

Filed on behalf of:

Patent Owner

By: Alison L. McCarthy (Lead Counsel)

Alison.McCarthy@Troutman.com

Joshua L. Jones (Back-up Counsel)

Joshua.L.Jones@Troutman.com

Paper No. _____

Date: February 12, 2026

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

LIFTWERX USA INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

LIFTRA IP APS,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2026-00102
Patent 12,104,578

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

37 C.F.R. § 42.107 and 35 U.S.C. § 313

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	ii
LIST OF PATENT OWNER’S EXHIBITS	iv
CLAIM LISTING FOR U.S. PATENT NO. 12,104,578.....	v
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. SUMMARY OF ARGUMENTS	2
III. PETITIONER’S GROUNDS	4
IV. INSTITUTION SHOULD BE DENIED.....	5
A. Grounds 1 – 3: Signore (EX1007) and Weaver (EX1008) have already been considered by the Examiner.	5
1. Prosecution History for the Application Resulting in the ’578 Patent Dictates that Institution Should Be Denied.	5
B. Ground 4: The ’518 Patent is not Prior Art to the ’578 Patent	8
V. CONCLUSION.....	12
 CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE.....	14
 CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	15

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page
CASES	
<i>Antares Pharma, Inc. v. Medac Pharma Inc.</i> , 771 F.3d 1354 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	11
<i>In re Float’N’Grill LLC</i> , 72 F.4th 1347 (Fed. Cir. 2023)	11
CODES, REGULATIONS AND OTHER AUTHORITIES	
35 U.S.C. § 102	4
35 U.S.C. § 103	4, 6, 12
35 U.S.C. § 112	9, 10
35 U.S.C. § 112(b)	10
35 U.S.C. § 313	1
35 U.S.C. § 314(a)	1
35 U.S.C. § 325(d)	1
37 C.F.R. § 42.107(a)	1
37 C.F.R. § 42.108(c)	1
Squires, J. A. <i>An open letter from America’s Innovation Agency: Bringing the USPTO back to the future: Return of institution authority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 314 and 324 to the Director. U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.</i> (Oct. 17, 2025), https://www.uspto.gov/sites/default/files/documents/open-letter-and-memo_20251017.pdf?utm_campaign=subscriptioncenter&utm_content=&utm_medium=email&utm_name=&utm_source=govdelivery&utm_term= (“Open Letter”)	2

Stewart, Coke Morgan. *Interim Processes for PTAB Workload Management*, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (Mar. 26, 2025),

<https://www.uspto.gov/sites/default/files/documents/InterimProcesses-PTABWorkloadMgmt-20250326.pdf> (“March 26 memo”).....1, 2

LIST OF PATENT OWNER'S EXHIBITS

PO Exhibit Number	Description
	Filed and Served on January 12, 2026 with Patent Owner's Request for Discretionary Denial
2001	Complaint for Declaratory Judgment of Noninfringement filed October 23, 2025 in <i>LiftWerx USA Inc. v. Liftra IP ApS</i> , Case No. 2:25-cv-00679 (EDVA) ("EDVA Litigation") ("EDVA Complaint")
2002	Table C-5, U.S. District Courts, Civil Federal judicial Caseload Statistics (March 31, 2025), in Federal Judicial Caseload Statistics 2025 Tables , https://www.uscourts.gov/data-news/data-tables/2025/03/31/federal-judicial-caseload-statistics/c-5 (last updated March 31, 2025)
2003	Table C-5, U.S. District Courts, Civil Federal judicial Caseload Statistics (June 30, 2025), in Federal Judicial Caseload Statistics 2025 Tables , https://www.uscourts.gov/data-news/data-tables/2025/06/30/statistical-tables-federal-judiciary/c-5 (last updated June 30, 2025)
2004	Liftra IP APS's Answer, Affirmative Defenses, and Counterclaims filed January 9, 2026 in EDVA Litigation ("EDVA Answer")

