conductive contact with one another” to be “grounded.” *Id.* at 6:8–14.

First and second o-rings 82 and 84 both seal the interior of connector 10, including the end of coaxial cable 12 retained therein, from intrusion by moisture and other corrosive agents in the environment. *See id.* at 1:54–56, 2:14–16, 5:50–53.

2. *Lionetto*

Lionetto discloses a microminiature coaxial connector assembly. *See* Ex. 1008, code (57). Figure 1 of Lionetto is reproduced below.





FIG.1
Lionetto, Figure 1.

Figure 1 is a schematic diagrammatic partially section view of a coaxial cable assembly, including “an outer shield comprising a male half [10] and a female half [12].” *Id.* at 1:10–16, 1:64–65, 2:1–5. Patent Owner provides a helpful modified view of Figure 1, in which the two halves 10 and 12 of the outer shield are separated from each other, as reproduced below.




Lionetto, Figure 1 (as modified by Patent Owner, at PO Resp. 57).

Thus, male shield conductor 10 (colored green by Patent Owner) is associated with inner coaxial conductor 18 (colored pink by Patent Owner) and insulator 21, and female shield conductor 12 (colored blue by Patent Owner) is associated with inner coaxial conductor 16 (colored pink by Patent Owner) and insulator 20. *See* Paper 6 (Preliminary Response), 38–39; PO Resp. 56–57; Ex. 1008, 2:1–9. Inner conductor 16 has longitudinal slots 28, which permit axial misalignment between inner coaxial conductors 16 and 18. *See* Ex. 1008, 2:17–20, 2:44–48 (Fig. 2). Male shield conductor 10 receives snap ring 32 within groove 30, which engages collar 26 of female shield conductor 12 to hold it against removal. *See id.* at 1:47–56, 2:20–30.

Electrical contact between the two shield conductors 10 and 12 “is essentially through the leaf spring 22 [carried in groove 24 of female shield conductor 12] and a conductive elastomer 34.” *Id.* at 1:23–26, 2:9–12, 2:31–36. “[T]he electrical contact between the two [shield conductors 10 and 12] is primarily through the spring contact [22]” when they are “coaxially aligned.” *Id.* at 1:33–37. Then, the conductive nature of elastomer gasket ring 34 helps to compensate for misalignment between shield conductors 10 and 12. *See id.* at 1:37–46, 2:37–44 (Fig. 2), 3:14–19 (claim 3). In this way, the coaxial connector assembly “provid[es] continuous circumferential electrical contact and RFI [radio frequency interference] suppression.” *Id.* at 3:19–20 (claim 3), code (57).

3. Horak


Horak discloses a cable connector for use with a coaxial cable in CATV systems. *See Ex. 1009*, 1:5–12. Figure 2 of Horak is reproduced below.



Horak, Figure 2.

Figure 2 is a sectional view of cable connector 10, comprising nut section 12 and pin section 14, in which the connector is “partially tightened onto a cable 60 inserted through the opening 22 into the nut section 12.” *Id.* at 2:35–36, 2:41–44, 4:1–3. Coaxial cable 60 is composed of outer conductive jacket 62, dielectric 64, and internal conductor 66. *See id.* at 3:26–31. Nut section 12 includes body 16 made of a conductive metal such as aluminum, rubber ring 18, cylindrical mandril 24, ferrule 32, and support sleeve 34 made of a tough material such as steel. *See id.* at 2:44–3:20. Pin section 14 is made of a conductive metal such as aluminum. *See id.* at 3:37–39.

Figure 3 of Horak is reproduced below.



Horak, Figure 3.

Figure 3 is a sectional view of cable connector 10, when fully tightened and attached to cable 60. *See id.* at 2:37–38, 4:20–22. As shown in comparison to Figure 2, the full tightening of nut member 12 onto pin section 14 via threads 42, 50 “causes the ring 18 to be compressed longitudinally,” which “forces the ring 18 to expand inward radially thereby providing a weather-proof seal with the conductive jacket 62 of the cable 60.” *Id.*

at 3:21–25, 3:46–48, 4:20–42. Full tightening also causes flat face 39 of support sleeve 34 to contact flat face 37 of pin section 14, “to provide a metal-to-metal seal.” *Id.* at 4:54–59.

Horak’s connector seeks to address “the dominant consideration of long-term radio frequency interference (RFI) effectiveness in” coaxial cable connections, in which “alternate tension and compression as well as rotational and vibrational forces . . . combined with temperature variations, air pollutants, and varying humidity conditions” can “serve to gradually deteriorate the contact” and therefore the “shielding effectiveness” over the course of time. *Id.* at 1:13–31. Thus: “In order to prevent the introduction of RFI in a signal carried by the cable 60, it is necessary to insure that the signal-carrying central conductor 66 of the cable 60 is always surrounded by a continuous metal shield,” which “is provided by the outer conductive jacket 62.” *Id.* at 4:60–66. Connector 10 eliminates RFI introduction to central conductor 66 “by the metal-to-metal seal between the faces 37, 39 of the pin section 14 and the support sleeve 34,” and additionally “by using a conductive rubber for the ring 18.” *Id.* at 4:67–5:4. “Thus, when the ring 18 is compressed onto the outer jacket 62 of the cable 60 to provide weather sealing, RFI is eliminated at the same time.” *Id.* at 5:4–7.

4. *Claim 1*

Petitioner sets forth a detailed analysis showing how the combined teachings of Youtsey, Lionetto, and Horak meet the limitations of claim 1. *See* Pet. 15–16, 24–43; Ex. 1005 ¶¶ 55–57, 70–112. In particular, Petitioner relies upon Youtsey as teaching most of the elements of claim 1. *See, e.g.,* Pet. 15 (“Youtsey’s connector with conductive, compressible, metal o-rings

is materially the same as the claimed embodiment of the '083 patent and discloses every claim element as arranged in the challenged claims.” (citing Pet. 24–43)). Petitioner then recognizes “Youtsey does not expressly disclose that its o-rings are made of conductive, compressible, metal material.” *Id.* at 16. Relying on Lionetto and Horak, Petitioner contends “it would have been obvious to use [conductive, compressible, metal] o-rings to not only seal against moisture but also maintain a ground shield across the connector, even when the connector is not properly tightened onto the port and/or movement of the cable causes the ground path between the post and the nut to break.” *Id.*

Patent Owner opposes several aspects of Petitioner’s analysis. We consider the various disputed issues concerning claim 1 on a limitation-by-limitation basis.

a) Coaxial Cable Connector (Element 1[pre])

Without taking a position on whether the preamble of claim 1 is limiting, Petitioner contends “Youtsey discloses a connector 10 . . . that couples an end of coaxial cable 12 to interface port 16.” Pet. 24. Petitioner provides the following annotated versions of Youtsey’s Figures 1 and 3:




FIG. 1

Youtsey, Figure 1 (Annotated by Petitioner).





FIG. 3

Youtsey, Figure 3 (Annotated by Petitioner).


Pet. 24–26 (citing Ex. 1007, Figs. 1, 3, 2:49–67, 6:5–14; Ex. 1005

¶¶ 72–74). Figure 1 is “an environmental view of a female coaxial cable connector using[an] axially compressible outer barrel,” and Figure 3 is “a cross sectional view of a female coaxial cable connector using the axially compressible outer barrel . . . after axial compression.” Ex. 1007, 2:27–29, 2:33–35. Petitioner’s annotated versions color connector 10 yellow, and leave coaxial cable 12 and other components uncolored. *See* Pet. 24–25.

Petitioner contends Youtsey’s coaxial cable 12 has the components recited in the preamble of claim 1. *See id.* at 25. Petitioner provides the following annotated versions of Youtsey’s Figures 2 and 3:



Youtsey, Figure 2 (Annotated by Petitioner).



Youtsey, Figure 3 (Annotated by Petitioner).


Pet. 25–26 (citing Ex. 1007, 2:65–67; Ex. 1005 ¶ 74). Figure 2 is “a cutaway perspective view showing internal details of a female coaxial cable connector [10]” and coaxial cable 12, and Figure 3 is a cross sectional view of the same connector after axial compression onto the cable. Ex. 1007, 2:30–35, 2:49–52. Petitioner’s annotated versions identify the illustrated coaxial cable, including its “center conductor” (central conductor 20, colored gold), “dielectric” (inner insulation layer 22, not colored), “conductive grounding shield” (outer conductor 24, colored dark grey), and “protective outer jacket” (outer insulation layer 26, colored grey). *See* Pet. 25–26.

Patent Owner does not challenge Petitioner’s analysis and evidence directed to the preamble of claim 1. *See, e.g.*, PO Resp. 8–27 (Patent Owner’s challenges to the disclosures of Youtsey, Lionetto, and Horak).

We find Youtsey discloses the preamble of claim 1, as summarized above.³

b) Body Member (Limitation 1[a])

Petitioner contends “Youtsey’s connector includes a conductive body member (‘outer barrel 14,’ red) with a forward body end portion (including ‘small interior diameter portion 58’) and an opposing rearward body end portion (large interior diameter portion),” as shown in Petitioner’s annotated version of Youtsey’s Figure 3 reproduced below. Pet. 26.



Youtsey, Figure 3 (Annotated by Petitioner).

Id. at 26–27 (citing Ex. 1007, 3:2–15, 4:63–5:16; Ex. 1005 ¶¶ 75–77).


Petitioner’s annotated version of Youtsey’s Figure 3 identifies a “body

³ We need not determine whether the preamble of claim 1 is limiting because we find, on the present record, that Petitioner has shown it is disclosed by Youtsey.

member” (outer barrel 14, colored red), and its “forward body end portion” and “rearward body end portion.” *Id.* at 26. Petitioner asserts “[t]he body member is a tubular metal wall.” *Id.* at 27 (citing Ex. 1007, Figs. 2–4, 1:39–45, 2:49–52, 2:61–63, 3:1–15, 4:14–32; Ex. 1021, 4:5–10; Ex. 1005 ¶¶ 77).⁴

For Limitation 1[a][i], Petitioner contends the rearward body end portion of Youtsey’s body member receives an end portion of coaxial cable 12, as shown in Youtsey’s Figure 3. *See* Pet. 27–28 (citing Ex. 1007, Figs. 2, 3, 3:49–60, 5:57–6:5; Ex. 1005 ¶¶ 78–80).


For Limitation 1[a][ii], Petitioner contends the forward body end portion of Youtsey’s body member has the claimed portions and surfaces, as shown in two annotated versions of Youtsey’s Figure 3. *See* Pet. 28–30. Petitioner’s first annotations are reproduced below.



Youtsey, Figure 3 (Annotated by Petitioner).

⁴ We have omitted Petitioner’s citations to Exhibit 1004, the file history for *Inter Partes* Reexamination No. 95/001,689 of U.S. Patent No. 7,833,053, here and elsewhere in this Decision because, as discussed below in Section III.D.4(i), we do not rely on collateral estoppel arising from that reexamination as a basis for this Decision.

Id. at 28 (citing Ex. 1007, 4:64–5:1; Ex. 1005 ¶¶ 81–82). Petitioner’s first annotated version of Youtsey’s Figure 3 identifies the “forward facing body portion” and the “forwardmost surface” of the “forward body end portion” of Youtsey’s “body member.” *Id.* Petitioner’s second annotated version of Youtsey’s Figure 3 is reproduced below.



Youtsey, Figure 3 (Annotated by Petitioner).


Id. at 29 (citing Ex. 1007, 5:1–6; Ex. 1005 ¶¶ 83–84). Petitioner’s second annotated version of Youtsey’s Figure 3 identifies the “conductive member outer body contact portion” of the “forward body end portion” of Youtsey’s “body member.” *Id.* In particular, Petitioner asserts that, after modifying Youtsey in light of Lionetto and Horak, Youtsey’s o-ring 84 corresponds to the conductive metal ring grounding member recited in claim 1, and is in contact with the identified contact portion of Youtsey’s body member. *Id.* (citing Ex. 1007, 5:46–53; Ex. 1005 ¶¶ 83–84).

Patent Owner does not challenge Petitioner’s foregoing analysis and evidence directed to the “body member” Limitation 1[a]. *See, e.g.*, PO Resp. 8–27 (Patent Owner’s challenges to the disclosures of Youtsey,

Lionetto, and Horak). We recognize, however, that Patent Owner’s arguments directed to nonobviousness (including motivation to combine) are relevant here because, as reflected above, Petitioner relies on modifying Youtsey to have a conductive grounding member, which results in Youtsey’s body member 14 having “a conductive member outer body contact portion.” See Pet. 29. As explained in detail in our discussion of the claimed conductive grounding member below (Section III.D.4(e)), where we address the parties’ arguments as to obviousness, we find Petitioner’s evidence and argument establishes that the combination of Youtsey, Lionetto, and Horak teaches the “body member” Limitation 1[a].

c) Post Member (Limitation 1[b])

Petitioner asserts “Youtsey’s connector includes a post member (‘inner tube 28,’ yellow) that engages, and is not integral with, the conductive body member (red),” as shown in Petitioner’s annotated version of Youtsey’s Figure 3 reproduced below. Pet. 30.



Youtsey, Figure 3 (Annotated by Petitioner).


Id. at 30–31 (citing Ex. 1007, 3:1–5, 4:62–64, 5:13–16; Ex. 1005 ¶¶ 85–86).

Petitioner’s annotated version of Youtsey’s Figure 3 identifies a “body

member” (outer barrel 14, colored red) and a “post member” (inner tube 28, colored yellow); and colors outer conductor 24 dark grey and outer insulation layer 26 grey. *Id.*

For Limitation 1[b][i], Petitioner contends Youtsey’s “post member has a forward end (left end) including a flange (‘flange 70’).” Pet. 31 (citing Ex. 1007, Fig. 3, 5:19–20; Ex. 1005 ¶¶ 87–88).

For Limitation 1[b][ii], Petitioner contends Youtsey’s “post member has rearward end (‘serrated tube portion 90’) that inserts into an end portion of the coaxial cable, around the dielectric (white) and under the conductive grounding shield (dark grey) to make electrical contact with the conductive grounding shield,” as shown in Petitioner’s annotated version of Youtsey’s Figure 3 reproduced below. Pet. 31–32.



Youtsey, Figure 3 (Annotated by Petitioner).

Id. (citing Ex. 1007, 5:61–65, 6:15–22; Ex. 1005 ¶¶ 89–90). Petitioner’s annotated version of Youtsey’s Figure 3 identifies a “body member” (outer barrel 14, colored red), a “post member” (inner tube 28, colored yellow), a “center conductor” (central conductor 20, colored gold), and a “grounding


shield” (outer conductor 24, colored dark grey); and colors outer insulation layer 26 grey. *Id.*

Patent Owner does not challenge Petitioner’s foregoing analysis and evidence directed to the “post member” Limitation 1[b]. *See, e.g.*, PO Resp. 8–27 (Patent Owner’s challenges to the disclosures of Youtsey, Lionetto, and Horak).

We find Youtsey discloses the “post member” Limitation 1[b], as summarized above.

d) Nut Member (Limitation 1[c])

Petitioner contends Youtsey’s connector 10 “includes a conductive nut member (‘female receptacle 30,’ green) that rotates relative to the post member (yellow) and the conductive body member (red),” as shown in Petitioner’s annotated version of Youtsey’s Figure 3 reproduced below. Pet. 32.



Youtsey, Figure 3 (Annotated by Petitioner).

Id. (citing Ex. 1007, 5:23–38, 5:61–65; Ex. 1005 ¶¶ 91–93). Petitioner’s annotated version of Youtsey’s Figure 3 identifies a “body member” (outer

Id. (citing Ex. 1007, 5:25–35; Ex. 1005 ¶¶ 96–97). Petitioner’s annotated version of Youtsey’s Figure 3 colors female receptacle 30 green, and identifies its “forward nut end portion,” “lip,” and “rearward nut end portion.” *Id.*

Patent Owner does not challenge Petitioner’s analysis and evidence directed to the “nut member” Limitation 1[c]. *See, e.g.*, PO Resp. 8–27 (Patent Owner’s challenges to the disclosures of Youtsey, Lionetto, and Horak).

