[redacted]

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C.

Before the Honorable Clark S. Cheney
Chief Administrative Law Judge

In the Matter of **CERTAIN GLOW FISH TAPE SYSTEMS, SAFETY HELMET SYSTEMS, AND COMPONENTS THEREOF**	**Investigation No. 337-TA-1442**

COMPLAINANT KLEIN TOOLS, INC.'S PRE-HEARING BRIEF

PGR2025-00080 Klein Tools
Ex. 2004
Page 1 of 27

[redacted]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction 1

A. Procedural History 6

B. The Parties 7

1. Klein Tools, Inc. 7

2. Milwaukee Electric Tool Corp. 7

C. Overview of the Technology 8

1. Safety Helmets 8

2. Fish Tape 9

D. The Patents at Issue 10

1. The Asserted Safety Helmet Patents 10

2. The Asserted Glow Fish Tape Patents 12

E. The Products at Issue 13

1. The Domestic Industry Products/Systems 13

a. Klein Tools' Safety Helmet System 13

i. Klein Tools' Hard Hats 14

ii. Klein Tools' Safety Helmets 15

iii. Klein Tools' Accessory Devices 16

b. Klein Tools' Glow Fish Tape Systems 18

2. The Accused Products/Systems 19

a. The Accused Milwaukee BOLT System 19

i. Accused BOLT Hard Hats 20

ii. Accused BOLT Safety Helmets 21

iii. Accused BOLT Accessory Devices 22

b. The Accused Milwaukee Glow Fish Tape Systems 24

II. Jurisdiction and Importation 25

A. Statutory Authority 25

B. Importation 26

C. Ownership 27

III. Level of Ordinary Skill In the Art 27

IV. Legal Standards 28

A. Infringement 28

B. Domestic Industry 29

1. Technical Prong 29

2. Economic Prong 30

C. Validity 31

D. Remedy 33

V. Claim Construction 33

VI. Asserted Safety Helmet Patents 35

A. U.S. Patent No. 11,452,327 35

1. Infringement 35

a. The Accused Hard Hats Together With The Accused Accessory Devices Infringe Claims 8, 10, 13–15, and 17 of the '327 Patent 40

i. Claim 8 40

(A) Claim 8[pre] 40

(B) Claim 8[a][i] 42

(C) Claim 8[a][ii] 43

(D) Claim 8[a][iii] 44

(E) Claim 8[b][i] 45

(1) Literal Infringement 45

(2) Doctrine of Equivalents 55

(F) Claim 8[b][ii] 59

(1) Literal Infringement 59

(2) Doctrine of Equivalents 62

(G) Claim 8[c] 65

(H) Claim 8[d] 68

(1) BOLT™ Headlamps Mounts 69

(2) BOLT™ REDLITHIUM™ USB Headlamp 71

(3) BOLT™ First-Generation Sunshade & Visors 73

(4) BOLT™ Universal Eye Visors 75

(5) BOLT™ Gasketed Full Face Shield 77

(6) BOLT™ Task Full Face Shield 80

(7) BOLT™ Second-Generation Sunshade & Visors 81

(I) Claim 8[e] 88

ii. Claim 10 89

iii. Claim 13 90

iv. Claim 14 93

(1) Literal Infringement 94

(2) Doctrine of Equivalents 97

v. Claim 15 99

(1) Literal Infringement 100

(2) Doctrine of Equivalents 101

vi. Claim 17 103

(A) Claim 17[pre] 103

(B) Claim 17[a] 104

(C) Claim 17[b][i] 104

(D) Claim 17[b][ii] 105

(E) Claim 17[c] 106

(F) Claim 17[d] 108

(G) Claim 17[e] 109

(H) Claim 17[f] 110

b. The Accused Safety Helmets Together With The Accused Accessory Devices Infringe Claim 17 of the '327 Patent 111

i. Claim 17 111

(A) Claim 17[pre] 111

(B) Claim 17[a] 112

(C) Claim 17[b][i] 113

(D) Claim 17[b][ii] 116

(E) Claim 17[c] 119

(F) Claim 17[d] 124

(1) BOLT™ Headlamps Mounts 126

(2) BOLT™ REDLITHIUM™ USB Headlamp 127

(3) BOLT™ Safety Helmet Eye Visors 128

(4) BOLT™ Task Full Face Shield 132

(5) BOLT™ Gasketed Full Face Shield 133

(6) BOLT™ First-Generation Sunshade & Visors 133

(7) BOLT™ Second-Generation Sunshade & Visors 134

(G) Claim 17[e] 135

(H) Claim 17[f] 137

ii. Unaccused Safety Helmets 137

c. No Exceptions to Doctrine of Equivalents 140

i. "external slot" 141

ii. "wherein the protruding nub … is disposed centrally relative to the external slot" 141