CLAIM LISTING FOR U.S. PATENT NO. 12,104,578

Claim	Element Abbreviation (see Petition at 112-120)
Claim 1 [1.Pre] Main shaft fixture for fixation of a main shaft on a wind turbine during execution of installation and repair work on heavy parts of a wind turbine,	“Main Shaft Fixture”
[1.a] where the fixture is divided up into a number of sections for mounting on stable structural parts in a nacelle of a wind turbine, including a bottom frame of the nacelle,	“Divided in Sections”
[1.b] characterised in that the main shaft fixture comprises adjustable pressure mandrels with tap shoes,	“Adjustable Pressure Mandrels”
[1.c] and the adjustable pressure mandrels being displaceable between a passive position where the tap shoes are configured to be located at a distance from a surface of the main shaft and an active position where the tap shoes are configured to be engaged with the main shaft	“Passive/Active Mandrel Positions”
[1.d] and in that the main shaft fixture further comprises mounting facilities adapted for anchoring a crane on/in a nacelle of a wind turbine.	“Crane Mounting Facilities”
Claim 2 Main shaft fixture according to claim 1, characterized in that the adjustable pressure mandrels with tap shoes comprise at least three radial displaceable pressure mandrels, substantially symmetrical located around a centre axis of the main shaft, ends of the adjustable pressure mandrels facing the main shaft being furnished with the tap shoes.	“At Least Three Radial Displaceable Pressure Mandrels”

Claim	Element Abbreviation (see Petition at 112-120)
Claim 3 Main shaft fixture, according to claim 1, characterised in, that the mounting facilities are adapted for anchoring a self-hoisting crane on/in a nacelle of a wind turbine and in that a winch of the self-hoisting crane is located on a ground surface near a foot of the wind turbine.	“Mounting Facilities for Self-Hoisting Crane”
Claim 4 Main shaft fixture, according to claim 1, characterised in, that the adjustable pressure mandrels is provided with actuators for displacing and retaining the tap shoes in the passive position and the active position, respectively, alternatively in a selectable position between the passive and the active position.	“Pressure Mandrel Actuators”
Claim 5 Main shaft fixture, according to claim 1, characterised n, that the adjustable pressure mandrels consists of threaded bolts whose opposing free ends facing the main shaft are furnished with tap shoes, and the threaded bolts cooperates with threaded holes in relevant sections of the main shaft fixture.	“Pressure Mandrel Threaded Bolts”
Claim 6 Main shaft fixture, according to claim 1, characterised by a slideway lining being located between opposing sides of a surface of the main shaft and tap shoes.	“Slideway Lining”

Claim	Element Abbreviation (see Petition at 112-120)
Claim 7 Main shaft fixture according to claim 6, characterised in, that the slideway lining is configured so that of opposing free ends of the tap shoes facing the main shaft are provided with a slide plate which in the active position is engaged with the main shaft.	“Slide Plate”
Claim 8 Main shaft fixture according to claim 7, characterised in that it comprises a multi-part slide plate cooperating with the main shaft for mounting on the main shaft, where the multi-part slide plate in its mounted position on the main shaft is cooperating with the tap shoes.	“Multi-Part Slide Plate”
Claim 9 Main shaft fixture according to claim 1, characterised in, that it comprises one of a multi-part needle bearing, roller bearing, ball bearing consisting of a multi-part inner ring fastened to the main shaft, and a therewith cooperating multi-part outer ring consisting of bowed subsegments corresponding to a number of tap shoes, mounted on opposing side of the tap shoes facing an inner ring, which in the active position of the adjustable pressure mandrels form an outer ring at a distance from an outer periphery of the multi-part inner ring, and where an appropriate number of needle rollers, rollers, or balls are arranged between the inner ring and the outer ring, and where means are present for retaining needles, rollers, or balls in position between the inner ring and outer ring.	“Multi-Part Bearing”