We find Youtsey discloses the “nut member” Limitation 1[c], as summarized above.


e) Grounding Member (Limitation 1[d])

The “grounding member” Limitation 1[d] is the focus of the parties’ dispute, and there are several factual and legal issues presented for resolution by the Board. We firstly discuss Petitioner’s partial reliance on Youtsey’s o-ring 84 in relation to the claimed grounding member (sub-section (i)), which is not disputed by Patent Owner. Then, we summarize Petitioner’s contentions as to modifying Youtsey’s o-ring to be conductive, in light of Lionetto and Horak (sub-section (ii)), which are disputed by Patent Owner. Then, we discuss the scope and content of the prior art as it relates to the parties’ obviousness disputes (sub-sections (iii) and (iv)). Next, we address motivation to combine Youtsey with Lionetto and Horak (sub-section (v)). Then, we consider reasonable expectation of success (sub-section (vi)). Next, we turn to Patent Owner’s reliance on objective indicia of nonobviousness (sub-section (vii)). Lastly, we weigh all

of the arguments and evidence to reach a conclusion as to obviousness (sub-section (viii)).

(i) *Comparing the Claimed Grounding Member with Youtsey's O-Ring 84*


Petitioner asserts that, after modifying Youtsey in light of Lionetto and Horak, Youtsey's connector 10 would have "o-ring 84 (orange) [which is] a conductive metal ring grounding member to maintain a ground shield across the connector," as shown in Petitioner's annotated version of Youtsey's Figure 3 reproduced below. Pet. 34.



Youtsey, Figure 3 (Annotated by Petitioner).

Id. at 34–35 (citing Ex. 1007, Fig. 3; Ex. 1005 ¶¶ 98–99) (also referring to Pet. 15–20 (motivation to combine)). Petitioner's annotated version of Youtsey's Figure 3 identifies a "body member" (outer barrel 14, colored red), a "nut member" (female receptacle 30, colored green), a "grounding member" (o-ring 84, colored orange), a "ground shield" (outer conductor 24, colored dark grey), and a "post member" (inner tube 28, colored yellow); and colors outer insulation layer 26 grey. *See id.*

For Limitations 1[d][i] and 1[d][ii], Petitioner contends Youtsey as modified “discloses that the grounding member (orange) includes a nut contact portion (top left half) that electrically couples to the conductive nut member [(green)] and a body contact portion (bottom right half) that encircles a portion of the conductive body member (red),” as shown in Petitioner’s annotated and magnified version of Youtsey’s Figure 3 reproduced below. Pet. 38.




Youtsey, Figure 3 (Annotated and Magnified by Petitioner).


Id. at 38–39 (citing Ex. 1007, Fig. 3; Ex. 1005 ¶¶ 102–103). Petitioner’s annotated version of Youtsey’s Figure 3 focuses on how o-ring 84 (colored orange) has a “nut contact portion” facing and contacting the nut member (colored green) and a “body contact portion” facing and contacting the body member (colored red). *See id.* In particular, according to Petitioner, the o-ring’s “body contact portion” encircles a portion of the body member (colored red) and is physically coupled to the “conductive member outer

body contact portion” without contacting the “forward facing body portion.” *See id.* Petitioner asserts that, due to this structural configuration, once Youtsey’s o-ring 84 is made conductive in light of Lionetto and Horak, the o-ring will be electrically coupled to the nut member (colored green) and the body member (colored red) to form a nut-body electrical circuit that extends electromagnetic shielding from Youtsey’s coaxial cable 12 through Youtsey’s connector 10. *See id.* at 38–40 (citing Ex. 1005 ¶¶ 102–105) (also referring to Pet. 15–20 (motivation to combine)).

Referring to its element-by-element analysis detailed above, Petitioner contends that, “[a]s reflected in the figures below, Youtsey’s connector with conductive, compressible, metal o-rings is materially the same as the claimed embodiment of the ’083 patent and discloses every claim element as arranged in the challenged claims.” Pet. 15 (citing Ex. 1005 ¶¶ 55–56) (also referring to Pet. 24–43). Petitioner provides the following annotated versions of Figure 3 of Youtsey and Figure 1B of the ’083 patent, illustrating their similarities:



Youtsey Fig. 3.



'083 patent Fig. 1B.

Youtsey, Figure 3 and '083 Patent, Figure 1B (Annotated by Petitioner). *Id.* Petitioner's annotated versions of Figure 3 of Youtsey and Figure 1B of the '083 patent identify, in each figure, a "post" (yellow), a "coupler/nut" (green), "grounding sealing o-rings" (orange), "body" (red), "ground shield" (dark grey), and "dielectric" (white). *Id.*

Patent Owner does not challenge Petitioner's foregoing analysis and evidence comparing the claimed grounding member with Youtsey's o-ring 84. *See, e.g.,* PO Resp. 8–27 (Patent Owner's challenges to the disclosures of Youtsey, Lionetto, and Horak). We find Petitioner's unopposed evidence and argument establish that Youtsey's o-ring 84 satisfies the grounding member Limitation 1[d] except that Youtsey's

o-ring 84 is *not (as emphasized in italics) a conductive metal* ring that forms an *electrically coupled circuit* between Youtsey's nut member 30 and Youtsey's body member 30 *to extend an electromagnetic shielding* through the connector. We therefore turn to the parties' various disputes concerning obviousness.

(ii) *Summary of Petitioner's Contentions*

Petitioner asserts "Youtsey does not expressly disclose that its o-rings [82⁵ and 84] are made of *conductive, compressible, metal* material," but "it would have been obvious to use such o-rings" in Youtsey for two reasons. Pet. 16–19. The first reason is because the modification would "not only seal against moisture but also maintain a ground shield across the connector, even when the connector is not properly tightened onto the port and/or movement of the cable causes the ground path between the post and the nut to break," as demonstrated by Lionetto and Horak. *Id.* at 16–18. The second reason is because a person of ordinary skill in the art "would have understood that Youtsey's o-rings are located in areas susceptible to RFI," which would be better shielded by making the o-rings conductive, also as demonstrated by Lionetto and Horak. *Id.* at 17–18. Petitioner further contends a person of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success in this regard. *Id.* at 19–20.

⁵ As reflected in this Decision, the disputes between the parties and the entirety of Patent Owner's arguments in opposition to Petitioner's challenges are focused on o-ring 84 as opposed to o-ring 82. Therefore, our discussion and analysis in this Decision also are focused on o-ring 84.

(iii) *Differences Between Claim 1 and Youtsey, Lionetto, and Horak*

(1) *Coupler-Body Electrical Grounding Path*

As discussed above in Section III.D.4(e)(i), it is undisputed that Youtsey's o-ring 84 is *located in the position* required by claim 1—that is, Youtsey's o-ring 84 is disposed between and contacts a nut member (i.e., female receptable 30) and a body member (i.e., outer barrel 14).

As part of its argument as to why one of ordinary skill in the art would have modified Youtsey's o-ring 84 to be conductive, compressible, and metal, Petitioner asserts "Lionetto discloses a sealing o-ring [(conductive elastomer 34)] between *the outer body* [(male conductor 10)] and inner post [(internal sleeve 14)] of a coaxial cable connector" that "is conductive and compressible." Pet. 16 (emphasis added) (citing Ex. 1008, Fig. 1, 1:23–26, 2:1–5, 3:14–20); Ex. 1005 ¶ 58.

Patent Owner contests Petitioner's characterization of Lionetto, asserting that "the prior art fails to teach or suggest the coupler-body grounding member and coupler-body grounding path limitations of" claim 1. PO Resp. 8–10; *see also id.* at 6–7 (arguing the '083 patent's grounding member 80 provides "***a new coupler-body grounding path***" from grounding shield 14, to connector body 50, to member 80, to coupling member 30, to interface port 20, which does "***not***" include post 40 as had been known before the '083 patent); Ex. 2001 ¶¶ 69–71, 79–80. Patent Owner asserts Dr. Dickens "admitted that he relied upon the 'nomenclature' of [claim 1], instead of relying upon what the prior art actually teaches, in arriving at his opinion that Lionetto discloses a grounding member contacting the 'body,'" and Dr. Dickens also "admitted that he did not 'have any particular reason for calling' [Lionetto's male conductor 10] a body, and agreed that it could

have been labeled a ‘coupler,’ not a body.” PO Resp. 10 (citing Ex. 1005 ¶ 58; Ex. 2041, 145:11–146:9, 147:16–148:3, 152:1–7, 152:17–156:15); Ex. 2001 ¶¶ 88–114.

Patent Owner concludes “Petitioner and its expert mislabeled the components in [Lionetto] as the claimed ‘body’ to try to make [Lionetto] appear as if [it reads] on the claimed invention *without even attempting to provide any supporting evidence*.” PO Resp. 13. In response to the Institution Decision’s statement that the Board need not determine whether Petitioner accurately characterizes various components of Lionetto as corresponding to structural terms in claim 1, Patent Owner asserts that “in light of the record evidence . . . developed during this Trial, in its Final Written Decision, the Board should reject Petitioner’s invitation to commit legal error.” *Id.* at 14 (citing Inst. Dec. 55, 64). Patent Owner emphasizes that claim 1 “requires a conductive grounding member ‘*configured to*’ produce the claimed grounding path,” and argues this language “requires that the structure must be ‘designed or configured to accomplish the specified objective, not simply that [it] can be made to serve that purpose.’” *Id.* at 14–15 (citations omitted). In Patent Owner’s view, Petitioner must “establish[] that *the prior art actually discloses or suggests* a coupler-body grounding member that is designed or configured to provide the claimed coupler-body ground path,” which Petitioner has failed to do. *Id.* at 15 (emphasis added) (citing Ex. 1005 ¶ 58; Ex. 2041, 147:16–149:18).

Petitioner replies that Patent Owner “draws up a strawman, questioning the Petition’s illustrations of” Lionetto as to the “body member” limitation. Pet. Reply 4. Petitioner asserts “the Board correctly found [in the Institution Decision] that it need not decide this issue because the

importance of Lionetto . . . lies in [its] disclosure of a sealing, conductive o-ring that provides protection from both weather and RFI.” *Id.* (citing Inst. Dec. 54–56).

We find Youtsey’s o-ring 84 is, as recited in claim 1, a ring disposed between respective portions of a nut member (i.e., female receptacle 30) and a body member (i.e., outer barrel 14). *See* Ex. 1007, Fig. 3; *supra* Sections III.D.4(b) and III.D.4(d). However, Youtsey’s o-ring 84 is not a *conductive metal* ring that forms an *electrically coupled circuit* between Youtsey’s nut member 30 and Youtsey’s body member 30 *to extend an electromagnetic shielding* through the connector, as further recited in claim 1.

We find Lionetto discloses a compliant conductive grounding member (i.e., conductive elastomer 34) disposed between respective surfaces of male conductor 10 and female conductor 12, and configured to produce an electrical path between those two conductors. *See* Ex. 1008, Fig. 1, 2:1–5, 2:31–36, 3:14–20.

We find Horak discloses a compliant conductive grounding member (i.e., rubber ring 18) disposed between respective surfaces of conductive body 16 and conductive jacket 62, and configured to produce an electrical path between those two conductors. *See* Ex. 1009, Figs. 2–3, 2:41–56, 3:28–31, 4:67–5:11.

We do not decide whether Lionetto’s male conductor 10 or Horak’s conductive body 16 are “body members,” as that term is used in claim 1, despite Petitioner’s contention and Dr. Dickens’s testimony that they are. *See* Pet. 16; Ex. 1005 ¶¶ 46, 50, 58–59. This is because it is undisputed that Youtsey’s outer barrel 14 is such a body member, as we find above. Thus,

we need not and do not rely on Lionetto's male conductor 10 or Horak's conductive body 16 as corresponding to the claimed "body member" because this element of the claim already is met by Youtsey. Our consideration of the issues presented here is based on the findings concerning the disclosures of Lionetto and Horak as set forth above, without analogizing Lionetto's male conductor 10 or Horak's conductive body 16 to the claimed "body member" or to Youtsey's outer barrel 14.

(2) *O-Ring*

It is undisputed that Youtsey's o-ring 84 is a "ring" as that term is used in claim 1.

As part of asserting why one of ordinary skill in the art would have modified Youtsey's o-ring 84 to be conductive, compressible, and metal, Petitioner asserts "Lionetto discloses a sealing *o-ring*" as conductive elastomer 34, and "Horak discloses a conductive, compressible sealing *o-ring*" as rubber ring 18. Pet. 16 (emphases added) (citing Ex. 1008, Fig. 1, 1:23–26, 2:1–5, 3:14–20; Ex. 1009, 2:41–56, 3:11–20, 4:67–5:11); Ex. 1005 ¶¶ 58–60.

Patent Owner asserts that neither Lionetto's conductive elastomer 34 nor Horak's rubber ring 18 is an "o-ring" like Youtsey's o-ring 84. See PO Resp. 56–59; Ex. 2042 ¶¶ 253–259. Patent Owner argues an o-ring is a ring formed by material having a circular cross-section. See PO Resp. 58–59 (citing Ex. 2036 § 3.1.1); Ex. 2042 ¶¶ 252, 256. By contrast, Lionetto's conductive elastomer 34 and Horak's rubber ring 18 both have flat sides in cross-section. See PO Resp. 56–59 (citing Ex. 1008, Fig. 1; Ex. 1009, Fig. 3, 3:42–47, 4:47–49; Ex. 2041, 217:2–220:4, 221:16–222:6,

224:8–20, 225:21–226:15, 240:21–244:3, 250:13–252:12); Ex. 2042 ¶¶ 252–259.

We need not and do not decide whether Lionetto’s conductive elastomer 34 or Horak’s conductive rubber ring 18 are “o-rings,” because it is undisputed that Youtsey’s o-ring 84 is a ring, as recited in claim 1, and because Petitioner relies on Youtsey’s o-ring 84 as teaching the recited nut-body o-ring. *See* Pet. 34 (referring to “o-ring 84” and stating that one of ordinary skill in the art “would have made o-ring 84 . . . a conductive metal ring grounding member”). Thus, even though Petitioner pointed to what it refers to as an “o-ring” in each reference, we do not rely on Lionetto’s conductive elastomer 34 or Horak’s conductive rubber ring 18 as corresponding to an “o-ring” structure. Our consideration of the obviousness issues presented here is based on our findings that Lionetto’s conductive elastomer 34 and Horak’s conductive rubber ring 18 are both ring-shaped compliant conductive grounding members disposed between and contacting two conductors, and configured to produce an electrical path between those two conductors. *See* Ex. 1008, Fig. 1, 2:1–5, 2:31–36, 3:14–20; Ex. 1009, Fig. 2, 2:41–56, 3:28–31, 4:67–5:11.

We find Youtsey’s o-ring 84 is an o-ring located in the position required by claim 1—that is, o-ring 84 is disposed between and contacts a nut member and a body member. We also find Lionetto and Horak each disclose a ring-shaped compliant conductive grounding member disposed between and contacting two conductors in a coaxial cable connector, to produce an electrical path between the two conductors.

(iv) *Scope of Prior Art—Grounding Paths in Coaxial Cable Connectors*


Patent Owner asserts a person of ordinary skill in the art, prior to the '083 patent's invention, would have understood that the *post* and not the *body* of a coaxial cable connector is used to extend the grounding shield through the connector. *See* PO Resp. 16–18 (citations omitted). Patent Owner summarizes several references that it asserts support this view: Youtsey (Ex. 1007), Tarrant (Ex. 1010), Campbell (Ex. 1013), Youtsey '631 (Ex. 2021), Palinkas (Ex. 2022), and Bence (Ex. 2023). *See* PO Resp. 15–22 (citing Ex. 1005 ¶¶ 22, 90, 200; Ex. 2041, 41:15–42:6, 45:8–17, 173:22–176:8, 266:5–10); Ex. 2001 ¶¶ 38–45, 54–62, 83–85. Patent Owner concludes the grounding member of claim 1 “which is configured to (*i.e.*, designed to) **contact the body, not the post**, was a significant departure from the prior art.” PO Resp. 16. Patent Owner also asserts, due to this alleged state of the art, that Petitioner's case for obviousness is “without support” and is based on “speculation . . . contrary to what the prior art teaches.” *Id.* at 18.

Petitioner argues Patent Owner's foregoing argument is belied by positions taken by Patent Owner in *Corning Optical Communications RF, LLC v. PPC Broadband, Inc.*, IPR2013-00340, and Dr. Eldering's testimony in that proceeding. *See* Pet. Reply 6–8. Petitioner asserts Patent Owner there described Tatsuzuki (Ex. 1029) as “addressing the loose connector problem with a conductive member that—in Dr. Eldering's own words—‘provide[s] continuity between the nut and the **body**, not between the nut and the post.’” *Id.* (quoting Ex. 1034, 7 (alteration and emphases in original)) (citing Ex. 1029, Figs. 3, 5, 6, 7, ¶ 11; Ex. 1033, 68; Ex. 1034, 7–10; Ex. 1035, 4–5; Ex. 1036 ¶¶ 30–43). Petitioner also argues that Bence,

contrary to Patent Owner's position, "address[es] a loose connector by utilizing a coupler-body ground." Pet. Reply 8 (citing Ex. 2023, 1:47–2:3, 2:27–31); Ex. 1026 ¶¶ 279–281.