d. Indirect Infringement 143

i. Direct Infringement by Milwaukee Customers and End Users 143

ii. Affirmative Inducement by Milwaukee 145

iii. Milwaukee's Knowledge of the '327 Patent 149

iv. Knowledge of and Willful Blindness to Infringement 150

v. Milwaukee Had Specific and Actual Intent to Cause the Acts Which Constitute the Infringement 153

2. Domestic Industry – Technical Prong 154

a. The DI Hard Hats Together With The DI Accessory Devices Practice Claims 8–15 and 17 of the '327 Patent 154

i. Claim 8 154

(A) Claim 8[pre] 154

(B) Claim 8[a][i] 155

(C) Claim 8[a][ii] 156

(D) Claim 8[a][iii] 156

(E) Claim 8[b][i] 157

(F) Claim 8[b][ii] 159

(1) Practiced Literally 159

(2) Doctrine of Equivalents 166

(G) Claim 8[c] 168

(H) Claim 8[d] 170

(I) Claim 8[e] 173

ii. Claim 9 174

(1) Practiced Literally 174

(2) Doctrine of Equivalents 179

iii. Claim 10 180

iv. Claim 11 180

i. Claim 12 183

ii. Claim 13 183

iii. Claim 14 185

iv. Claim 15 187

v. Claim 17 189

(A) Claim 17[pre] 189

(B) Claim 17[a] 189

(C) Claim 17[b][i] 190

(D) Claim 17[b][ii] 190

(E) Claim 17[c] 190

(F) Claim 17[d] 192

(G) Claim 17[e] 192

(H) Claim 17[f] 192

b. The DI Safety Helmets Together With The DI Accessory Devices Practice Claim 17 of the '327 Patent 193

i. Claim 17 193

(A) Claim 17[pre] 193

(B) Claim 17[a] 194

(C) Claim 17[b][i] 195

(D) Claim 17[b][ii] 197

(E) Claim 17[c] 199

(F) Claim 17[d] 202

(G) Claim 17[e] 204

(H) Claim 17[f] 205

c. No Exceptions To Doctrine of Equivalents 206

3. Validity 208

a. Claims 8-15 and 17 of the '327 Patent are Not Invalid Under 35 U.S.C. § 112 for Lack of Written Description Support 209

i. The Term "Protruding Nub" Is Adequately Supported 209

ii. The Limitations Reciting "Integrally Molded" and "A Unitary Feature" Are Adequately Supported 215

b. Claims 8–15 and 17 of the '327 Patent Are Not Obvious Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 223

i. Summary of Asserted Prior Art 223

(A) Yan 223

(B) Daley 224

(C) Kiessler 224

(D) Nesbitt 226

ii. Claims 8–15 and 17 of the '327 Patent Would Not Have Been Obvious Over Yan in View of Daley 226

(A) Claim 8 230

(1) Claim 8[a][i] 230

(2) Claim 8[a][ii] 231

(3) Claim 8[b][i] 236

(4) Claim 8[b][ii] 239

(5) Claim 8[c] 243

PGR2025-00080 Klein Tools
Ex. 2004
Page 8 of 27

(B) Claim 9 244

(C) Claim 10 247

(D) Claim 11 248

(E) Claim 12 248

(F) Claim 13 248

(G) Claim 14 249

(H) Claim 15 249

(I) Claim 17 249

(1) Claim 17[a] 249

(2) Claim 17[b][ii] 249

(3) Claim 17[c] 249

(4) Claim 17[f] 250

iii. Claims 9 and 12 of the '327 Patent Would Not Have Been Obvious Over Yan in View of Daley and Kiessler 251

(A) Claim 9 256

(B) Claim 12 258

iv. Claims 8–15 and 17 of the '327 Patent Would Not Have Been Obvious Over Yan in View of Nesbitt 258