Claim	Element Abbreviation (see Petition at 112-120)
Claim 10 Main shaft fixture, according to claim 1, characterised in, that it comprises a rotor lock for fixation of a rotor of the wind turbine.	“Rotor Lock”
Claim 11 Main shaft fixture, according to claim 10, characterised in, that the rotor lock consists of a flange element, whose bolt circle geometry corresponds to a bolt circle geometry on the rotor, the flange element being fastened [] to a first end of two first beam-shaped brackets extending parallel with, and on each side of the main shaft, the beam shaped brackets belonging to the main shaft fixture, and where a second end of the beam-shaped brackets are pivotally mounted with horizontally oriented bolt connections, on other beam-shaped brackets belonging to the main shaft fixture, which are adapted to be anchored on the bottom frame of the nacelle.	“Rotor Lock and Beam-Shaped Brackets With Horizontal Pivots”
Claim 12 Main shaft fixture, according to claim 11, characterised in, that at least one actuator is located nearest the rotor lock between the bottom frame of the nacelle and an adjacent side of the first beam-shaped brackets facing the bottom frame, the actuator is displaceable between a first passive outer position and an active outer position where the flange element is displaced vertically.	“Rotor Actuator”

Claim	Element Abbreviation (see Petition at 112-120)
Claim 13 Assembly for installing and repairing heavy parts of a wind turbine arranged in a nacelle of a wind turbine, the assembly comprising a main shaft fixture according to claim 1, characterized in that a crane is mounted to the main shaft fixture via the mounting facilities of the main shaft fixture.	“Mounted Crane”
Claim 14 Main shaft fixture, according to claim 1, characterised in that the mounting facilities are adapted for anchoring a lightweight crane on/in a nacelle of a wind turbine.	“Mount for Lightweight Crane Mount”
Claim 15 [15.Pre] Main shaft fixture for fixation of a main shaft on a wind turbine during execution of installation and repair work on heavy parts of a wind turbine,	“Main Shaft Fixture (15)”
[15.a] where the main shaft fixture is divided up into a number of sections for mounting on stable structural parts in a nacelle of a wind turbine, including a bottom frame of the nacelle,	“Divided in Sections (15)”
[15.b] characterised in that, the main shaft fixture comprises adjustable pressure mandrels with tap shoes, and	“Adjustable Pressure Mandrels (15)”
[15.c] the adjustable pressure mandrels being displaceable between a passive position where the tap shoes are configured to be located at a distance from a surface of the main shaft and an active position where the tap shoes are configured to be engaged with the main shaft,	“Passive/Active Mandrel Positions (15)”

Claim	Element Abbreviation (see Petition at 112-120)
[15.d] the adjustable pressure mandrels consisting of threaded bolts whose opposing free ends facing the main shaft are furnished with tap shoes, and the threaded bolts cooperates with threaded holes in relevant sections of the main shaft fixture,	“Pressure Mandrel Threaded Bolts (15)”
[15.e] and in that the main shaft fixture further comprises mounting facilities adapted for anchoring a crane on/in a nacelle of a wind turbine.	“Crane Mounting Facilities (15)”
Claim 16 [16.Pre] Main shaft fixture for fixation of a main shaft on a wind turbine during execution of installation and repair work on heavy parts of a wind turbine,	“Main Shaft Fixture (16)”
[16.a] where the main shaft fixture is divided up into a number of sections for mounting on stable structural parts in a nacelle of a wind turbine, including a bottom frame of the nacelle,	“Divided in Sections (16)”
[16.b] characterised in, that the main shaft fixture comprises adjustable pressure mandrels with tap shoes, and	“Adjustable Pressure Mandrels (16)”
[16.c] the adjustable pressure mandrels being displaceable between a passive position where the tap shoes are configured to be located at a distance from a surface of the main shaft and an active position where the tap shoes are configured to be engaged with the main shaft and	“Passive/Active Mandrel Positions (16)”
[16.d] in that the main shaft fixture further comprises mounting facilities adapted for anchoring a crane on/in a nacelle of a wind turbine, and	“Crane Mounting Facilities (16)”
[16.e] further comprising a rotor lock for fixation of a rotor of the wind turbine,	“Rotor Lock (16)”