Patent Owner replies that Petitioner's reliance on Tatsuzuki and Bence in the Reply exceeds the proper scope for a reply under 37 C.F.R. § 42.23(b). *See* Paper 25, 1–2 (cites #1, #2); PO Sur-reply 3–4. We disagree. As to Tatsuzuki, the Patent Owner Response argues at some length that the post, not the body, is used to extend a grounding shield (*see* PO Resp. 15–22), thereby opening the door for Petitioner to argue Patent Owner took an inconsistent position in IPR2013-00340 in relation to Tatsuzuki. As to Bence, the Patent Owner Response cites Bence in support of its arguments (*see id.* at 21–22), thereby opening the door for Petitioner to argue Bence supports Petitioner's arguments and does not support Patent Owner's arguments. *See, e.g., Rembrandt Diagnostics, LP v. Alere, Inc.*, 76 F.4th 1376, 1384 (Fed. Cir. 2023) (stating that "the need to rely on new evidence in response may not arise until a particular point has been raised in the patent owner response," and "the introduction of new evidence in the course of the trial is to be expected in [IPR] trial proceedings" and permissible "as long as the opposing party is given notice of the evidence and an opportunity to respond to it" (alteration in original)).

On the merits, Patent Owner asserts its arguments in IPR2013-00340 concerned "a ***different and unrelated patent***" (i.e., U.S. Patent No. 8,323,060) and "a ***different prior art reference***" (i.e., Tatsuzuki) "directed to a ***different type of connector***" than those at issue here. PO Sur-reply 6–7. Specifically, Patent Owner annotates Tatsuzuki's Figure 3 (*see id.* at 7), as reproduced below.



Tatsuzuki, Figure 3 (Annotated by Patent Owner).

Tatsuzuki's Figure 3 shows coaxial cable 3 including grounding braided wire 34 (dark grey), connected to coaxial connector 50 (light blue) by plug main body 11 (purple) and rotary mounting element 12 (green) with an interposing disc-shaped spring 13 (orange). *See* Ex. 1029 ¶¶ 18–19.

According to Patent Owner, Tatsuzuki provides: (1) spring 13 as a grounding member, which is “not a conductive elastomer” and (2) plug body 11, which is “an *integral* post/body” in direct contact with Tatsuzuki's cable grounding shield 34, as opposed to Youtsey's “*separate* post and body components.” PO Sur-reply 7–8 (citing Ex. 1029, Fig. 3, ¶¶ 16, 17, 19; Ex. 2044, 359:22–362:8, 368:15–369:6, 370:12–372:14; Ex. 2001 ¶ 55) (also citing IPR2013-00340, Paper 5 at 5 n.1, 17; Ex. 1030, Fig. 3). It was only the petitioner in IPR2013-00340 that proposed the obviousness of splitting Tatsuzuki's plug body 11 into a separate post and body, according to Patent Owner, and even with that modification Tatsuzuki's spring 13 still “*contact[ed] both the post and the body*”—not just the body as Petitioner would have it. *Id.* at 8–9 (citing Pet. Reply 7) (also citing IPR2013-00340, Paper 5 at 22, 30; Paper 91, 14 n.2).


Patent Owner moreover asserts “Bence is *not even prior art*” because it was filed after the effective filing date of the ’083 patent. *Id.* at 4 (citing Paper 6 (Preliminary Response), 13 n.3). Further, according to Patent Owner, all of the embodiments in Bence use a grounding member between a coupler and a post. *See id.* at 4–5 (citing Ex. 2023, code (57), Figs. 1–11D, 2:50–67, 5:60–6:21, 8:1–66, 9:12–21, 10:15–25, 10:36–39; Ex. 2044, 391:1–399:2).

We disagree with Patent Owner’s contention that the prior art is limited to using a post to extend the grounding shield through a coaxial cable connector. We agree with Patent Owner that some prior art connectors used a post to extend the grounding shield. Critically, however, the prior art *also* discloses using *other* conductive components to provide grounding shield paths through the connector, some of which *do not* pass through a post.

For example, Lionetto discloses two electrical grounding paths through its connector: (1) from male conductor 10, to leaf spring 22, to female conductor 12 and (2) from male conductor 10, to conductive elastomer 34, to female conductor 12. *See* Ex. 1008, Fig. 1, 2:31–36, 2:50–58 (claim 1), 3:14–20 (claim 3). The parties have disputed whether Lionetto’s female conductor 12 corresponds to a “post.” *See* Pet. 12–13 (stating “Lionetto’s connector includes . . . a post (‘female outer conductor’ 12 . . .)”); Paper 6 (Preliminary Response), 41 (stating “Lionetto’s inner female member 12 is not a post of a connector”). Regardless, Lionetto demonstrates that different grounding paths may be provided through a coaxial cable connector, using different structures in the connector.

Horak also discloses two electrical grounding paths through its connector: (1) from outer conductive jacket 62, to support sleeve (post) 34, to pin section 14 and (2) from outer conductive jacket 62, to conductive rubber ring 18, to conductive body 16, to pin section 14. *See* Ex. 1009, Figs. 1–2, 3:21, 4:60–5:7. Further, Horak’s second path does not go through Horak’s post 34. *See id.* at Fig. 2.

Campbell also discloses two electrical grounding paths through a coaxial cable connector. Campbell’s Figure 10b is reproduced below.



Campbell, Figure 10b.

Figure 10b is a cross-sectional view of coaxial cable connector 40 in a partially assembled state, including post 41, nut 42, collar 43, and sleeve 44. *See* Ex. 1013, 7:12–14, 7:32–41. Campbell’s Figure 13 is reproduced below.




FIG. 13

Campbell, Figure 13.

Figure 13 is a cross-sectional view of connector 40 in an assembled state, on coaxial cable 3 including central conductor 1, dielectric 2, outer conductor 4, and outside insulation layer 5. *See id.* at 7:19–21, 10:31–39, 10:65–68.

The two electrical grounding paths through Campbell’s connector 40 are: (1) from outer conductor 4 of coaxial cable 3, to post 41, to collar 43 and (2) from outer conductor 4 to collar 43 directly. *See Ex. 1013, 1:51–60, 5:63–6:11, 7:32–60, 8:5–20, 10:5–18, 10:30–68; id.* at 10:47–50 (“Forcing sleeve 44 into collar 43 of integral end piece 46 *forces braid outer conductor 4 against inside surface 43c of collar 43, providing a good electrical contact.*” (emphasis added)). Further, Campbell’s second path does not go through Campbell’s post 41. Patent Owner’s summary of Campbell discusses the first path, but overlooks the second path. *See PO Resp. 16.*

Bell provides coaxial cable connector 10 with an electrical grounding path extending from conducting braid 64 of cable 60, to outlet body 22, to conductive o-ring 34, to plug body 12. *See Ex. 1011, Fig. 1, 1:43–51,*

2:6–21, 2:52–67, 3:13–18. Patent Owner argues Bell’s outlet body is a post. *See* PO Resp. 10–13. Regardless, Bell demonstrates using different structures in the connector to provide a grounding shield path.

As to Bence, given the uncertainty in the record as to whether Bence is prior art to the ’083 patent, we do not rely on it here. *See, e.g.*, PO Resp. 21–22; Pet. Reply 8 n.6; PO Sur-reply 4.

The remaining prior art references cited by Patent Owner drive home the fact that it was known to use different structures to provide grounding shield path(s) through a coaxial cable connector. *See* PO Resp. 16–18 (describing Youtsey and Tarrant), 20–21 (describing Youtsey ’631 and Palinkas). Tatsuzuki, discussed above, is another example of this variability.

Further, Patent Owner does not point to any prior art disclosures that might suggest a post is a critical component of a grounding shield path, or that a post is better than other connector component(s) in this regard, including a body. *See, e.g.*, PO Resp. 15–22. Dr. Eldering similarly discusses how various connectors used a post to create a grounding shield path, but does not opine that the post is critical or more useful than other components in this regard. *See, e.g.*, Ex. 2001 ¶¶ 38–45, 48, 55–63, 85–87. Thus, although some prior art references use a post to maintain a grounding shield path, that fact does not detract from the overall variability of prior art solutions in this regard.

Finally, claim 1 does not exclude using a post to provide a grounding path, so long as the recited grounding member is part of one or more grounding paths. Indeed, claim 1 specifies that the post “make[s] electrical contact with the conductive grounding shield of the coaxial cable,” and with the nut member, “so as to form a first electrical ground path” through the

connector. Ex. 1001, 15:55–63, 16:21–25. Thus, Patent Owner’s insistence that the claimed invention differs from the prior art by avoiding use of the post to provide a grounding path fails to recognize that claim 1 does not exclude this use of the post.

In short, the evidence demonstrates that, prior to the ’083 patent, it was known to one of ordinary skill in the art to use different conductive components to provide grounding shield paths through a coaxial connector, some of which did not pass through a post. Also, claim 1 is broader than Patent Owner would have it, because it does not exclude using a post to provide a grounding shield path.

(v) *Motivation to Modify Youtsey in Light of Lionetto and Horak*

(1) *Petitioner’s First Motivation—Maintain Ground Shield in Loose Connector*

The Petition

Petitioner’s first motivation for modifying Youtsey’s o-ring 84 to be conductive, compressible, and metal, is to “maintain a ground shield across the connector [10], even when the connector is not properly tightened onto the port [16] and/or movement of the cable [12, 18] causes the ground path between the post [28] and the nut [30] to break.” Pet. 16; *see also* Ex. 1007, Figs. 1, 3, 2:49–60, 5:17–37 (illustrating and describing these components in Youtsey). Petitioner explains Youtsey’s “o-rings 82 and 84 seal the interior of the . . . connector 10 from moisture and other corrosive agents in the ambient environment.” Pet. 16 (quoting Ex. 1007, 5:45–53). Petitioner contends a person of ordinary skill in the art “would have known that conductive, compressible metal o-rings can be used for this purpose,” based on Lionetto and Horak. *Id.*

In particular, Petitioner asserts Lionetto discloses a conductive and compressible sealing elastomer 34 between two metal conductors of a coaxial cable connector. *Id.* (citing Ex. 1008, Fig. 1, 1:23–26, 2:1–5, 3:14–20; Ex. 1005 ¶¶ 58–59). Petitioner asserts Horak similarly discloses a conductive and compressible sealing rubber ring 18 between two metal conductors of a coaxial cable connector. *Id.* (citing Ex. 1009, 2:41–56, 3:11–20, 4:67–5:11; Ex. 1005 ¶ 60). Relying, *inter alia*, on Horak, Petitioner contends a person of ordinary skill in the art “would have understood that maintaining a continuous ground shield across the connector is critical” for preventing radio frequency interference and signal loss of the signal traveling on the main conductor of the coaxial cable, thereby motivating use of a conductive and compressible sealing material for Youtsey’s o-ring 84. *Id.* at 17 (citing Ex. 1009, 1:13–15 (“The cable-connector interface imposes the dominant consideration of long-term radio frequency interference (RFI) effectiveness in a CATV system.”), 4:60–63 (“[I]t is necessary to insure that the signal-carrying central conductor 66 of the cable 60 is always surrounded by a continuous metal shield.”)).

Petitioner further contends a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood that the conductive and compressible sealing members of Lionetto and Horak “are conventional metallic o-rings used for sealing and RFI shielding.” *Id.* at 16 (citing Pet. 34–38 as “discussing metal ring grounding members within a POSA’s knowledge”); Ex. 1005 ¶¶ 59–60. According to Petitioner, the “metal” claim term encompasses “any type of metallic o-ring that electrically engages the body with the nut.” Pet. 35 (citing Ex. 1001, 16:44–60 (claims 4–7)); Ex. 1005 ¶ 100. This type of metallic o-ring assertedly includes “elastomeric mixtures, composite

materials having conductive properties, soft metals, conductive rubber, and/or the like and/or any workable combination thereof.” Pet. 35–36 (quoting Ex. 1001, 11:37–42) (citing Ex. 1001, 6:21–26, 11:55–66, 12:3–12, 14:11–15); Ex. 1005 ¶¶ 100–101. According to Petitioner, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include metal in Youtsey’s o-ring 84. *See, e.g.*, Pet. 16 (asserting “Youtsey does not expressly disclose that its o-rings are made of conductive, compressible, metal material,” and a person of ordinary skill in the art “would have understood that the conductive o-rings of Lionetto and Horak are conventional metallic o-rings”); *id.* at 18; Ex. 1005 ¶¶ 57–60. Petitioner particularly asserts there is motivation for using “a metal-coated or metal-loaded o-ring” in Youtsey, because “[t]he use of such o-rings and gaskets for both sealing and RFI shielding was known in the art,” as demonstrated by Peng (Ex. 1022, U.S. Patent No. 6,121,545, published Sept. 19, 2000).⁶ Pet. 36–38; Ex. 1005 ¶ 101.

Patent Owner’s Response

Patent Owner argues that prior art solutions to the loose connector problem placed grounding members in contact with the *post* and not the *body* of the connector, thereby “demonstrat[ing] that a [person of ordinary skill in the art] would have been motivated to (and did) place grounding members in contact with the *post*, **not the body**, to maintain a grounding path through a connector.” PO Resp. 20; *see id.* at 18–22.

⁶ Petitioner also relies on Stabile (Ex. 1019) and Tallis (Ex. 1020) in this regard. *See* Pet. 36–38. Patent Owner opposes this reliance (*see* PO Resp. 67–68), to which Petitioner replies (*see* Pet. Reply 21). We do not rely on Stabile or Tallis in this Decision.

Patent Owner next asserts “the parties agree” that “RFI could only be a problem, if at all, in any crevices in the Youtsey [connector] if the *already existing* grounding shield extending across the connector was broken.” *Id.* at 38 (citing Pet. 17, 62–63; Ex. 1005 ¶¶ 61, 175; Ex. 2041, 64:17–67:7, 72:19–74:1); Ex. 2042 ¶¶ 231, 234. Patent Owner contends Dr. Dickens “admitted that if the grounding path was maintained” then “there would be no RFI problems.” PO Resp. 38, 43–44 (citing Ex. 2041, 66:9–68:11). Patent Owner concludes Petitioner’s motivation falls short because Petitioner has not provided any evidence to show that Youtsey’s already-existing ground path between its post 28 and coupling element 30 had a problem. *Id.* at 38–39, 45–46; Ex. 2042 ¶¶ 235, 287–289.

Indeed, according to Patent Owner, Youtsey already solves the loose connector problem, so “there is no apparent reason to modify” Youtsey’s o-ring 84 to be conductive. PO Resp. 41–44. Patent Owner argues that Youtsey’s existing non-conductive o-rings 82 and 84 combine to retain the parts of the connector together and also to prevent moisture infiltration and the resulting corrosion, thereby preventing the connector from loosening. *Id.* at 41–43 (citing Ex. 1007, Fig. 3, 5:52–55; Ex. 2041, 59:15–61:9, 108:4–111:5, 185:1–186:22, 187:1–189:1); Ex. 2042 ¶¶ 218–220, 228–231.

Patent Owner moreover argues Petitioner does not explain persuasively why Youtsey’s o-ring 84 would have been made conductive, given that Lionetto and Horak “show that it was known to make ‘a sealing o-ring between the outer body and *inner post* [*i.e.*, not the coupler] of a coaxial cable connector’ conductive.” PO Resp. 28–29 (citing Pet. 16, 62). Patent Owner concludes “the prior art does not provide any evidence that a

[person of ordinary skill in the art] would be motivated to make Youtsey's o-ring 84 . . . between the body and the coupler conductive." *Id.* at 29.

For example, Patent Owner argues the desire to maintain a continuous grounding shield across Youtsey's connector is "too generic" to motivate modifying Youtsey's o-ring 84 to be conductive, as the Federal Circuit has instructed that "mere 'knowledge of a problem and motivation to solve it are entirely different from motivation to combine particular references.'" *Id.* at 29–30 (quoting *ActiveVideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Commc 'ns, Inc.*, 694 F.3d 1312, 1328 (Fed. Cir. 2012)). In particular, according to Patent Owner, Petitioner "simply identifies the problem to be solved (*i.e.*, the need to maintain the grounding path) without any indication or suggestion of how to specifically solve it" using the claimed *coupler-body* grounding path, instead of the *post* grounding path taught by the prior art. *Id.*; *see also id.* at 30–31 (citing Ex. 2021 (Youtsey '631), Ex. 2022 (Palinkas), Ex. 2023 (Bence)); Ex. 2001 ¶¶ 47, 54–62, 68; Ex. 2042 ¶¶ 272–273.