(A) Claim 8 262

(1) Claim 8[a][i] 262

(2) Claim 8[a][ii] 263

(3) Claim 8[b][i] 265

(4) Claim 8[b][ii] 267

(5) Claim 8[c] 274

(B) Claim 9 275

(C) Claim 10 277

(D) Claim 11 278

(E) Claim 12 278

(F) Claim 13 278

(G) Claim 14 279

(H) Claim 15 279

(I) Claim 17 279

(1) Claim 17[a] 279

(2) Claim 17[b][ii] 279

(3) Claim 17[c] 280

(4) Claim 17[f] 280

v. Objective Indicia Support a Finding of Nonobviousness 282

(A) Nexus 283

(B) Commercial Success 286

(C) Long-Felt Need 295

(D) Industry Praise 305

(E) Copying 312

c. Claims 8–15 and 17 of the '327 Patent Are Not Anticipated Under 35 U.S.C. § 102 331

i. Claims 8-15 and 17 of the '327 Patent are Entitled to a Priority Date No Later Than January 14, 2019 331

(A) "the protruding nub is integrally molded with the outer shell from the common material" 334

(B) "a front receptacle being integrally molded with the outer shell" 338

(C) "wherein the brim, the front receptacle, and the rear receptacle are a unitary feature of the outer shell" 338

ii. The Klein News Release Does Not Anticipate Claims 8–15 and 17 of the '327 Patent Under 35 U.S.C. § 102 340

iii. The Domestic Industry Products Do Not Anticipate Claims 8–15 and 17 of the '327 Patent Under 35 U.S.C. § 102 341

B. U.S. Patent No. 12,268,265 341

1. Infringement 341

a. The Accused Hard Hats Together With The Accused Accessory Devices Infringe Claims 1–4 of the '265 Patent 342

i. Claim 1 342

(A) Claim 1[pre] 342

(B) Claim 1[a] 344

(C) Claim 1[b] 344

(D) Claim 1[c] 345

(a) Literal Infringement 345

(b) Doctrine of Equivalents 351

(E) Claim 1[d] 353

(F) Claim 1[e] 356

(1) BOLT™ Headlamps Mounts 356

(2) BOLT™ REDLITHIUM™ USB Headlamp 358

(3) BOLT™ First-Generation Sunshade & Visors 359

(4) BOLT™ Universal Eye Visors 361

(5) BOLT™ Task Full Face Shield 362

(G) Claim 1[f] 365

(a) Literal Infringement 365

(b) Doctrine of Equivalents 373

ii. Claim 2 378

iii. Claim 3 378

iv. Claim 4 378

b. The Accused Safety Helmets Together With The Accused Accessory Devices Infringe Claims 1–4 of the '265 Patent 380

i. Claim 1 380

(A) Claim 1[pre] 381

(B) Claim 1[a] 381

(C) Claim 1[b] 381

(D) Claim 1[c] 382

(E) Claim 1[d] 386

(F) Claim 1[e] 388

(1) BOLT™ Headlamps Mounts 389

(2) BOLT™ REDLITHIUM™ USB Headlamp 391

(3) BOLT™ Safety Helmet Eye Visors 392

(4) BOLT™ Task Full Face Shield 395

(G) Claim 1[f] 396

ii. Claim 2 405

iii. Claim 3 406

iv. Claim 4 406

v. Unaccused Safety Helmets 408

c. No Exceptions to Doctrine of Equivalents 411

d. Indirect Infringement 412

2. Domestic Industry – Technical Prong 413

PGR2025-00080 Klein Tools
Ex. 2004
Page 12 of 27

a. The DI Hard Hats Together With The DI Accessory Devices Practice Claims 1–4 of the '265 Patent 413

i. Claim 1 413

(A) Claim 1[pre] 413

(B) Claim 1[a] 413

(C) Claim 1[b] 414

(D) Claim 1[c] 414

(a) Practiced Literally 415

(b) Doctrine of Equivalents 419

(E) Claim 1[d] 421

(F) Claim 1[e] 422

(G) Claim 1[f] 424

ii. Claim 2 427

iii. Claim 3 428

iv. Claim 4 429

b. The DI Safety Helmets Together With The DI Accessory Devices Practice Claims 1–4 of the '265 Patent 430