Claim	Element Abbreviation (see Petition at 112-120)
[16.f] wherein the rotor lock consists of a flange element, whose bolt circle geometry corresponds to a bolt circle geometry on the rotor, the flange element being fastened to a first end of two first beam-shaped brackets extending parallel with, and on each side of the main shaft, the two first beam shaped brackets belonging to the main shaft fixture, and where a second end of the two first beam shaped brackets are pivotally mounted with horizontally oriented bolt connections, on other brackets belonging to the main shaft fixture, which are adapted to be anchored on the bottom frame of the nacelle.	“Rotor Lock and Beam-Shaped Brackets With Horizontal Pivots (16)”
Claim 17 Main shaft fixture, according to claim 16, wherein at least one actuator is located nearest the rotor lock between the bottom frame of the nacelle and an adjacent side of the first beam shaped brackets facing the bottom frame, the actuator is displaceable between a first passive outer position and an active outer position where the flange element is displaced vertically.	“Rotor Actuator”

EX1001 ('578 Patent), 7:2-9:17; see Petition at 112-120.

I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.107(a) and 35 U.S.C. § 313, Liftra IP ApS or (“Patent Owner” or “Liftra”) submits this Preliminary Response to the Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of claims 1-17 (the “Challenged Claims”) of U.S. Patent No. 12,104,578 (EX1001) (“the ’578 Patent”) filed by Petitioner LiftWerx USA Inc. (“Petitioner” or “LiftWerx”) on November 4, 2025 (*see* Paper 1), with a filing date accorded of November 4, 2025 per the notice mailed on November 12, 2025 (*see* Paper 3). This Preliminary Response is timely filed.

It is Petitioner’s burden to show — by the Petition and its supporting evidence — that there is a reasonable likelihood that at least one of the Challenged Claims (defined below) is unpatentable. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.108(c); *see also* 35 U.S.C. §§ 314(a), 325(d) (“In determining whether to institute or order a proceeding under this chapter, chapter 30, or chapter 31, the Director may take into account whether, and reject the petition or request because, the same or substantially the same prior art or arguments previously were presented to the Office.”). For the reasons discussed below, Petitioner has failed to meet this burden.

As an initial matter, Patent Owner’s arguments for discretionary denial under Section 325(d) were submitted January 12, 2026 through a separate paper (*see* Paper 12) pursuant to the Director’s March 26, 2025 Memorandum regarding

Interim Process for PTAB Workload Management (the “March 26 Memo”) and consistent with the Open Letter dated October 17, 2025 from the Director.

Even if discretionary denial were not warranted, the Petition fails on the merits. As discussed below, Petitioner has not met its burden to show a reasonable likelihood that lead references Signore and Weaver¹, in combination with the other Ground references, Power Climber, Holloway, Stegemann, Hanxing, Schulz, Cooper, Schaeffler, Guerenbourg, invalidate any of independent claims 1, 15, or 16 as asserted in obviousness arguments presented in Grounds 1 – 3 or by U.S. Patent No. 10,378,518 (“’518 Patent”) in the anticipation argument presented in Ground 4.

II. SUMMARY OF ARGUMENTS

Petitioner has failed to meet its burden to show a reasonable likelihood that at least one of the Challenged Claims is unpatentable over (i) Signore and Weaver in view of one or more of the additional eight references cited as cumulative art in Grounds 1 – 3; or (ii) that the parent ’518 Patent to the ’578 Patent somehow qualifies as prior art that anticipates the claims of the ’578 Patent.