Patent Owner further asserts: "The prior art relied upon by Petitioner also confirms that a [person of ordinary skill in the art] would have been motivated to follow the teachings of the prior art by placing a grounding member in ***direct contact*** with the grounding shield of the cable and/or the ***post*** that is designed to contact and extend the grounding shield of the cable in order to have ***as few possible failure points as possible***." PO Resp. 31; Ex. 2042 ¶ 274. Patent Owner argues in support that Lionetto's conductive elastomer 34 directly contacts outer shield conductor 10, Horak's conductive rubber ring 18 directly contacts outer conductive jacket 62, and Bell's conductive o-ring 34 directly contacts outlet body 22. PO Resp. 31–33 (citing Ex. 1008, Fig. 1, 2:1–7, 2:31–36; Ex. 1009, Figs. 1, 3, 3:26–36,

4:20–47, 5:2–7; Ex. 1011, Fig. 1, 2:60–62, 3:12–34; Ex. 2041, 224:22–225:20); Ex. 2001 ¶¶ 89–91, 119–125, 142–153; Ex. 2042 ¶¶ 275–277.

According to Patent Owner, this desire “to provide a grounding path with *as few potential failure points as possible*” would have led a person of ordinary skill in the art “to maintain the known *grounding path* through the *post*, instead of creating a new grounding [coupler-body] path with additional potential failure points.” PO Resp. 33 (citing Ex. 2041, 214:10–22); Ex. 2042 ¶ 278.

Petitioner’s Reply

Petitioner asserts Patent Owner acknowledges “[t]he loose connector problem was well known.” Pet. Reply 2, 6 (citing Pet. 15–20; PO Resp. 18–22; Ex. 2001 ¶¶ 52–53). Petitioner reiterates that Youtsey teaches elastomeric o-ring 84 between body member 14 and coupling element 30 to seal out moisture, and Lionetto and Horak “each teach a conductive, compressible elastomeric member that both seals out moisture and shields from RFI.” *Id.* at 1–2 (citing Pet. 10–20). Petitioner concludes a person of ordinary skill in the art therefore “would have wanted to prevent RFI and signal loss caused by a loose connector by modifying” Youtsey’s o-ring 84 to be conductive. *Id.* at 2.

Petitioner characterizes Patent Owner’s opposition as being that “no single prior art reference” discloses or suggests the nut-body grounding member of claim 1. *Id.* Petitioner responds: “[O]bviousness cannot be rebutted by attacking the references individually rather than their combined teachings.” *Id.* at 2–3. According to Petitioner, the evidence establishes that “[a]t the time of the alleged inventions, conductive elastomeric rings were

commonly used in cable connectors to avert RFI.” *Id.* at 3 (citing Pet. 15–20; Ex. 1005 ¶¶ 55–69). Petitioner asserts this common usage would have motivated a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Youtsey’s sealing o-ring 84 to be conductive to shield against RFI and signal loss. *Id.* at 3–4 & n.3 (citing Pet. 15–20, 34–43; Inst. Dec. 62–64). Petitioner concludes that it is the prior art, not improper hindsight based on the ’083 patent, that renders claim 1 obvious. *Id.* at 5, 9 (citing Inst. Dec. 54–55).

Petitioner moreover asserts Patent Owner errs in contending Youtsey’s “non-conductive o-rings ‘solve’ the loose connector problem by sealing out moisture.” *Id.* at 22. According to Petitioner, “[a] loose connector creates RFI issues, as [Patent Owner] recognizes,” and Youtsey’s o-rings “do not shield against RFI when the connector is loose.” *Id.* (citing Paper 6 (Preliminary Response), 8–11; PO Resp. 18–20; Ex. 2001 ¶¶ 49–54; Ex. 1034, 4; Ex. 1036 ¶¶ 21, 16–20). Petitioner reiterates that it “has [been] known—since at least 1975—that a conductive o-ring can provide weather sealing and block RF interference at the same time,” which “aligns with the stated objective of Youtsey . . . to protect against signal degradation.” *Id.* at 22–23 (citing Pet. 13–14, 17–19; Ex. 1007, 1:16–22, 2:16–19; Ex. 1009, 4:66–5:11; Ex. 1011, 2:17–21, 3:16–18); Ex. 1005 ¶¶ 55–66.

Petitioner further argues Patent Owner “errs in contending that there is no motivation to combine because RFI would not be a concern when the grounding path in Youtsey . . . is unbroken.” Pet. Reply 15. Petitioner contends Youtsey’s existing grounding path “can break when the connector is loose,” which would have motivated a person of ordinary skill in the art to implement “*redundant*” grounding paths by modifying o-rings 82 and 84 to

be conductive, “consistent with the prior art’s teachings” including Horak. *Id.* (emphasis added) (citing Pet. 15–18, 62–63; Ex. 1005 ¶¶ 111–112); Ex. 1026 ¶¶ 305–306. “For example, Horak teaches use of a conductive o-ring [18] in the presence of another internal ground path [37, 39].” Pet. Reply 15 (citing Ex. 1009, 4:59–65, 5:7–11).

Patent Owner’s Sur-reply

Patent Owner in reply maintains that Petitioner’s motivation is deficient because Youtsey’s two o-rings 82 and 84 already solve the loose connector problem by “*retain[ing] the parts of the coaxial cable end connector 10 together* until the connector 10 is fixed to the end of a coax cable.” PO Sur-reply 21 (quoting Ex. 1007, 5:52–55). Patent Owner concludes that “if Youtsey’s o-rings keep the connector parts together before cable connection, Petitioner does not explain why they would not also keep them together after cable connection.” *Id.* at 21–22. Patent Owner asserts Dr. Dickens admitted this, despite Petitioner’s argument that he did not. *See id.* at 22 (citing Pet. Reply 17 n.12; Ex. 1005 ¶ 124; Ex. 2041, 185:1–186:22).

Patent Owner also argues Petitioner’s “redundant” grounding path rationale exceeds the proper scope for a reply under 37 C.F.R. § 42.23(b). *See* Paper 25, 6–7 (cites #6–7), 17–19 (cites #20–22); PO Sur-reply 27. On the merits in that regard, Patent Owner asserts Petitioner’s redundant grounding path rationale is deficient, because the new redundant grounding path in Youtsey (outer conductor 24, to body member 14, to o-ring 84, to coupling element 30) would compromise the existing grounding path (outer conductor 24, to post 28, to coupling element 30). *See* PO Sur-reply 27.

Patent Owner also argues Petitioner’s redundancy rationale lacks sufficient explanation and evidentiary support. *Id.* (citing Pet. Reply 15). This is because, according to Patent Owner, Youtsey’s front o-ring 82 “maintain[s] the grounding path ***even if*** the connector is not fully tightened,” and “Horak fails to teach a redundant ***loose connector*** ground path because the conductive member 18 in Horak is not compressed to form a ground path until the entrance connector is ***already fully tightened.***” *Id.*; Ex. 2001 ¶¶ 122–126.

Analysis and Determination as to Petitioner’s First Motivation

As an initial matter, we disagree with Patent Owner’s position that Petitioner’s “redundant” grounding path discussion exceeds the proper scope for a reply. In the Petition, Petitioner asserts a person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make Youtsey’s o-ring 84 conductive to “*maintain* a ground shield across the connector, *even when* [(1)] the connector is not properly tightened and/or [(2)] movement of the cable causes the ground path between the post and the nut to break.” Pet. 16 (emphases added); *see id.* at 16–19. This discussion in the Petition clearly is directed to proposing a second (or redundant) grounding path because one could not *maintain* a ground shield (one path) when the other ground shield (between post and nut) breaks unless there were at least two grounding paths.

Patent Owner repeatedly argues, in various fashions in the Patent Owner Response, that the Petition is deficient for failing to explain and support those contentions. *See* PO Resp. 27–64. In Petitioner’s Reply, Petitioner further explains that which it originally presented in the Petition—

how and why making Youtsey's o-ring 84 conductive would accomplish *maintaining* a grounding path (ground shield) across the connector (i.e., outer conductor 24, to body member 14, to o-ring 84, to nut member 30) *even when* the other ground path already taught by Youtsey (i.e., outer conductor 24, to post 28, to nut member 30—between the post and nut) breaks because of (1) or (2). Accordingly, we find that Petitioner's further explanation in its Reply is not an improper new theory as alleged by Patent Owner, but rather is a permissible further explanation of the argument first expressed in the Petition. *See, e.g., Rembrandt Diagnostics*, 76 F.4th at 1384.

Next, we determine Petitioner's motivation contentions are supported by the evidence. We credit Dr. Dickens's testimony that a person of ordinary skill in the art "would have understood that maintaining a *continuous* ground shield across the connector *is critical*" for preventing RFI and signal loss of the signal traveling on the main conductor of the coaxial cable. Ex. 1005 ¶ 61 (emphases added); *see* Pet. 17. This design objective also is expressed in the background section of the '083 patent (*see* Ex. 1001, 1:46–67), Youtsey (*see* Ex. 1007, Figs. 1, 3, 5:57–65, 6:8–14), Lionetto (*see* Ex. 1008, code (57), 1:10–20), and Horak (*see* Ex. 1009, 1:13–30, 4:60–66).

Starting with Youtsey, Dr. Dickens testifies Youtsey provides a shielding ground path through connector 10. *See* Ex. 1005 ¶¶ 39–43, 89–90, 106–107, 110–112; Pet. 11–12, 31–32, 40–43. This path consists of outer conductor 24 of coaxial cable 12 contacting post 28, which contacts nut member 30, which contacts interface port 16, which contacts the outer conductor of coaxial cable 18. *See* Ex. 1007, Figs. 1, 3, 5:57–65, 6:8–14; Ex. 1005 ¶ 43. This is the sole shielding ground path provided in Youtsey.

Turning to Horak, Dr. Dickens relies on Horak's disclosure that coaxial cable connectors should account for "*the dominant consideration of long-term radio frequency interference (RFI) effectiveness*," because "[t]he mechanics of [Horak's] interface indicate that stress can reduce contact pressure between" components of the connector, which will "deteriorate shielding effectiveness." Ex. 1009, 1:5–19; *see* Ex. 1005 ¶ 61 (citing Ex. 1009, 1:13–19, 4:60–66); Pet. 17. Horak further states: "Once secured, this connection is typically subjected to alternate tension and compression as well as rotational and vibrational forces" that "combined with temperature variations, air pollutants, and varying humidity conditions, serve to gradually deteriorate the contact." Ex. 1009, 1:23–31. And: "In order to prevent the introduction of RFI in a signal carried by the cable 60, it is *necessary* to insure that the signal-carrying central conductor 66 of the cable 60 is *always* surrounded by a *continuous* metal shield." *Id.* at 4:60–63 (emphases added).

Dr. Dickens testifies persuasively that, to address this problem, Horak provides two different shielding ground paths in its connector, thus motivating a person of ordinary skill in the art to do the same in Youtsey. *See* Ex. 1009, Figs. 2–3; Ex. 1005 ¶¶ 50–54, 60–62, 65–66; Pet. 13–14, 16–17, 18–19. Horak's first path consists of outer conductive jacket 62 of coaxial cable 60 contacting support sleeve 34, which contacts pin section 14 at faces 37 and 39. *See* Ex. 1009, 3:11–15, 3:28–29, 3:37–39, 4:3–6, 4:54–5:2. Horak's second path consists of outer conductive jacket 62 contacting conductive rubber ring 18, which contacts conductive body 16 of nut section 12, which contacts pin section 14 at threads 42 and 50. *See id.* at 2:45–56, 3:21–25, 3:45–47, 4:37–41, 5:2–11.

Dr. Dickens also testifies persuasively that Lionetto, similarly to Horak, provides two different shielding ground paths in its connector, beneficially providing “*continuous* annular outer conductor electrical contact and RFI suppression” to help account for axial misalignment between the two halves of the connector. Ex. 1008, code (57) (emphasis added), Figs. 1–2, 2:50–58 (claim 1), 3:14–20 (claim 3); *see* Ex. 1005 ¶¶ 45–47, 50, 58, 65; Pet. 12–13, 16. Lionetto’s first path consists of male shield conductor 10 contacting annular leaf spring 22, which contacts internal sleeve 14 of female shield conductor 12. *See* Ex. 1008, 2:1–12, 2:31–44, 2:50–58 (claim 1). Lionetto’s second path consists of male shield conductor 10 contacting conductive elastomer gasket ring 34, which contacts internal sleeve 14 of female shield conductor 12. *See id.* at 2:34–36, 3:14–20 (claim 3).

In short, we find that Lionetto and Horak each teach that it is beneficial to have multiple shielding electrical ground paths in a coaxial cable connector, to account for loosening of the connector as it is subjected to different conditions over time. Lionetto and Horak further demonstrate that it was known to use ring-shaped conductive elastomers (Lionetto’s conductive elastomer 34 and Horak’s conductive rubber ring 18) disposed between two metal conductors, to electrically connect the metal conductors and thereby extend a grounding shield through a coaxial cable connector.⁷ *See supra* Section III.D.4(e)(iii)(2).

We further find that a person of ordinary skill in the art seeking to implement those teachings from Lionetto and Horak would have been

⁷ As noted above in Section III.D.4(e)(iii)(2), we do not rely on Lionetto or Horak as teaching an o-ring as that structure is disclosed by Youtsey.

motivated to add a second (redundant) grounding path to a connector that has only a single grounding path (such as the connector in Youtsey). Doing so in Youtsey, as Petitioner proposes, would provide the desired second grounding path—from outer conductor 24, to body member 14, to o-ring 84, to nut member 30.

“A person of ordinary skill is also a person of ordinary creativity, not an automaton,” and “in many cases a person of ordinary skill will be able to fit the teachings of multiple patents together like pieces of a puzzle.” *KSR*, 550 U.S. at 420–21. This is particularly the case here, where it was known prior to the ’083 patent to use different conductive components to provide grounding shield paths through a coaxial cable connector. *See supra* Section III.D.4(e)(iv). As explained above, Patent Owner’s opposing view of prior art solutions to the loose connector problem as motivating use of only a post, and not a body, to complete a grounding path is not supported sufficiently by the evidence. *See id.* Also as explained above, claim 1 does not exclude using a post to provide a grounding shield path. *See id.* Therefore, even if using a post were somehow a critical aspect of completing a grounding path as Patent Owner contends, this is performed by Youtsey’s existing ground path through post 28. Maintaining the grounding path through the post does not preclude or otherwise detract from also using a body member, such as Youtsey’s outer barrel 14, to provide a redundant ground path, thereby satisfying claim 1.

We disagree with Patent Owner’s arguments and Dr. Elderling’s testimony to the contrary. First, for reasons provided above in Section III.D.4(e)(iv), the evidence does not support Patent Owner’s position that the prior art is limited to using “*the post*” and “*not the body*” (PO

Resp. 20) to create a shielding ground path through a connector. Patent Owner's position that the Petition is fatally deficient because it "fail[s] to identify *any* prior art references that teach or suggest a coupler-body grounding member located between the *[nut] and the body*" (PO Resp. 7, 8–9) improperly attempts to hold Petitioner to a rigid teaching, suggestion, or motivation standard. *See KSR*, 550 U.S. at 415 ("We begin by rejecting the rigid [teaching, suggestion, motivation] approach.").

The proper inquiry is whether Petitioner has articulated adequate reasoning based on a rational underpinning, supported by the evidence, to explain why a person of ordinary skill in the art would have been led to combine Youtsey with Lionetto and Horak in the fashion claimed. *See id.* at 418. We conclude Petitioner has satisfied that here, for the reasons provided above, even assuming that neither Lionetto nor Horak discloses a nut-body grounding member, or an o-ring structure. This is because Youtsey's o-ring 84 is disposed between and contacts Youtsey's nut 30 and Youtsey's body 14, and Petitioner has articulated a reason with a rational basis for modifying Youtsey's o-ring 84 to be conductive based on the disclosures of Lionetto and Horak without hindsight bias, as discussed above.