i. Claim 1 430

(A) Claim 1[pre] 430

(B) Claim 1[a] 431

(C) Claim 1[b] 431

(D) Claim 1[c] 432

(E) Claim 1[d] 435

(F) Claim 1[e] 436

(G) Claim 1[f] 438

ii. Claim 2 442

iii. Claim 3 443

iv. Claim 4 443

c. No Exceptions To Doctrine of Equivalents 444

3. Validity 444

a. Written Description Under 35 U.S.C. § 112 444

i. The Terms "Protruding Member" and "Stop" in Claims 1–4 Are Adequately Supported 445

ii. The Terms "First Pair of External Slots" and "Second Pair of External Slots" in Claims 1–4 Are Adequately Supported 447

iii. The Limitations Reciting "A Common Material" in Claims 2 and 3 Are Adequately Supported 450

b. Claims 1–4 of the '265 Patent Are Not Obvious Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 452

i. Claims 1–4 of the '265 Patent Would Not Have Been Obvious Over Yan In View of Daley 452

(A) Claim 1 453

(1) Claim 1[b] 453

(2) Claim 1[c] 453

(3) Claim 1[d] 454

(4) Claim 1[f] 455

(B) Claim 2 456

(C) Claim 3 456

(D) Claim 4 457

ii. Claims 1–4 of the '265 Patent Would Not Have Been Obvious Over Yan in View of Daley and Kiessler 457

(A) Claim 1 457

(1) Claim 1[b] 458

(2) Claim 1[c] 458

(3) Claim 1[d] 458

(4) Claim 1[f] 459

(B) Claim 2 460

(C) Claim 3 460

(D) Claim 4 461

iii. Claims 1–4 of the ’265 Patent Would Not Have Been Obvious Over Yan In View of Nesbitt 461

(A) Claim 1 462

(1) Claim 1[b] 462

(2) Claim 1[c] 462

(3) Claim 1[d] 466

(4) Claim 1[f] 467

(B) Claim 2 468

(C) Claim 3 469

(D) Claim 4 469

iv. Objective Indicia Support a Finding of Nonobviousness 470

c. Claims 1–4 of the ’265 Patent Are Not Anticipated Under 35 U.S.C. § 102 470

i. Claims 1-4 of the ’265 Patent are Entitled to a Priority Date No Later Than January 14, 2019 470

ii. The Klein News Release Does Not Anticipate Claims 1–4 of the ’265 Patent Under 35 U.S.C. § 102 471

iii. The Domestic Industry Products Do Not Anticipate Claims 1–4 of the ’265 Patent Under 35 U.S.C. § 102 472

VII. Asserted Glow Fish Tape Patents 472

A. U.S. Patent No. 11,713,209 472

1. Infringement 472

a. The Accused Glow Fish Tape Products Directly Infringe Claims 6 and 8–9 of the '209 Patent 473

i. Claim 6 474

(A) Claim 6[pre] 474

(B) Claim 6[a] 476

(C) Claim 6[b] 478

(D) Claim 6[c] 485

(E) Claim 6[d] 487

(1) Claim Construction 488

(2) Literal Infringement under Klein Tools' Proposed Constructions 488

(3) Doctrine of Equivalents 498

(a) The GFT Accused Products Are Insubstantially Different From The Claimed Limitation 499

(b) The GFT Accused Products Perform Substantially The Same Function, In Substantially The Same Way, To Achieve Substantially The Same Result As The Claimed Limitation 510

ii. Claim 8 518

iii. Claim 9 521

b. No Exceptions to Doctrine of Equivalents 523

i. Claim Vitiation Does Not Apply 523

ii. Prosecution History Estoppel Does Not Apply 527

iii. Ensnarement Does Not Apply 530

c. Indirect Infringement 533

2. Domestic Industry – Technical Prong 538

a. The DI Glow Fish Tape Products Practice Claims 1, 5, 6, 8, and 9 of the '209 Patent 539

i. Claim 1 539

(A) Claim 1[pre] 539

(B) Claim 1[a] 541

(C) Claim 1[b] 545

(D) Claim 1[c] 550

(E) Claim 1[d] 553

ii. Claim 5 555

iii. Claim 6 558

(A) Claim 6[pre] 558

(B) Claim 6[a] 558

(C) Claim 6[b] 559

(D) Claim 6[c] 563

(E) Claim 6[d] 565

iv. Claim 8 567

v. Claim 9 568

3. Validity 570

a. Claims 1, 5, 6, 8 and 9 of the '209 Patent Are Not Invalid Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as Obvious 571

i. Summary of the Alleged Prior Art 571

(A) European Patent No. 1 391 412 A1 ("Hartranft") (RX-0347) 571

PGR2025-00080 Klein Tools
Ex. 2004
Page 17 of 27

(B) U.S. Patent No. 6,293,519 ("Farretta") (RX-0349) 572

(C) International Patent Application Publication Number WO 97/41626 ("Bruin") (RX-0350) 573