¹ To the extent not defined herein, defined terms used herein have the same meaning as ascribed to them in the Petition.

Petitioner has presented the same two primary references that were applied in a rejection by the Examiner, extensively considered, and overcome by Patent Owner during prosecution of the application resulting in the '578 Patent. Signore and Weaver (and Stegemann, for that matter) were considered extensively by the Examiner during prosecution of the application resulting in the '578 Patent. Petitioner applies these identical references in the same way for the same purpose as the Examiner, who ultimately allowed the claims. Petitioner posits that the Examiner "erred by overlooking and not applying relevant wind turbine crane art" during prosecution of the '578 Patent but then relies on the exact same references to show "relevant wind turbine crane art" that now somehow invalidates the claims. Petition at 12. The introduction of multiple additional references that are cumulative of those that were considered does not fix the problem or create a new issue of patentability. The Challenged Claims remain valid over the combinations of art asserted in this Petition.

Nor are Petitioner's efforts to qualify the '518 Patent, the parent of the '578 Patent, as prior art successful. Ground 4 alleges that the claims of the '578 Patent are invalid over the '518 Patent. Simply put, the parent '518 Patent is not prior art to the '578 Patent. There is no viable argument that the specification, which is essentially the same for both the '518 and '578 Patents, somehow only discloses "at least three pressure mandrels" because that particular limitation was claimed in

the parent '518 Patent and not in the '578 Patent. Ground 4 does not pose a new question of patentability.

III. PETITIONER'S GROUNDS

Petitioner proffers four (4) Grounds for attacking the Challenged Claims (claims 1-17):

Ground	Claims	Basis AIA §	References in Petition
1	1-4, 6-8, 10, and 13-14	103	Signore (EX1007) and Weaver (EX1008) in view of Power Climber (EX1023), Holloway (EX1010) and/or Stegemann (EX1009)
2	2, 5, and 15	103	Signore and Weaver in view of Power Climber, Holloway, and/or Stegemann, further in view of Hanxing (EX1014) and/or Schulz (EX1013)
3	9, 11-12, and 16-17	103	Signore and Weaver in view of Power Climber, Holloway, and/or Stegemann, further in view of Cooper (EX1019), Schaeffler (EX1020), and/or Guerenbourg (EX1022)
4	1 and 3-14, 15, 16, 17	102	'518 Patent (EX1005)

See Petition at 4 (independent claims emphasized).

As discussed below, Petitioner has failed to meet its burden to show a reasonable likelihood that at least one of the Challenged Claims is unpatentable under these Grounds.

IV. INSTITUTION SHOULD BE DENIED

A. Grounds 1 – 3: Signore (EX1007) and Weaver (EX1008) have already been considered by the Examiner.

Across Grounds 1 through 3, Petitioner fails to establish that any of its various combinations of ten total references, three of which are reiterated, presents a new question of patentability disclosing all the elements of independent claims 1, 15 or 16.

As an initial matter, Petitioner describes and discusses six additional references as “Background Art” throughout its Petition. This background art is not properly relied on in any of the Grounds asserted but appears to be an effort to rely on even more obviousness combinations with art that may or may not qualify as prior art or analogous art in the first place. Patent Owner does not, and need not, address any of this alleged “Background Art”.

Independent claims 1, 15 and 16 are patentable over the art asserted in Grounds 1 – 3.

1. Prosecution History for the Application Resulting in the '578 Patent Dictates that Institution Should Be Denied.

The application resulting in the '578 Patent was filed on January 24, 2024 and subject to a single office action. That non-final office action dated April 26, 2024 (“578 Office Action or OA”) rejected then pending claims 1-4, 6-8, 10, and

13-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Signore (US 2012/0141292) in view of Weaver (EP 1748182). *See* EX1002 at 87 of 177.