Second, we disagree with Patent Owner that Youtsey *solves* the loose connector problem, and thereby nullifies any motivation to provide a redundant shielding ground path. No doubt, Youtsey's existing o-rings 82 and 84 function to "seal the interior of the coaxial cable end connector 10 from moisture and other corrosive agents in the ambient environment," and "to retain the parts of the coaxial cable end connector 10 together until the connector 10 is fixed to the end of a coax cable by crimping." Ex. 1007,

Figs. 1–3, 5:45–55; *see also* Ex. 2041, 59:15–61:9, 108:4–111:5; Ex. 2042 ¶¶ 215–220. However, we determine that these teachings do not detract from Petitioner’s motivation arguments. Dr. Dickens testifies that the redundant shielding ground path provided by a conductive o-ring 84 would be beneficial either “when the connector is not properly tightened onto the port,” or when “movement of the cable causes the ground path between the post and the nut to break.” Ex. 1005 ¶ 57. Either of those two events could occur even if Youtsey’s existing o-rings 82 and 84 are functioning as intended to seal the interior of the connector from exposure to corrosive agents in the environment, and to retain the parts of the connector together. We do not agree with the premise of Patent Owner’s argument that it is *only* corrosion caused by moisture intrusion (*see* PO Resp. 41–46; PO Sur-reply 21–22) that can lead to breaking of the ground path between Youtsey’s post 28 and nut 30. As Dr. Dickens testifies (*see above*), and Dr. Eldering does not materially dispute, this breakage can *also* be caused by an improper tightening of the connector, or by movement of the connected coaxial cables over time.⁸ Thus, we find that the evidence indicates there are some circumstances in which the redundant shielding ground path—provided by modifying Youtsey’s o-ring 84 to be conductive—would be beneficial, which provides a reason with a rational basis why a person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make this modification without the benefit of hindsight.

⁸ Indeed, in another IPR proceeding, Patent Owner’s counsel stated, “[t]his problem of loose connectors has haunted customers and multiple system operators (‘MSOs’ or ‘cable companies’) over many decades.” Ex. 1034, 9; *see* Tr. 90:5–91:1.

Third, Patent Owner’s reliance on a desire to provide a grounding path with as few failure points as possible does not detract from Petitioner’s motivation to modify Youtsey’s o-ring 84 to be conductive. This modification would have been made to provide a second (redundant) ground path in Youtsey, for the very purpose of compensating for failures in Youtsey’s existing ground path, as discussed above. In other words, Petitioner’s modification results in a more robust ground path structure, not a reduced ground path structure. Moreover, the Federal Circuit’s “precedent . . . does not require that the motivation be the *best* option, only that it be a *suitable* option from which the prior art did not teach away.” *PAR Pharm., Inc. v. TWI Pharms., Inc.*, 773 F.3d 1186, 1197–98 (Fed. Cir. 2014). So, even if Petitioner’s proposed second grounding path could have been improved by further modification(s) to reduce failure points, these potential weaknesses do not detract sufficiently from the proposed suitable improvement of simply making o-ring 84 conductive.⁹

Lastly, Petitioner’s case for modifying Youtsey’s o-ring 84 to be *metal* (specifically) as part of modifying it to be conductive is not opposed by Patent Owner. In this regard, we determine that relationships between independent claim 1 and its dependent claims indicate the term “conductive metal ring” in claim 1 may comprise any of “a soft metal material” per dependent claim 4, or “a compressible material” per dependent claim 5, or “a conductively coated O-ring sealing member” per dependent claim 7. Ex. 1001, 16:29, 16:44–60. The ’083 patent specification similarly

⁹ See *infra* Section III.D.4(e)(iv)(6) (weighing the advantages and disadvantages of the proposed combination when assessing motivation to combine).

provides: “The connector body conductive member 80 should be formed of a conductive material” and such materials may include “*elastomeric mixtures, composite materials having conductive properties, soft metals*, conductive rubber, and/or the like and/or *any workable combination thereof*.” *Id.* at 11:37–42 (emphases added). Thus, claim 1 encompasses “a metal-coated or metal-loaded o-ring” as Petitioner proposes to use in the combination. Pet. 36. Such o-rings were known in the art as demonstrated by Peng, which describes how “EMI shielding gaskets typically are constructed as a resilient core element having gap-filling capabilities which is either *filled, sheathed, or coated* with an electrically conductive element,” including “*metal or metal-plated particles*.” Ex. 1022, 2:8–21 (emphases added); *see also* Pet. 16, 36–37 (discussing Peng in relation to motivation to combine); *infra* Section III.D.4(e)(v)(4) (discussing Peng, including demonstrative illustrations offered by both witnesses).

We find that the redundant grounding path provided by Petitioner’s modification of Youtsey’s o-ring 84 to be conductive and metal is a sufficiently articulated and rational motivation, based on the evidence including Lionetto and Horak, that avoids improper hindsight in Petitioner’s proposed modification.

(2) *Petitioner’s Second Motivation—Crevice Susceptible to RFI*

Petitioner’s second motivation for modifying Youtsey’s o-ring 84 to be conductive is that the particular area where the o-ring is located is “susceptible to RFI,” because it is “susceptible to moisture intrusion” as described in Youtsey. Pet. 17–18 (citing Ex. 1007, 1:19–22, 2:14–16, 5:50–53; Ex. 1005 ¶¶ 63–64); Pet. Reply 14–16 (citing Ex. 1026 ¶¶ 300–

304; Ex. 2023, 1:65–2:3; Ex. 2034, 1:13–39; Ex. 2035, 1:15–2:21; Inst. Dec. 66–67).

Patent Owner argues the evidence does not support Petitioner’s contention that Youtsey’s o-ring 84 is located in a crevice that is susceptible to RFI, and a person of ordinary in the art instead would have understood Youtsey’s central conductor 20 “*is completely surrounded*, and physically and electrically protected, *except for where it is exposed inside of the coupler/nut 30*” which would not be protected by making Youtsey’s o-ring 84 conductive. PO Resp. 34–36 (citing Ex. 1007, Fig. 3, 2:65–67; Ex. 2001 ¶¶ 171–174; Ex. 2041, 78:12–79:22, 100:12–101:7; Ex. 2042 ¶¶ 283–286). Indeed, according to Patent Owner, the evidence “contradict[s]” Petitioner’s theory. *See id.* at 36–38 (citing Ex. 1007, Fig. 3; Ex. 2001 ¶¶ 175–180; Ex. 2021, 1:22–35; Ex. 2041, 91:4–92:9; Ex. 2042 ¶¶ 279–282).

We do not rely on Petitioner’s second motivation theory to support this Decision.

(3) *Patent Owner’s First Disadvantage—Inferior Environmental Seal*

Patent Owner argues that modifying Youtsey’s o-ring 84 to be conductive and metal would reduce the compressibility of the o-ring due to the added conductive metal component(s), thereby interfering with its ability to seal out moisture. *See* PO Resp. 22–23, 46–47 (citing Pet. 16; Ex. 2041, 57:8–58:2, 96:12–98:19; Ex. 1001, 1:56–60); Ex. 2042 ¶¶ 215–217, 236. This is why, Patent Owner urges, some prior art solutions to the loose connector problem, allegedly including Youtsey, used *non-conductive* o-rings to seal out moisture and avoid corrosion that leads to looseness. *See*

PO Resp. 23–25 (summarizing Ex. 1007 (Youtsey) and Ex. 1010 (Tarrant)) (also citing Ex. 2041, 59:15–61:9, 108:4–111:5); Ex. 2042 ¶¶ 218–222.

Patent Owner therefore concludes a person of ordinary skill in the art “would not [have been] motivated” to make Youtsey’s o-ring 84 conductive. PO Resp. 24–25; Ex. 2042 ¶ 223.

Patent Owner relies on Choudary (Ex. 2034, U.S. Patent No. 6,173,970, issued Jan. 16, 2001) in this regard, as “teach[ing] that conductive gaskets were known for reducing EMI and RFI,” but also “identif[y]ing a number of known problems with using these known conductive gaskets” including a “difficulty in providing a ‘proper environmental seal.’” PO Resp. 47–48 (citing Ex. 2034, 1:28–36, 1:50–57, 1:61–63); Ex. 2042 ¶¶ 237–238. Patent Owner also relies on Bunyan (Ex. 2035, U.S. Patent No. 8,633,402, issued Jan. 21, 2014) as “further teach[ing] that conductive gaskets . . . have a number of known problems, including their difficulty in providing a ‘desired environmental seal’ which can lead to corrosion.” PO Resp. 48 (citing Ex. 2035, 2:4–8, 2:22–43); Ex. 2042 ¶ 239.

“Given these problems,” Patent Owner urges, the prior art “teaches that separate products are typically provided for environmental sealing and EMI shielding to avoid corrosion because a single gasket frequently cannot provide both functions satisfactorily.” PO Resp. 48–49 (citing Ex. 1009, Fig. 3, 3:42–47, 4:47–49; Ex. 2035, 2:46–53); *id.* at 39–40; Ex. 2042 ¶¶ 240–243, 290–291. Patent Owner further asserts “[t]his is confirmed by . . . Petitioner’s own patent application,” filed several years after the ’083 patent’s priority date. PO Resp. 48–50 (citing Ex. 2013, Figs. 4–5, ¶¶ 3, 14, 17, 18); Ex. 2001 ¶¶ 187–190. Patent Owner relatedly argues that

making Youtsey's o-ring 84 conductive would render it "inoperable for [its] intended purpose (*i.e.*, preventing water infiltration and resulting corrosion)." PO Resp. 51; Ex. 2042 ¶ 243.

Petitioner replies that it "has [been] known—since at least 1975—that a conductive o-ring can provide weather sealing and block RF interference at the same time," which "aligns with the stated objective of Youtsey . . . to protect against signal degradation." Pet. Reply 22–23 (citing Pet. 13–14, 17–19; Ex. 1007, 1:16–22, 2:16–19; Ex. 1009, 4:66–5:11; Ex. 1011, 2:17–21, 3:16–18); Ex. 1005 ¶¶ 55–69. Petitioner asserts Choudary and Bunyan do not support Patent Owner's argument "that conductive o-rings always provide inferior environmental seals," because they instead both "disclose a gasket that combines RFI shielding and environmental sealing." Pet. Reply 23–24 (citing PO Resp. 47–49; Ex. 2034, 1:5–10, 1:13–20, 1:53–61, 2:51–61; Ex. 2035, 2:46–60, 3:38–42, 5:3–10); Ex. 1026 ¶¶ 325–329.

Patent Owner replies that Petitioner has not disputed "conductive elastomers would provide inferior environmental seals compared to non-conductive elastomers," and Petitioner instead "merely made the conclusory statement that the seals would be 'sufficient.'" PO Sur-reply 11 (citing Pet. Reply 19). Patent Owner asserts the parties have "agreed that the fundamental objective of [Youtsey] was to provide an environmental seal to avoid moisture infiltration." *Id.* at 19–20 (citing Pet. Reply 22–23; Ex. 1027, 166:7–167:15; Ex. 2044, 467:16–470:2). Patent Owner maintains Choudary and Bunyan demonstrate "it was well known in 2004 that use of . . . conductive elastomers would result in inferior environmental sealing." *Id.* (citing PO Resp. 47–51). Patent Owner concludes there is no motivation "to negate" the "superior" environmental seal provided by Youtsey's

non-conductive o-ring with an “inferior” environmental seal provided by a conductive o-ring. *Id.* at 21.

Patent Owner further urges “Petitioner ambiguously theorized” Choudary and Bunyan “describe conductive gaskets that provide an environmental seal,” whereas “in reality, these references teach the use of ***non-conductive*** gasket components to provide environmental seals.” *Id.* at 20 (citing Pet. Reply 23–24; Ex. 2034, Fig. 1, 2:38–3:9; Ex. 2035, code (57), 3:50–56). Patent Owner also cites Bell as “confirm[ing] that conductive o-ring 34 would provide an inferior ‘degree of sealing’ relative to the superior sealing provided by a non-conductive o-ring.” *Id.* at 20 (citing Ex. 1011, 2:18–21; Ex. 2044, 470:16–471:8).

We determine Petitioner has the better argument. First, the prior art reflects that an elastomeric ring structure may be used to provide *both* an environmental seal *and* a conductive pathway between two other conductors. As one example, Horak discloses its rubber ring 18 is compressed “to expand inward radially *thereby providing a weather-proof seal* with the conductive jacket 62,” while “at the same time” providing “[a]dditional *security from RFI . . . by using a conductive rubber* for the ring 18.” Ex. 1009, Figs. 2–3, 2:48–56, 4:38–42, 4:67–5:11 (emphases added). Patent Owner points out that Horak’s connector also has non-conductive o-rings 48 and 52 for weatherproof sealing, but it is readily apparent from Horak’s Figures 2 and 3 that those seals weatherproof a different part of the connector than rubber ring 18, and do not act as a “backup” to the weatherproofing of rubber ring 18.

As a second example, Choudary discloses “a gasket combining functions such as *electromagnetic interference or radio frequency*

interference (EMI/RFI) shielding, environmental protection, and galvanic protection attributes.” Ex. 2034, 1:6–10 (emphases added), 1:28–36 (further describing the shielding functionality). Choudary states one “difficulty with known gaskets for providing EMI/RFI shielding is that the gasket material, while resilient, is not as compressible and resilient as other materials,” and “[t]he reduced compressibility sometimes makes it difficult for the gasket to provide a proper environmental shield.” *Id.* at 1:50–57. Choudary nonetheless concludes, despite this difficulty, that “[i]t is desirable to provide a gasket that combines high levels of EMI/RFI shielding with high compressibility and resilience characteristics to provide high levels of environmental shielding.” *Id.* at 1:57–60. Choudary then discloses gasket 21, made by joining together first resilient component 25 having good environmental sealing properties, and second resilient component 27 being conductive to provide good shielding properties. *Id.* at Fig. 1, 1:66–2:17, 2:38–54. Thus, although Choudary recognizes there are challenges in designing an elastomeric structure to provide both an environmental seal and a conductive pathway, there are ways to overcome these challenges.

As a third example, Bell provides “a conductive resilient O-ring 34, which *provides a degree of sealing* between the plug body 12 and the outlet body 22,” while also being “*made from a conductive material to form part of the electrical path* from the plug body 12 to the braid 64.” Ex. 1011, 2:17–21, 3:16–18 (emphases added).

Further, Bunyan¹⁰ recognizes “gaskets and other seals have been proposed *both* for maintaining electrical continuity across the structure, *and* for excluding from the interior of the device such contaminants as moisture and dust.” Ex. 2035, 2:4–21 (emphases added). Bunyan describes various structural configurations for such gaskets (*see id.* at 2:22–30), and then discusses how such gaskets “exhibit a number of problems in actual use” (*id.* at 2:31–45) such that “it is frequently the case that gaskets providing satisfactory EMI shielding capabilities are unable to provide environmental sealing, thereby causing corrosion problems” (*id.* at 2:46–51). “As a result, the EMI shielding and environmental sealing functions have typically been seen as two separate functions requiring two separate products.” *Id.* at 2:51–60. Bunyan accordingly provides “an EMI gasket having *both* enhanced resistance to corrosion *and* a reduction in the compressive forces required to form a seal between adjacent surfaces in circumstances where both sealing and EMI shielding are required.” *Id.* at 5:3–10 (emphasis added); *see also id.* at Figs. 3–4, 5:51–63, 6:16–54, 7:4–12 (Bunyan’s gasket comprises a rod-shaped conductive elastomeric polymer 5 having rib sections 6, and a non-conductive polymer gel 7 disposed between the ribs to provide sealing). Thus, although Bunyan recognizes there are challenges in designing a gasket to provide both an environmental seal and a conductive pathway, there are ways to overcome these challenges.

At best for Patent Owner, the foregoing evidence shows a person of ordinary skill in the art would have known that modifying Youtsey’s

¹⁰ Bunyan may not be prior art to the ’083 patent. *See* Ex. 1001, code (63); Ex. 2035, code (60). Patent Owner nonetheless argues Bunyan supports its arguments here, so we address it accordingly.

o-ring 84 to be conductive to achieve the *benefit* of a redundant shielding ground path (*see supra* Section III.D.4(e)(v)(1)) might be associated with the *drawback* of reduced environmental sealing versus Youtsey's existing non-conductive o-ring 84. However, as discussed above, the evidence also shows a person of ordinary skill in the art knew of ways to minimize the latter drawback, while still achieving the former benefit. Most importantly, Horak and Bell both teach an elastomeric ring structure may be used to provide *both* a sufficient environmental seal *and* a sufficient grounding conductive pathway in the specific context of a coaxial cable connection.

Dr. Eldering's testimony on behalf of Patent Owner does not add much to our foregoing consideration of the prior art. He emphasizes Youtsey's desire to use its o-ring 84 to provide a good environmental seal. *See* Ex. 2042 ¶¶ 215–220, 236, 243. He also summarizes the disclosures of Choudary and Bunyan concerning the challenges in designing a gasket that provides both an environmental seal and a conductive pathway. *See id.* ¶¶ 236–243. However, Dr. Eldering does not grapple with Horak's description of rubber ring 18 as providing both an environmental seal and a conductive pathway. *See id.* ¶¶ 242, 290–291. Nor does he explain sufficiently why a person of ordinary skill in the art might have been deterred from following Bell's, Choudary's, and Bunyan's common approach of using one gasket to provide both an environmental seal and a conductive pathway, despite the design challenges this might pose.

We appreciate, as Dr. Eldering testifies, that another way to achieve both goals is to use two separate products—a compressible but non-conductive product for environmental sealing, and a stiffer conductive product for conductivity—rather than one product such as the compressible

and conductive o-ring proposed by Petitioner's combination. *See* Ex. 2042 ¶¶ 240–241, 243 (discussing Bunyan). For example, the patent application filed by Petitioner and discussed by Patent Owner and Dr. Eldering provides such a solution. *See* PO Resp. 49–50; Ex. 2001 ¶¶ 187–190; Ex. 2013, code (57), Figs. 4–5, ¶¶ 3, 5, 14, 17–18. Nonetheless, obviousness requires only that the proposed solution is a suitable option, not that it is the best option. *See PAR Pharm.*, 773 F.3d at 1197–98.


We find the prior art demonstrates that a single elastomeric ring structure can have both sufficient compressibility to provide an environmental seal, and sufficient conductivity to extend a shielding ground path, in a coaxial cable connector. We therefore turn to Patent Owner's further argument that modifying Youtsey's o-ring 84 to be conductive and thereby perform both functions would have the further disadvantageous effect of inhibiting free rotation of Youtsey's nut member 30 around Youtsey's body member 14.

(4) *Patent Owner's Second Disadvantage—Increased Resistance to Rotation*

Patent Owner argues that modifying Youtsey's o-ring 84 to be conductive and metal would reduce the compressibility of the o-ring due to the added conductive metal component(s), disadvantageously increasing the connector's resistance to free rotation of nut member 30, and thereby exacerbating any loose connection problem (assuming there is one), leading away from Petitioner's proposed modification. *See* PO Resp. 25–27, 51–64. For the following reasons, we disagree.

Compressibility of Conductive Elastomer O-Rings

Patent Owner asserts conductive elastomers “require *significant compression* to form a conductive pathway.” PO Resp. 25–27 (section heading modified, emphasis added). Patent Owner relies on Peng¹¹ in this regard. *See id.* Patent Owner argues “Peng teaches that an EMI shielding gasket would have a resilient core element that is formed of an elastomeric material and is either filled, sheathed, or coated with electrically conductive metal particles, fabrics, meshes, or fibers.” *Id.* at 25 (citing Ex. 1022, 2:8–24); Ex. 2042 ¶¶ 225–226. Dr. Eldering provides two demonstrative illustrations of a conductor-filled shielding gasket, reproduced below.



Demonstrative Illustrations of a Conductor-Filled Elastomer.

These two illustrations are cross-sectional views of a “conductive elastomer with an elastomeric material core and conductive fillers (shown in orange).” Ex. 2042 ¶¶ 226–227. The illustration on the left shows the elastomeric core in an uncompressed state, and the illustration on the right shows the elastomeric core in a compressed state. *Id.* Dr. Eldering testifies a person of


¹¹ The record contains two copies of Peng, Exhibit 1022 (filed with the Petition) and Exhibit 2033 (filed with the Patent Owner Response). We cite to the former. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(d) (“A document already in the record of the proceeding must not be filed again, not even as an exhibit or an appendix, without express Board authorization.”).

ordinary skill in the art would have understood: “(i) the conductive elastomer must be sufficiently compressed (*i.e.*, 10% minimum to as much as 50%) with higher compression providing better conductivity (hence higher shielding effectiveness) because the conductive fillers need to have sufficient contact with each other inside of the conductive elastomer to form one or more conductive pathways (shown in blue) as illustrated” on the right; and “(ii) the conductive fillers need to have sufficient contact with the contacting conductive surfaces at the edge or surface of the conductive elastomer.” *Id.* ¶ 227 (citing Ex. 1022, 4:19–23, 9:2–6); *see* PO Resp. 26.

Petitioner replies that conductive o-rings do not require increased compression versus non-conductive o-rings. *See* Pet. Reply 9. Petitioner asserts Patent Owner “relies solely on Peng and an unsourced graphic created by Dr. Eldering” to support a position that conflicts with the prior art and the knowledge of a person of ordinary skill in the art. *Id.* (citing PO Resp. 25–27, 59–64; Ex. 1027, 120:8–12). Petitioner argues Peng does not support Patent Owner’s argument “that compression properties of a conductive elastomer filled with conductive material (not even an o-ring) applies to all types of conductive o-rings.” *Id.* at 9–10 (citing PO Resp. 61–62, 25–27; Ex. 2042 ¶¶ 226–227; Ex. 1027, 124:8–18).

Petitioner’s view is that Dr. Eldering’s demonstrative illustrations are limited to “an elastomeric material core and conductive fillers,” whereas Peng discloses conductive elastomer o-rings also may be “sheathed, or coated with electrically conductive metal particles, fabrics, meshes, or fibers.” *Id.* (citing Ex. 1022, 2:8–24; Ex. 1027, 155:22–157:1); Ex. 1026 ¶¶ 282–285. Petitioner asserts: “Nothing in Peng suggests that these other types of o-rings would require significant compression.” Pet. Reply 10;

Ex. 1026 ¶ 284. Dr. Dickens provides two demonstrative illustrations of an o-ring with a conductive sheath or coating, reproduced below.



**Demonstrative Illustrations of an O-ring with
a Conductive Sheath or Coating.**

These two illustrations show an elastomeric o-ring (in orange) having a conductive sheathing or coating (in blue). *See* Ex. 1026 ¶¶ 284–285. The illustration on the left shows the o-ring without any compression and having a conductive pathway from the top to the bottom, and the illustration on the right shows the o-ring under $\geq 10\%$ compression and having a conductive pathway from the top to the bottom. *See id.* Dr. Dickens concludes “a conductive o-ring may demonstrate conductive and shielding properties without requiring additional compression beyond the standard compression for sealing o-rings, like” Youtsey’s existing o-ring 84. *Id.* ¶ 285 (citing Ex. 1032 (Squitieri), 1:35–39).

Petitioner also cites several prior art references as establishing that “the compression needed to properly install such an o-ring is well within the expertise of a” person of ordinary skill in the art. Pet. Reply 11 (citing Ex. 1007 (Youtsey), 5:44–52; Ex. 1010 (Tarrant), 3:41–50; Ex. 1008

(Lionetto), 2:31–36, 3:14–20; Ex. 1009 (Horak), 4:67–5:11; Ex. 1011 (Bell), 2:17–20, 3:12–30; Ex. 2030 (Rodrigues), 6:4–14); Ex. 1026 ¶ 286. In particular, according to Petitioner, each of Lionetto, Horak, and Bell “teaches an o-ring that provides both weather sealing and protection from RFI.” Pet. Reply 12; Ex. 1026 ¶ 293 (citing Ex. 1005 ¶¶ 55–66, 171–179).

Petitioner further asserts other prior art, such as Buonanno (Ex. 1031) and Squitieri (Ex. 1032), “teaches that gaskets with conductive sheaths could be used to block ‘electromagnetic interference (EMI), while also sealing the gap environmentally against airflow, noise, dust or the like.’” Pet. Reply 12 (quoting Ex. 1031, 1:7–11; citing Ex. 1032, 1:35–39); Ex. 1026 ¶ 292. Petitioner adds that “conductive o-rings in 2004 did not require increased compression and were fully ‘interchangeable with standard non-conductive seals of the same dimensions,’” as established by a Chomerics Handbook reference (Ex. 1028). Pet. Reply 12 (quoting Ex. 1028, 63); Ex. 1026 ¶¶ 293–294.

Patent Owner criticizes Petitioner’s reliance on Peng’s conductor-“sheathed” and conductor-“coated” embodiments (Ex. 1022, 2:8–21) as “trial-by-ambush” by “switching” to a “new” obviousness theory in Petitioner’s Reply. PO Sur-reply 2, 13, 15, 17. Patent Owner cites Dr. Dickens’s deposition testimony, during which he “testified that a [person of ordinary skill in the art] would have used ‘metal-impregnated’ or ‘metal-filled’ conductive o-rings in his proposed modification.” PO Sur-reply 13 & n.8 (citing Ex. 2041, 172:2–6, 209:10–210:22, 227:22–228:12, 231:21–235:4, 284:3–286:11, 322:21–323:8; Ex. 2044, 410:11–411:1). On the merits in this regard, Patent Owner characterizes Petitioner’s argument as being that “no compression was required” for

conductivity (*id.* at 15, 17 (emphasis added)), and asserts this is “based on the undocumented knowledge of a [person of ordinary skill in the art]” because Petitioner “provide[s] no supporting evidence that such o-rings even existed” (*id.* at 2, 15–16).

Patent Owner replies further that the evidence shows “the required compression of a metal-filled conductive elastomer is in the range of **10% minimum to as much as 50%**, with higher compression providing higher shielding effectiveness.” *Id.* at 13 (citing PO Resp. 25–27, 60; Ex. 2044, 408:7–409:11).

Patent Owner asserts Petitioner’s reliance on Buonanno, Squitieri, and Chomerics Handbook exceeds the proper scope for a reply under 37 C.F.R. § 42.23(b). *See* Paper 25, 4–5 (cites #4, #5), 10 (cite #11), 14–16 (cites #17–19), 20–22 (cites #25–27), 23 (cites #29, #30); PO Sur-reply 14, 16 (citing Ex. 2041, 231:21–235:4; Ex. 2044, 424:1–425:3). Patent Owner adds that Buonanno and Squitieri bely Petitioner’s motivation theory because they “actually teach that conductive sheathing seals were compressed,” and Chomerics Handbook supports Patent Owner’s arguments because it “confirms that a metal-filled conductive o-ring must be ‘**compressed in a properly designed groove**’ and that ‘**[g]rooves should be designed to assure 10 to 20% deflection of the gasket.**’” PO Sur-reply 14 (quoting Ex. 1028, 32–33, 63) (citing Ex. 2044, 425:4–428:17, 420:17–423:13, 428:19–430:22); *id.* at 16–17 (citing Ex. 1031, Figs. 1–2, 3:66–67; Ex. 1032, Figs. 1–4; Ex. 2044, 415:4–420:16).

As an initial matter, we disagree with Patent Owner’s position that Petitioner’s reliance on Peng is trial by ambush. In the Petition, Petitioner cites Peng as supporting Petitioner’s contentions in relation to using a

“metal” grounding member, as recited in claim 1. *See* Pet. 36–37 (citing Ex. 1022, 1:39–47, 1:54–58, 1:63–2:21, 8:15–57, 9:7–11). The Patent Owner Response then relies on Peng’s conductor-“filled” embodiment (Ex. 1022, 2:8–24) as providing an unsuitably stiff structure for use as Youtsey’s o-ring 84. *See* PO Resp. 25–27, 59–64. Petitioner’s Reply next cites Peng as providing conductor-“sheathed” and conductor-“coated” embodiments, as alternative structures that are suitable for use as Youtsey’s o-ring 84, relying on a selection of the same disclosures previously cited in the Petition. *See* Pet. Reply 9–11 (citing Ex. 1022, 2:8–24). Under these circumstances, Petitioner’s Reply is not improper.

Turning to the merits, we are persuaded by Dr. Eldering’s testimony that an elastomeric o-ring using a *metal filler* requires at least about a 10% compression to complete a grounding pathway through an o-ring. *See* Ex. 2042 ¶¶ 225–227. This testimony is supported by Peng. *See* Ex. 1022, 2:8–27, 4:19–22, 9:2–6. Dr. Dickens responds that Peng’s disclosure concerns “a flat spacer gasket” rather than an o-ring like Youtsey’s o-ring 84, and he concludes “Peng’s compression requirements of the flat elastomeric member 24 are not representative of all conductive o-rings.” Ex. 1026 ¶¶ 283, 287–290 (citing Ex. 1022, Figs. 1, 2A, 2B, 3:59–4:35; Ex. 1027, 146:13–148:22). However, Dr. Dickens does not materially dispute Dr. Eldering’s testimony that an o-ring incorporating a metal filler requires at least some minimum compression to form a conductive pathway. *See* Ex. 2042 ¶¶ 225–227; Ex. 1026 ¶¶ 287–290; Ex. 2044, 408:7–411:8 (Dr. Dickens testifying on cross-examination that no “deflection” is required for conductivity, but not citing any evidence to support this testimony). We

are persuaded by Dr. Eldering’s testimony and demonstrative illustrations in that regard.

Next, we are persuaded by Dr. Dickens’s testimony that an elastomeric o-ring may be made conductive by using a *metal coating* or a *metal sheathing*, as opposed to the *metal filler* discussed by Dr. Eldering. *See* Ex. 1005 ¶ 101; Ex. 1026 ¶¶ 284–286. This testimony is supported by Peng, and is not materially disputed by Dr. Eldering. *See* Ex. 1022, 2:8–27; Ex. 1027, 155:22–157:8. We are also persuaded by Dr. Dickens’s testimony that a person of ordinary skill in the art would have known a conductor-coated or conductor-sheathed elastomeric o-ring “may demonstrate conductive and shielding properties without requiring additional compression beyond the standard compression for sealing o-rings” like Youtsey’s o-ring 84. Ex. 1026 ¶¶ 284–285.

Petitioner and Dr. Dickens also rely on Squitieri, Buonanno, and the Chomerics Handbook as teaching that gaskets with conductive sheaths can block electromagnetic interference and provide an environmental seal at the same time, without requiring more compression than a non-conductive sealing gasket. *See* Pet. Reply 12; Ex. 1026 ¶¶ 285, 292–293. However, in our view this proposition is established sufficiently by Horak, Bell, Choudary, Bunyan, and Peng as discussed above, so we do not rely on Squitieri, Buonanno, or the Chomerics Handbook in this Decision.

Coupler / Nut Rotation in Coaxial Cable Connectors

Patent Owner next asserts a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood that couplers or nuts such as Youtsey’s nut 30 “need to be *freely rotatable* in order to easily screw or thread the connector onto the

port [16].” PO Resp. 51–52 (citing Ex. 1005 ¶ 165; Ex. 1007, Fig. 3, 5:29–35; Ex. 2041, 57:8–59:2, 198:6–199:21, 200:4–202:1, 258:12–259:17); Ex. 2042 ¶¶ 244–245. Patent Owner cites various prior art references as supporting this view. See PO Resp. 52–55 (summarizing Ex. 2037 (Burris), Ex. 2038 (Samchisen), and Ex. 2023 (Bence)); Ex. 2042 ¶¶ 246–249. Patent Owner concludes a person of ordinary skill in the art would have known it was “necessary to *lightly compress* Youtsey’s non-conductive o-ring 84 . . . between the coupler [30] and the body [14] just enough to provide an environmental seal, while producing as little friction and drag as possible on the coupler.” PO Resp. 55 (emphasis added); Ex. 2042 ¶ 250.

This alleged need for free rotation, according to Patent Owner, is inconsistent with modifying Youtsey’s o-ring 84 to be conductive, because this “would require *larger compression forces* to establish the required electrical conductivity,” as discussed above. PO Resp. 55–56 (emphasis added); Ex. 2042 ¶ 251. Patent Owner asserts these larger compression forces “would undesirably increase the friction or drag on the coupler, and thus make it much more likely that a connector would not be fully tightened onto an interface port (*i.e.*, the proposed modification would cause the very same problem that it was intended to solve!).” PO Resp. 55–56, 60–61; Ex. 2042 ¶¶ 251, 262. This compressibility difference between conductive and non-conductive elastomers is illustrated, in Patent Owner’s view, by Youtsey’s o-ring 84 and Tarrant’s o-ring 12 being *non-conductive o-rings* having a circular cross-section (thereby reducing their resistance to tightening and providing free rotation), and by Lionetto’s elastomer 34 and Horak’s elastomer 18 being *conductive* but not *o-rings* because they have flat sides (allowing them to fill the space between connected components, to

provide a more reliable electrical connection). *See* PO Resp. 56–59 (citing Ex. 1008, Fig. 1, 2:31–36; Ex. 1009, Fig. 3, 4:20–47; Ex. 1022 (Peng), 1:54–58; Ex. 2035 (Bunyan), 2:4–8; Ex. 2041, 224:8–20, 225:21–226:15); Ex. 2001 ¶¶ 86–87; Ex. 2042 ¶¶ 252–255, 258–259.