The Examiner's rejections in the 578 Office Action were overcome by Patent Owner in its reply to office action, dated July 26, 2024 ("578 OA Reply"). *See* EX1002 at 66-76 of 177. Patent Owner argued that in the 578 Office Action, the Examiner had not considered the claim limitation "that the main shaft fixture further comprises mounting facilities adapted for anchoring a crane on/in a nacelle of a wind turbine," and that the cited references (including Signore and Weaver) do not disclose or suggest at least this element of the rejected claims. EX1002 at 73-74 of 177. The Examiner then conducted another search. *See* EX1002 at 28-32, 34-62 of 177. Finding no additional material art, the Examiner issued a Notice of Allowance on August 15, 2024. *See* EX1002 at 21-27 of 177. The Reasons for Allowance set forth by the Examiner include that the cited art – which, again, includes Signore, Weaver and Stegemann – "does not teach the main shaft fixture further having mounting facilities adapted for anchoring a crane on or in a nacelle of a wind turbine." EX1002 at 26 of 177.

Petitioner apparently agrees with the Examiner that no additional material art exists that would present a new issue of patentability of the Challenged Claims since Petitioner again argues that Signore (EX1007) in combination with Weaver (EX1008) render obvious the Challenged Claims under Grounds 1 – 3. In its

argument that claim 1 is unpatentable over the Ground 1 references, Petitioner argues that “the examiner found that Signore discloses [the Crane Mounting Facilities] element.” Petition at 56. This very rejection was overcome during prosecution. *See, e.g.*, EX 1002 (578 OA Reply) at 73-74 of 177. Petitioner hedges its bets and states that “to the extent that Signore does not disclose this element, Weaver provides sufficient mounting facilities for a crane....” Petition at 56-57. Weaver, too, was considered and overcome. *See* EX 1002 (578 NOA 8/15/2024) at 26 of 177. So Petitioner then relies on three additional cumulative references – Power Climber, Stegemann and Holloway – as meeting this same limitation in claim 1. Stegemann, which is argued to disclose the very same element as Power Climber and Holloway, was also considered by the Examiner, though it was not relied on for rejection of claim 1 during prosecution. *See* EX 1002 (578 IDS 1/24/2024) at 142 of 177. Through all of this, Petitioner does not introduce a single new theory or explain how or why the Examiner erred in his finding of patentability in view of these identical references. For claim 1, Petitioner throws combinations of five different references at the wall to see if one might stick. But Petitioner does not show how these references show anything more significant than the documents which the Examiner had access to during his examination. To the contrary, Petitioner effectively concedes that they are merely cumulative of the insufficient disclosures in Signore, Weaver and Stegemann for remaining

independent claims 15 and 16 – each of which differs in scope from one another and claim 1, but includes the same limitation the Examiner found missing when allowing these claims to issue – Petitioner merely reiterates its claim 1 argument. Petition at 85-86, 95-96. For at least the reasons that the Examiner already found claims 1, 15 and 16 to be patentable, claims 1, 15 and 16 remain patentable.

The remaining Challenged Claims depend from one of claims 1, 15 and 16, and are patentable for at least the reasons that claims 1, 15 and 16 are patentable over the recycled art presented in the Petition.

B. Ground 4: The '518 Patent is not Prior Art to the '578 Patent

In Ground 4, Petitioner asserts that claims 1 and 3-17 of the '578 Patent are anticipated by its parent patent, the '518 Patent (EX1005). *See* Petition at 97-109. The '518 Patent was filed on October 6, 2015 and claims priority to Denmark Patent Application Nos. PA 2015/00527 (filed September 4, 2015) and PA 2014/00573 (filed October 7, 2014). EX 1005 at cover. Thus, the '578 Patent is entitled to a priority date of October 7, 2014. Petitioner fails to show that the '578 Patent is not entitled to its priority date of October 7, 2014 based on an alleged lack of written description in the originally filed parent application of the “adjustable pressure mandrels” claim element.

As an initial matter, the Examiner was aware that the '578 Patent claimed priority to the '518 Patent but properly concluded that the '518 Patent is not prior

art to the '578 Patent. *See* EX1002 (578 OA 4/26/2024) at 91 of 177, (578 OA Reply 7/26/2024) at 74 of 117, (578 NOA 8/15/2024) at 26 of 177. In fact, the Examiner issued a non-statutory double patenting rejection of the '578 Patent claims over the '518 Patent. EX 1002 (578 OA 4/26/2024) at 91 of 177. By its reply to office action dated July 26, 2024, Patent Owner overcame that rejection by explicitly pointing out that the '518 Patent does not claim "mounting facilities adapted for anchoring a crane on/in a nacelle of a wind turbine" as claimed in the '578 Patent. EX 1002 (578 OA Reply 7/26/2024) at 74 of 177. The Examiner withdrew the double patenting rejection. It is noted that Patent Owner also explicitly rescinded any disclaimers "originating from arguments made during the prosecution of parent applications." *Id.* at 75 of 177. The Examiner, by all objective measures, considered the '518 Patent and its prosecution history in allowing the claims of the '578 Patent.

The applications resulting in the '518 and '578 Patents were thoroughly examined. The Examiners in each respective prosecution did make certain rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, indicating that 112 requirements were carefully considered by the Examiner when evaluating patentability. Specifically, during prosecution of the parent '518 Patent, the Examiner rejected claim 9 for indefiniteness, and this rejection was overcome. *See* EX1006 (518 OA 6/29/2018) at 96-97 of 349. During prosecution of the '578 Patent, the Examiner rejected

claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 112(b) as being indefinite. EX1002 (578 OA 4/26/2024) at 85-87 of 177. These 112 rejections were also successfully overcome.

No rejection for lack of written description of “adjustable pressure mandrels” was ever made, rightfully so as they are unquestionably disclosed in the parent application. Yet, the Petition claims that the ’578 Patent is not entitled to its priority date of October 7, 2014 based on an alleged lack of written description in the originally filed application of the “adjustable pressure mandrels” claim element. *See* Petition at 97-109. The parent ’518 Patent claims “at least three radially displaceable pressure mandrels” (EX1005 at 6:55-56 (claim 1), 7:20-21 (claim 2)), while the ’578 Patent independent claims include “adjustable pressure mandrels...” (*see* EX1001 at claims at 7:2-9:17) without the “at least three” language in the independent claims. The ’578 Patent specification discloses “a main shaft fixture 10 of the given type that comprises adjustable pressure mandrels 18 with tap shoes 20....” EX1001 at 6:56-57. The parent ’518 Patent specification has the very same disclosure, as expected. *See* EX1005 at 6:36-37. This same disclosure appears in the respective Abstracts of the ’578 Patent and the ’518 Patent. *See* EX1001 at Abstract; EX1005 at Abstract. The ’578 Patent further discloses that, in Figure 2, there are “in total four pressure mandrels 18 symmetrically placed around the main shaft 2, with tap shoes 20 that are engaged onto the main shaft 4 in order to fix it in place.” EX1001 at 5:27-30. This very

same disclosure related to the pressure mandrels appears identically in all the applications to which the '578 Patent claims priority. *See* EX1005 at 5:9-12, 6:36-37, Abstract; EX1006 (DK PA 2014 00573) at 166 of 349; EX1006 (DK PA 2015 00527) at 313 of 349.