Indeed, according to Patent Owner, a person of ordinary skill in the art “would understand that for the rotary seals provided by the nonconductive o-rings in Youtsey (84) and Tarrant (12), *the compression would be much lower than 10%, and likely no more than 5%* in order to provide free rotation of the coupler.” PO Resp. 59–60 (emphasis added) (citing Ex. 2039, 1). Patent Owner contrasts this alleged understanding with Peng, which as discussed above indicates an elastomeric o-ring using a conductive filler requires at least about a 10% compression to complete a conductive pathway. *Id.* at 60 (citing Ex. 1022, 4:19–23, 9:2–6). Thus, Dr. Eldering testifies that “the lower compression used for the non-conductive o-rings in Youtsey and Tarrant [i.e., no more than 5%] to provide a freely rotatable coupler would have to be significantly increased [i.e., to greater than 10%] for compressing a []conductive o-ring to provide the required compression to form one or more conductive pathways.” Ex. 2042 ¶ 261; *see* PO Resp. 60; PO Sur-reply 17 n.13 (stating the last sentence of Ex. 2042 ¶ 261 “should read ‘for compressing a **conductive** o-ring’”); Ex. 2042 ¶¶ 260–261.

According to Patent Owner, Bell’s disclosure of conductive o-ring 34 is not to the contrary, because Bell discloses a right-angle and unthreaded connector where “resistance to rotation was actually desirable” which is not the case with Youtsey’s “freely rotating coupler.” PO Resp. 60–61 (citing Ex. 1011, code (57), Fig. 1, 3:18–34; Ex. 2041, 303:15–306:7); Ex. 2042 ¶¶ 263–265.

Patent Owner challenges Dr. Dickens's testimony as lacking support in and being contradicted by documentary evidence. *See* PO Resp. 61–63 (citing Ex. 1022, 4:19–23, 9:2–6, 9:15–35; Ex. 2041, 238:5–239:22); Ex. 2042 ¶ 266. In particular, according to Patent Owner, “manufacturers recommend a certain compression to form . . . an electrical path,” and Peng discloses “a required minimum compression of 10%.” PO Resp. 61. Patent Owner also argues Dr. Dickens's testimony lacks a persuasive explanation of how the proposed modification would have been implemented using an o-ring structure. *See* PO Resp. 61–63 (citing Ex. 1005 ¶¶ 55–58, 64, 173–176; Ex. 2041, 206:17–207:20, 231:21–235:4, 285:17–286:11); Ex. 2042 ¶¶ 267–269.

Petitioner replies that conductive o-rings do not limit free rotation of the coupler. *See* Pet. Reply 12. Petitioner asserts Patent Owner's arguments in this regard “incorrectly assume that conductive o-rings require more compression than non-conductive sealing o-rings,” as discussed above. *Id.* at 12–13; Ex. 1026 ¶ 295. Petitioner further asserts Patent Owner mistakenly relies on Bell, because although “Bell discloses a conductive, sealing o-ring that provides ‘some resistance to rotation,’” Bell also teaches that “*the user of the connector can rotate the cable assembly*” demonstrating “that conductive, sealing o-rings do not resist free rotation of a coupler.” Pet. Reply 13 (quoting Ex. 1011, 3:18–33); Ex. 1026 ¶¶ 296–297. Petitioner also argues “*some resistance* to coupler rotation is *necessary* to prevent the coupler from loosening after being fully tightened onto a port.” Pet. Reply 13 (emphasis added) (citing Ex. 1027, 187:17–190:16); Ex. 1026 ¶ 297.

Patent Owner replies that although “conductive o-rings could be suitable for *other applications* that were not rotary seals and did not require free rotation,” a person of ordinary skill in the art would not have modified Youtsey’s rotary seal o-ring 84 to be conductive due to the higher compression required for conductivity. PO Sur-reply 12 (citing Ex. 1027, 90:8–20, 118:16–119:9); *id.* at 17–18 (citing Ex. 1027, 196:12–199:4, 200:10–202:18); *id.* at 28 (citing Ex. 1027, 97:18–102:1). Bell is not to the contrary, according to Patent Owner, because its “conductive o-ring 34 was designed to intentionally provide ‘resistance to rotation’ ‘sufficient to prevent the outlet body from rotating under the weight of the cable so that it remains in the desired position.’” *Id.* at 18 (citing PO Resp. 60–61; Ex. 1011, code (57), Figs. 1 and 3, 3:18–34; Ex. 2041, 303:15–306:7; Ex. 2044, 446:20–450:16). Patent Owner finally asserts that Petitioner mischaracterizes Dr. Eldering’s testimony as “admitt[ing] that some resistance to coupler rotation is necessary to prevent the coupler from loosening after being fully tightened onto a port.” *Id.* at 19 (citing Pet. Reply 13; Ex. 1027, 187:17–190:16).

We begin by rejecting Dr. Eldering’s testimony that Youtsey’s o-ring 84 is subject to a maximum compression of “much lower than 10%, and likely no more than 5%” to permit free rotation of nut member 30 around body member 14. Ex. 2042 ¶ 260. Dr. Eldering cites “O-Ring Groove Design Guide & Basic Recommendations (available at <https://www.allorings.com/o-ring-groove-design-considerations> (last accessed Jan. 16, 2023))” (Ex. 2039, “allorings.com”) in support. *See id.*; PO Resp. vii. The allorings.com reference begins by stating: “Our o-ring groove design guides list default o-ring groove dimensions for the most

basic applications and are intended to be used with the following o-ring groove design considerations to engineer an o-ring gland to optimize specific application performance.” Ex. 2039, 1. The allorings.com disclosure cited by Dr. Eldering is reproduced below.

O-Ring Squeeze Compression (O-Ring C/S) - Gland Depth / (O-Ring C/S)	■ Face seal:20-30% ■ Static Male/Female: 18-25% ■ Reciprocating: 10-20% ■ Rotary: 0-10%
--	---

allorings.com (Ex. 2039, 1).

Ex. 2042 ¶ 260. This is a table entry under the heading “O-Ring Material Properties,” in a row entitled “O-Ring Squeeze Compression,” with the phrase “Rotary: 0–10%” highlighted in yellow by Dr. Eldering.

Dr. Eldering does not explain persuasively how this disclosure leads to his conclusion that Youtsey’s o-ring 84 must be subject to a maximum compression of *much lower* than 10%, and *no more* than 5%, to permit sufficient rotation of nut 30 around body 14. *See* Ex. 2042 ¶ 260; Ex. 1027, 200:10–202:18. Given the lack of detail in allorings.com as to the “Rotary” environment(s) at issue there, we discern no meaningful connection between the o-rings at issue in allorings.com and Youtsey’s o-ring 84 in a coaxial cable connector. Moreover, even assuming the respective o-ring environments are similar, allorings.com overlaps at or near its maximum 10% value with Peng’s disclosure that sufficient conductivity for a shielding ground path can be achieved at “about 10%” compression (Ex. 1022, 4:19–22, 9:2–6) of a metal-filled elastomeric o-ring, as discussed above. Further, also as discussed above, a metal-coated or a metal-sheathed elastomeric o-ring may have been used to avoid the about 10% minimum compression required of a metal-filled elastomeric o-ring.

We acknowledge that Youtsey's nut member 30 must be able to rotate around Youtsey's body member 14 in order for the nut to be threaded onto port 16. *See, e.g.*, Ex. 1007, Figs. 1, 3, 5:23–37. We also acknowledge that Youtsey's o-ring 84 is trapped between nut member 30 and body member 14, to provide an environmental seal there, so it will frictionally resist the rotation. *See id.* at Fig. 3, 5:45–56. These competing design considerations are discussed by the Burris, Samchisen, and Bence disclosures summarized by Patent Owner, and are acknowledged by Dr. Dickens. *See* PO Resp. 52–55; Ex. 2041, 200:4–202:1.

Where we part ways from Patent Owner's position, however, is in the notion that modifying Youtsey's o-ring 84 to be conductive will decrease its compressibility by so much that it will become too difficult to rotate nut member 30 around body member 14 to complete the threaded connection between nut member 30 and port 16. Dr. Dickens and Dr. Eldering agree that completing this connection involves at least some resistance to coupler rotation by o-ring 84, although Dr. Eldering quibbles over whether the resistance is large enough to prevent the nut from loosening after the connector is fully tightened. *See* Ex. 1026 ¶ 297; Ex. 1027, 187:11–190:16 (“It creates drag that then impedes rotation, or works as a force that is — counterforce to the rotational force that some person is applying.”). This, then, becomes a matter of degree rather than absolutes. And the only evidence proffered to support Dr. Eldering's testimony in this regard is allorings.com, which as discussed above has an uncertain applicability to the coaxial cable connectors at issue here, or if it does apply, then it supports Dr. Dickens's testimony that even a metal-filled elastomeric o-ring would work in Youtsey.

As a further example, Bell provides conductive resilient o-ring 34, which both seals and provides a conductive pathway between plug body 12 and outlet body 22. *See* Ex. 1011, Fig. 1, 2:17–21, 3:16–18. O-ring 34 further “provid[es] a limited degree of frictional resistance to the relative rotation of” plug body 12 and outlet body 22. *Id.* at code (57), 2:46–51, 3:19–43. In particular, “some resistance to rotation is provided by the O-ring 34, which is in compression between the plug body 12 and the outlet body 22,” wherein the “resistance is preferably sufficient to prevent the outlet body from rotating under the weight of the cable so that it remains in the desired position.” *Id.* at 3:29–35. Patent Owner points out correctly that Bell differs from Youtsey in that: (1) Bell’s coupling is not a threaded connection like Youtsey’s and (2) the purpose of the resistance is different—cable positioning in Bell, versus completing a threaded connection in Youtsey. Despite these differences, Bell establishes that the prior art includes at least one *o-ring* structure that was *conductive* to extend a shielding ground path, provided *environmental sealing*, and *permitted a desired rotation* of parts, all within a *coaxial cable connector*. It therefore tends to support Dr. Dickens’s testimony that such an o-ring would have been useful in Youtsey, and to cut against Dr. Eldering’s opposing testimony, despite the differences between Bell and Youtsey.

Finally, we agree with Dr. Eldering’s testimony that the *circle shaped* cross-section of Youtsey’s o-ring 84 structure is different from the *flat sided* cross-sections of Lionetto’s conductive elastomer 34 and Horak’s rubber ring 18. *See supra* Section III.D.4(e)(ii)(2); Ex. 1007, Fig. 3; Ex. 1008, Fig. 1; Ex. 1009, Figs. 2–3; Ex. 2042 ¶¶ 251–262. However, based on the complete record, we conclude this is an insignificant distinction. For

reasons provided above, we do not agree with Dr. Eldering’s testimony that adding a conductive filler / coating / sheath to Youtsey’s o-ring 84 will result in the o-ring being unable to perform the dual functions of environmental sealing and completing a conductive pathway, without unduly inhibiting rotation of nut member 30 around body member 14.

(5) *Patent Owner’s Third Disadvantage—Increased Cost*

Patent Owner argues “conductive elastomers tend to be expensive as compared to other gasket materials,” cutting against any motivation for making Youtsey’s o-ring 84 out of a conductive elastomer. PO Resp. 47–48 (quoting Ex. 2034 (Choudary), 1:61–63; citing Ex. 2035 (Bunyan), 2:4–8, 2:22–43); Ex. 2042 ¶¶ 236–239. Patent Owner cites *Hynix Semiconductor Inc. v. Rambus Inc.*, 645 F.3d 1336, 1353 (Fed. Cir. 2011), as stating: “Lowering cost is a ubiquitous market demand, and the fact that a combination is expected to increase cost has some bearing on the obviousness of that combination.” PO Resp. 47–48.

Petitioner replies that Patent Owner “provided no evidence to establish that replacing a nonconductive o-ring with a conductive o-ring would lead to the connector being ‘expensive.’” Pet. Reply 24. Petitioner argues a person of ordinary skill in the art “would view any additional cost of using a conductive o-ring as minuscule compared to the benefits in RFI/EMI protection.” *Id.* at 24–25 (citing Ex. 2041, 172:2–7; Inst. Dec. 63–64); Ex. 1026 ¶ 331 (citing Ex. 1028, 35).

We find Choudary pertinently states: “Another problem with EMI/RFI shielding gaskets is that conductive elastomers tend to be expensive as compared to other gasket materials,” and “[i]t is desirable to provide a

gasket that is inexpensive and simple to install.” Ex. 2034, 1:62–65. We find Bunyan pertinently states: “The use of noble metal wires adds significantly to the cost of the gasket.” Ex. 2035, 2:34–36.

No doubt, the cost of manufacture is a relevant consideration in determining motivation to combine. However, the present record is entirely silent as to *how much* using a conductive o-ring rather than a non-conductive o-ring in Youtsey would increase the cost of manufacture. Thus, the simple notion of being more expensive, without knowing any contours regarding the expense or increase in expense, provides minimal evidence in support of Patent Owner’s position. As discussed below, we find that the evidence as to the benefit achieved by Petitioner’s proposed modification (i.e., a redundant grounding path) outweighs any disadvantage of increased cost.

(6) *Analysis and Conclusion as to Motivation to Modify Youtsey*

Having considered and balanced the prior art for all that it teaches, including disclosures that diverge from the invention at hand as well as disclosures that point towards the invention at hand, we find Petitioner’s asserted motivation is supported by the evidence. *See Polaris Indus., Inc. v. Arctic Cat, Inc.*, 882 F.3d 1056, 1067–70 (Fed. Cir. 2018); *Winner Int’l Royalty Corp. v. Wang*, 202 F.3d 1340, 1349 & n.8 (Fed. Cir. 2000) (stating “the benefits, both lost and gained, should be weighed against one another” when assessing motivation to combine); *see also In re Urbanski*, 809 F.3d 1237, 1243–44 (Fed. Cir. 2016) (person of ordinary skill in the art may be motivated to pursue desirable properties of one prior art reference, even at the expense of foregoing a benefit taught by another prior art reference).

In particular, providing a redundant grounding path by modifying Youtsey's o-ring 84 to be conductive is a sufficiently articulated and rational motivation, based on the evidence including Lionetto and Horak, and avoids improper hindsight in Petitioner's proposed modification. *See supra* Section III.D.4(e)(v)(1). This modification might reduce the compressibility of the modified (conductive) o-ring versus Youtsey's existing (non-conductive) o-ring. However, the prior art reflects that a single elastomeric ring structure may be used to provide *both* a sufficient environmental seal *and* a sufficiently conductive pathway, as needed in the context of a coaxial cable connector. *See supra* Section III.D.4(e)(v)(3). Also, the evidence does not support Patent Owner's contention that modifying Youtsey's o-ring 84 to be conductive will decrease its compressibility by so much that it will become too difficult to rotate nut member 30 around body member 14 to complete the threaded connection between nut member 30 and port 16. *See supra* Section III.D.4(e)(v)(4). The evidence instead establishes: (1) a conductor-filled o-ring could provide the requisite conductivity at about 10% compression, which would also allow relative rotation between Youtsey's nut member and body member; and (2) a conductor-coated or a conductor-sheathed o-ring may exhibit the requisite conductivity without requiring any more compression than what would be provided by a non-conductive o-ring. *See id.* Finally, although Petitioner's proposed modification would increase the cost of manufacture of Youtsey's device, there is no evidence in the record to suggest that this increase would be so significant so as to lead away from achieving the benefit of the modification. *See supra* Section III.D.4(e)(v)(5).

Having resolved the question of motivation to combine in Petitioner's favor, we now turn to the issue of reasonable expectation of success.

(vi) *Reasonable Expectation of Success*

Petitioner contends a person of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success modifying Youtsey's o-ring 84 to be conductive, compressible, and metal. *See* Pet. 19–20 (citing Ex. 1005 ¶¶ 67–69). Petitioner asserts “Lionetto and Horak show this was a known technique for improving coaxial cable connectors in the same way [and] [t]hey also show that using such o-rings would yield the predictable result of sealing against both moisture and RFI at the same time.” *Id.* at 18 (citing Ex. 1005 ¶ 67). Petitioner further asserts “[t]he '083 patent confirms this was well within a [person of ordinary skill in the art]'s knowledge and skill,” because “[i]t provides a similar level of implementation detail regarding the o-rings in its structurally similar connector and shows that determining a workable material for the o-rings was a matter of routine experimentation.” *Id.* at 19 (citing Ex. 1001, 11:18–12:16, 11:47–53; Ex. 1005 ¶¶ 68–69).