Petitioner's argument focuses on the removal of the language "at least three" from the claims and the specification of the '578 Patent. The parent '518 patent specification supports both of these claim requirements. Simply, the written description discloses adjustable pressure mandrels generally and also discloses that there may be "at least three" adjustable pressure mandrels. *See* EX 1005 at 2:22, 6:55-56 (claim 1), 7:20-21 (claim 2). This changed language was apparent to the Examiner who found that "pressure mandrels" are fully enabled and described in the '578 Patent and its predecessors. It is well established Federal Circuit law that claim scope in continuation applications need not be commensurate with the claim scope of parent applications. "An applicant is free to seek an expanded scope of coverage beyond that originally sought by filing a continuation or divisional application during the pendency of a parent application and may therein include claims extending to the full scope of the subject matter described in the original specification under 35 U.S.C. § 112(a)." *In re Float'N'Grill LLC*, 72 F.4th 1347, 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2023) (citing *Antares Pharma, Inc. v. Medac Pharma Inc.*, 771 F.3d 1354, 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2014)). In the present case, Patent Owner was

intentional in obtaining claims in the '578 Patent that addressed novel aspects of its invention. That these claims differ from the claims in the parent '518 patent application was squarely before the Examiner. Thus, in Ground 4, Petitioner has not – and cannot – establish that the '518 Patent is prior art to the '578 Patent. No new questions of patentability are raised in Ground 4 of the Petition.

As a side note, the application resulting in the '518 Patent, the parent of the '578 Patent, was also rejected over Signore in combination with Weaver, and those rejections were ultimately overcome. EX1006 (518 OA 6/29/2018) at 98 of 349 and EX1006 (518 OA 1/31/2019) at 41 of 349 (both rejecting the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Signore in view of Weaver). The Signore and Weaver art was therefore considered in detail in the prosecution of both the '518 Patent and the '578 Patent.

V. CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, Petitioner has failed to demonstrate a reasonable likelihood that it would prevail with respect to any of the Challenged Claims. Thus, *inter partes* review of the '578 Patent should be denied.

IPR2026-00102 (Patent 12,104,578)
Patent Owner's Preliminary Response

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 12, 2026

/Alison L. McCarthy/
Alison L. McCarthy (Lead Counsel)
Registration No. 51,998

Counsel for Patent Owner

Troutman Pepper Locke LLP
111 Huntington Avenue, 9th Floor
Boston, MA 02199
Tel: (617) 204-5109
Fax: (617) 204-5150
E-mail: Alison.McCarthy@Troutman.com

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE WITH WORD COUNT

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.24(d), I certify that this preliminary response complies with the type-volume limits of 37 C.F.R. § 42.24(b)(1) because it contains **2,805** words, according to the word-processing system used to prepare this preliminary response, excluding the parts of this preliminary response that are exempted by 37 C.F.R. § 42.24 (including the table of contents, a table of authorities, a claim listing, a listing of facts, a certificate of service or this certificate of word count, or appendix of exhibits).

Date: February 12, 2026

/Alison L. McCarthy/
Alison L. McCarthy (Lead Counsel)
Registration No. 51,998

Counsel for Patent Owner

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(e), this is to certify that on this 12th day of February, 2026, I caused to be served a true and correct copy of the foregoing **PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE** by e-mail on the following counsel of record (as identified in the Petition and Updated Mandatory Notices):

Blaine M. Hackman (Reg. No.
67,479)
(Lead Counsel)
DECHERT LLP
Three Bryant Park
1095 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10036
Tel.: (212) 698-3500
Fax: (212) 698-3599
blaine.hackman@dechert.com
LiftWerx-IPR@dechert.com

Lead Counsel for Petitioner

Noah M. Leibowitz (*pro hac vice*)
Gregory T. Chuebon (*pro hac vice*)
(Back-Up Counsel)
DECHERT LLP
Three Bryant Park
1095 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10036
Tel.: (212) 698-3500
noah.leibowitz@dechert.com
greg.chuebon@dechert.com

Michael H. Joshi (*pro hac vice*)
DECHERT LLP
45 Fremont Street, 26th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94105
Tel.: (212) 698-3500
michael.joshi@dechert.com

Back-up Counsel for Petitioner

/Alison L. McCarthy/
Alison L. McCarthy (Lead Counsel)
Registration No. 51,998

Counsel for Patent Owner