Patent Owner responds that Petitioner has not established a reasonable expectation of success. *See* PO Resp. 68–69; Ex. 2042 ¶¶ 292–295. This argument is premised on Patent Owner's allegations of “the significant disadvantages that would result from” Petitioner's modification, as discussed in Section III.D.4(e)(v) above. PO Resp. 68–69. Patent Owner also asserts Petitioner incorrectly suggests that “Lionetto and Horak show [a conductive, compressible o-ring] was a known technique for improving coaxial cable connectors in the *same way*” as Youtsey's o-ring 84 is used, also as discussed above. *Id.* at 69.

Petitioner replies that a person of ordinary skill in the art “would have had at least a reasonable expectation of success,” due to “the prior art’s consistent teaching of improving a coaxial cable by using a conductive o-ring to shield from both moisture and RFI.” Pet. Reply 18 (citing Pet. 18–19). Petitioner also asserts that each of Patent Owner’s alleged disadvantages to conductive o-rings is “either false or irrelevant” for reasons provided above. *Id.* at 18–19.

Thus, the parties’ arguments directed to reasonable expectation of success essentially re-hash arguments we have already considered above in the context of motivation to combine. For the reasons provided above, we resolve these disputes in Petitioner’s favor. We also emphasize that the prior art of record, taken as a whole, demonstrates a wide array of solutions providing a shielding ground path through a coaxial cable connector, demonstrating the relative ease of implementing various design choices in this respect. The solutions include providing conductive elastomeric members of various compositions and structural configurations to maintain the grounding path.

Having resolved the disputed issues as to reasonable expectation of success in Petitioner’s favor, we now turn to the issue of objective indicia of nonobviousness.

(vii) Objective Indicia of Nonobviousness

Patent Owner asserts that two objective indicia of nonobviousness confirm that claim 1 would not have been obvious. *See* PO Resp. 2, 70–73.

Proceeding Contrary to Conventional Wisdom

Patent Owner argues the invention of claim 1 “proceeded contrary to conventional wisdom by creating an alternative [nut]-body grounding path,” which “is ‘strong evidence of unobviousness.’” PO Resp. 2, 70 (quoting *Ruiz v. A.B. Chance Co.*, 234 F.3d 654, 668 (Fed. Cir. 2000); citing *Panduit Corp. v. Dennison Mfg. Co.*, 774 F.2d 1082, 1099 (Fed. Cir. 1985)¹²). This argument is premised on Patent Owner’s allegation, discussed above in Section III.D.4(e)(iv), that “prior art solutions to shielding problems placed grounding members in contact with the *post, not the body*.” PO Resp. 70–71; PO Sur-reply 3–4.

Petitioner replies that Patent Owner here “merely repackages” arguments we have already addressed above. Pet. Reply 19. Further: “Notably missing is any evidence of unexpected results, commercial success, long-felt but unsolved need, failure of others, skepticism of experts, or copying.” *Id.*

As discussed above in Section III.D.4(e)(iii), the evidence does not support Patent Owner’s contention that the prior art is limited to using a post, and leads away from using a body member, to extend the grounding shield through a coaxial cable connector. The prior art instead discloses that different grounding paths may be provided through a coaxial cable connector, using different structures in the connector, some of which do not

¹² This decision was vacated by the Supreme Court in *Dennison Mfg. Co. v. Panduit Corp.*, 475 U.S. 809 (1986), on the basis that the Federal Circuit “did not mention [Fed. R. Civ. P.] 52(a), did not explicitly apply the clearly-erroneous standard to any of the District Court’s findings on obviousness, and did not explain why, if it was of that view, Rule 52(a) had no applicability to this issue.” *Id.* at 811.

include a post. Further, Patent Owner does not point to any prior art disclosures that might suggest a post is a critical component of a grounding shield path, or that a post is better than any particular other connector component(s) in this regard, including a body.

The Federal Circuit decisions cited by Patent Owner are distinguished from this case. In *Ruiz*, “one of the inventors of the prior art . . . had expressed skepticism that [the patent owner’s] prototype model offered advantages over the concrete haunch method.” *Ruiz*, 234 F.3d at 668. There is no evidence of skepticism in this case. The *Panduit* decision turned on evidence of “outstanding commercial success,” with the patent owner’s cable tie product “becoming, early on, the unquestioned leading tie on the market” only after “many others . . . tried for years and failed to create a superior cable tie.” *Panduit*, 774 F.2d at 1099. There is no evidence of commercial success or failure of others in this case.

For these reasons, Patent Owner’s first objective indicia argument is unavailing.

Petitioner’s Patent Application

Patent Owner argues that Petitioner, in its own U.S. Patent Application No. 13/530,831 (*see* Ex. 2013, “the ’831 Application”) filed several years after the ’083 patent’s priority date, took positions contrary to and belying Petitioner’s positions in this proceeding. *See* PO Resp. 2, 71–73. In particular, according to Patent Owner, the ’831 Application “included claims directed to the same [nut]-body grounding member/path limitations at issue here,” demonstrating that “***five of Petitioner’s own inventors*** (*i.e.*, POSA’s) understood that a [nut]-body grounding

member/path was patentable.” *Id.* (citing Ex. 2013, code (57), Figs. 4 and 5, ¶¶ 3, 5, 14, 18, claim 1; Ex. 2014, 4:6–14; Ex. 2015, 3–6; Ex. 2016, 2); PO Sur-reply 3; Ex. 2001 ¶¶ 187–196. Patent Owner cites *Andersen Corp. v. Pella Corp.*, 300 F. App’x 893, 899–900 (Fed. Cir. 2008), as “finding statements made in the accused infringer’s own patent applications provided objective evidence that the challenged claims were not obvious.” PO Resp. 73.

Petitioner in reply points out that the original claims of the ’831 Application were rejected by the Examiner, and the claims were not allowed until they were amended “to require the grounding member to be ‘exposed outside of the connector body,’ supporting that other features attribute to the non-obviousness of [Petitioner’s] claimed invention.” Pet. Reply 19–20; *see* Ex. 2014, 3:35–4:15 (issued claim 1 from the ’831 Application). Petitioner distinguishes the *Andersen* decision cited by Patent Owner as involving “long-felt need, the failure of others, unexpected results, copying, and praise by others,” none of which are present here. Pet. Reply 20.

Patent Owner replies that the Examiner’s rejection in the ’831 Application “fails to change the fact that Petitioner’s own inventors thought that the original claims were nonobvious.” PO Sur-reply 3. Patent Owner additionally notes that the “rejection was based on a parent patent to the ’083 [p]atent,” which Patent Owner argues “confirm[s] that Petitioner’s inventors were trying to patent the same claimed invention believing it to be patentable.” *Id.* (citing Ex. 2015, 4–5).

We conclude that, even assuming the original claims of the ’831 Application are substantially identical to claim 1 of the ’083 patent at

issue here, this provides only very little objective evidence of nonobviousness. It may very well be that Petitioner and these inventors believed that the original claims were patentable, in a generic sense. The issue presented here, however, is whether claim 1 would have been obvious in view of specific teachings in Youtsey, Lionetto, Horak, and specific knowledge of a person of ordinary skill in the art as demonstrated by other references discussed above. Petitioner's view on that issue is expressed in the Petition and Petitioner's Reply. The '831 Application inventors' view on that issue is not reflected in the record before us.


(viii) Weighing of Evidence and Conclusion as to Obviousness

Youtsey anticipates the claimed invention except that its sealing o-ring 84 is not disclosed as being conductive and metal, and Lionetto and Horak together with the knowledge of a person of ordinary skill in the art provide a motivation to modify Youtsey's o-ring 84 to be conductive and metal (i.e., adding a redundant grounding path). Further, even assuming the original claims of Petitioner's '831 Application are substantially identical to claim 1 of the '083 patent at issue here, this provides only very little objective evidence of nonobviousness in light of the specific challenge by Petitioner. On balance, weighing the entirety of the evidence and argument presented by the parties, we conclude Petitioner has shown by a preponderance of the evidence that claim 1 of the '083 patent is unpatentable as having been obvious over Youtsey, Lionetto, and Horak.

f) First Electrical Ground Path (Limitation 1[e])

Petitioner asserts Youtsey's post member 28 has flange 70 that is configured to electrically contact flange 76 of Youtsey's nut member 30 to

form a first electrical ground path between the post member and the nut member, as shown in Petitioner’s annotated version of Youtsey’s Figure 3 reproduced below. *See* Pet. 40–41.



Youtsey, Figure 3 (Annotated by Petitioner).

See id. (citing Ex. 1007, Figs. 1, 3, 5:23–25, 5:29–35, 5:61–65, 6:5–14; Ex. 1005 ¶¶ 106–107). Petitioner’s annotated version of Youtsey’s Figure 3 identifies a “flange” of inner tube 28 colored yellow, a “lip” of female receptacle 30 colored green, a “body” (outer barrel 14) colored red, a “grounding member” (o-ring 84) colored orange, and a “ground shield” (outer conductor 24) colored dark grey. *See id.*

Patent Owner does not challenge Petitioner’s foregoing analysis and evidence directed to Limitation 1[e]. *See, e.g.*, PO Resp. 8–27 (Patent Owner’s challenges to the disclosures of Youtsey, Lionetto, and Horak).


We find Youtsey discloses the first electrical ground path of Limitation 1[e], as summarized above.

g) Second Electrical Ground Path (Limitation 1[f])

Petitioner asserts that Youtsey's o-ring 84, when made to be conductive in light of Lionetto and Horak, forms a second electrical ground path between Youtsey's body member and Youtsey's nut member. *See* Pet. 41 (citing Ex. 1005 ¶¶ 108–109). Patent Owner does not challenge Petitioner's analysis and evidence directed to Limitation 1[f], apart from arguments we have already considered above in Section III.D.4(e) in relation to the "grounding member" Limitation 1[d]. For the reasons expressed there, we find the combination of Youtsey, Lionetto, and Horak teaches the second electrical ground path of Limitation 1[f].

h) Maintaining Second Electrical Ground Path in Unbroken State (Limitation 1[g])

Petitioner asserts that Youtsey's o-ring 84, when made to be conductive in light of Lionetto and Horak, "maintains the second ground path in an unbroken state when the first ground path is in a broken state," as shown in Petitioner's annotated version of Youtsey's Figure 3 reproduced below. Pet. 41–43.



Youtsey, Figure 3 (Annotated by Petitioner).

See id. (citing Ex. 1007, Fig. 3, 5:50–53; Ex. 1005 ¶¶ 110–112). Petitioner’s annotated version of Youtsey’s Figure 3 identifies a “flange” of inner tube 28 colored yellow, a “lip” of female receptacle 30 colored green, a “body” (outer barrel 14) colored red, a “grounding member” (o-ring 84) colored orange, and a “ground shield” (outer conductor 24) colored dark grey. *See id.* According to Petitioner, “[t]he spaces between the nut member’s lip 76 and the body member’s intermediate portion 64, and between the mating edges of the nut and body members, provide for axial movement of the nut member relative to the body member.” *Id.* at 42. Petitioner therefore asserts that “grounding metal o-ring 84 maintains the seal (and thus the second ground path) even when the flange and lip separate such that the first ground path is broken.” *Id.*

Patent Owner does not challenge Petitioner’s foregoing analysis and evidence directed to Limitation 1[g], apart from arguments we have already considered above in Section III.D.4(e) in relation to the “grounding member” Limitation 1[d]. For the reasons expressed there, we find the combination of Youtsey, Lionetto, and Horak teaches maintaining the second electrical ground path in an unbroken state, as recited in Limitation 1[g].

i) Collateral Estoppel

Petitioner argues Patent Owner is estopped from arguing claim 1 is not unpatentable over Youtsey, Lionetto, and Horak, based on a prior PTAB decision entered during reexamination of U.S. Patent No. 7,833,053, which is related to the ’083 patent. *See* Pet. 1, 5–8, 20–23; Pet. Reply 1, 25–29. Petitioner relies on common law collateral estoppel, and on 37 C.F.R.

§ 42.73(d)(3). *See* Pet. 20–23. Patent Owner argues collateral estoppel and Rule 42.73(d)(3) do not apply here. *See* PO Resp. 3, 73–80; PO Sur-reply 29.

Petitioner states “the Board need not reach the [estoppel] issue if the challenged claims are found unpatentable” on the merits of the evidence presented here. Pet. Reply 1; Tr. 9:21–10:19. Accordingly, we do not rely on any sort of estoppel as a basis for ruling in Petitioner’s favor in this Decision.

j) Conclusion as to Claim 1

For the reasons discussed above, we conclude claim 1 of the ’083 patent is unpatentable as having been obvious over Youtsey, Lionetto, and Horak, without relying on any sort of estoppel against Patent Owner.

5. Claims 2–6, 8–19, 21–33, 35–43, 45–50, and 52–62

Petitioner provides arguments and evidence in support of contending claims 2–6, 8–19, 21–33, 35–43, 45–50, and 52–62 are unpatentable as having been obvious over Youtsey, Lionetto, and Horak. *See, e.g.*, Pet. 43–57; Ex. 1005 ¶¶ 113–156. In defense of these claims, Patent Owner relies solely on arguments considered above in relation to claim 1. *See generally* PO Resp. For the reasons provided above in Section III.D.4 in the context of claim 1, we conclude Patent Owner’s arguments are unavailing. We further adopt Petitioner’s additional analysis for the obviousness of claims 2–6, 8–19, 21–33, 35–43, 45–50, and 52–62 as our own in this Decision, and we accordingly conclude Petitioner has demonstrated by a preponderance of the evidence that these claims are unpatentable as having been obvious over Youtsey, Lionetto, and Horak.

E. Ground 2—Obviousness over Tarrant and Bell

In Ground 2, Petitioner argues claims 1–6, 8–19, 21–33, 35–43, 45–50, and 52–62 of the '083 patent are unpatentable as having been obvious over Tarrant and Bell. *See* Pet. 1, 57–91. Patent Owner opposes. *See generally* PO Resp. Having already found above in Section III.D that these same claims are unpatentable based on Ground 1, we need not and we do not reach Ground 2 here.

IV. SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

In summary, we determine a preponderance of the evidence establishes claims 1–6, 8–19, 21–33, 35–43, 45–50, and 52–62 of the '083 patent are unpatentable, as shown in the following table:¹³

Claim(s)	35 U.S.C. §	References	Claims Shown Unpatentable	Claims Not Shown Unpatentable
1–6, 8–19, 21–33, 35–43, 45–50, 52–62	103(a)	Youtsey, Lionetto, Horak	1–6, 8–19, 21–33, 35–43, 45–50, 52–62	

¹³ Should Patent Owner wish to pursue amendment of the challenged claims in a reissue or reexamination proceeding subsequent to the issuance of this decision, we draw Patent Owner's attention to the April 2019 *Notice Regarding Options for Amendments by Patent Owner Through Reissue or Reexamination During a Pending AIA Trial Proceeding*. *See* 84 Fed. Reg. 16,654 (Apr. 22, 2019). If Patent Owner chooses to file a reissue application or a request for reexamination of the challenged patent, we remind Patent Owner of its continuing obligation to notify the Board of any such related matters in updated mandatory notices. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(a)(3), (b)(2).

1–6, 8–19, 21–33, 35–43, 45–50, 52–62	103(a)	Tarrant, Bell ¹⁴		
Overall Outcome			1–6, 8–19, 21–33, 35–43, 45–50, 52–62	

V. ORDER

In consideration of the foregoing, it is hereby:

ORDERED that claims 1–6, 8–19, 21–33, 35–43, 45–50, and 52–62 of the '083 patent have been proven by a preponderance of the evidence to be unpatentable; and

FURTHER ORDERED that, because this is a final written decision, parties to this proceeding seeking judicial review of our Decision must comply with the notice and service requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 90.2.

¹⁴ We do not reach this asserted ground because we find claims 1–6, 8–19, 21–33, 35–43, 45–50, and 52–62 to be unpatentable in Ground 1. *See supra* Section III.E.

IPR2022-00721
Patent 9,225,083 B2

FOR PETITIONER:

S. Giri Pathmanaban
Jonathan M. Strang
Richard G. Frenkel
Richard Lowry
LATHAM & WATKINS LLP
giri.pathmanaban@lw.com
jonathan.strang@lw.com
rick.frenkel@lw.com
richard.lowry@lw.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

Denis J. Sullivan
Naresh K. Kannan
Genevieve M. Halpenny
BARCLAY DAMON, LLP
dsullivan@barclaydamon.com
nkannan@barclaydamon.com
ghalpenny@barclaydamon.com

Cory C. Bell
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT, & DUNNER LLP
cory.bell@finnegan.com