(D) U.S. Patent No. 5,505,432 ("Noonan") (RX-0321) 574

(E) Milwaukee 25' Steel Fish Tape (48-22-4181) ("MFT") (RX-0455) 575

ii. Claims 1, 6, and 8-9 of the '209 Patent Would Not Have Been Obvious Over Hartranft in View of Farretta 581

(A) Neither Hartranft Nor Farretta Discloses Each Limitation of Any Claim of the '209 or '573 Patents 581

(B) A POSITA Would Not Have Been Motivated to Combine Hartranft and Farretta in the Manner Milwaukee Proposes Absent Hindsight 585

(C) Claim 1 Is Not Obvious Based on Hartranft in View of Farretta 608

(D) Claim 6 Is Not Obvious Based on Hartranft in View of Farretta 610

(E) Claim 8 Is Not Obvious Based on Hartranft in View of Farretta 612

(F) Claim 9 Is Not Obvious Based on Hartranft in View of Farretta 612

iii. Claim 5 of the '209 Patent Would Not Have Been Obvious Over Hartranft in View of Farretta and Noonan 613

(A) None of Hartranft, Farretta Or Noonan Disclose Each Limitation of Any Claim of the '209 and '573 Patents 613

(B) A POSITA Would Not Have Been Motivated to Combine Hartranft, Farretta, and Noonan in the Manner Milwaukee Proposes Absent Hindsight 615

(C) Claim 5 Is Not Obvious Based on Hartranft in View of Farretta and Noonan 620

iv. Claims 1, 6, and 8-9 of the ’209 Patent Would Not Have Been Obvious Over Hartranft in View of Bruin 621

(A) Neither Hartranft nor Bruin Discloses Each Limitation of Any Claim of the ’209 or ’573 Patents 622

(B) A POSITA Would Not Have Been Motivated to Combine Hartranft and Bruin in the Manner Milwaukee Proposes Absent Hindsight 628

(C) Claim 1 Is Not Obvious Based on Hartranft in View of Bruin 641

(D) Claim 6 Is Not Obvious Based on Hartranft in View of Bruin 644

(E) Claim 8 Is Not Obvious Based on Hartranft in View of Bruin 647

(F) Claim 9 Is Not Obvious Based on Hartranft in View of Bruin 647

v. Claim 5 of the ’209 Patent Would Not Have Been Obvious Over Hartranft in View of Bruin and Noonan 648

(A) None of Hartranft, Bruin Or Noonan Disclose Each Limitation of Any Claim of the ’209 or ’573 Patents 648

(B) A POSITA Would Not Have Been Motivated to Combine Hartranft, Bruin, and Noonan in the Manner Milwaukee Proposes Absent Hindsight 650

(C) Claim 5 Is Not Obvious Based on Hartranft in View of Bruin and Noonan 653

vi. Claims 6 and 8-9 of the ’209 Patent Would Not Have Been Obvious Over MFT in View of Farretta 655

(A) Neither MFT Nor Farretta Discloses Each Limitation of Any Claim of the ’209 or ’573 Patents 655

(B) A POSITA Would Not Have Been Motivated to Combine MFT and Farretta in the Manner Milwaukee Proposes Absent Hindsight 663

(C) Claim 6 Is Not Obvious Based on MFT in View of Farretta 689

(D) Claim 8 Is Not Obvious Based on MFT in View of Farretta 690

(E) Claim 9 Is Not Obvious Based on MFT in View of Farretta 691

vii. Objective Indicia Support a Finding of Nonobviousness 691

(A) Nexus 693

(B) Commercial Success 708

(C) Copying 718

(D) Long-Felt But Unresolved Need 726

(E) Industry Praise 732

B. U.S. Patent No. 12,187,573 738

1. Infringement 738

a. The Accused Glow Fish Tape Products Directly Infringe Claims 6–8 of the '573 Patent 738

i. Claim 6 739

(A) Claim 6[pre] 739

(B) Claim 6[a] 740

(C) Claim 6[b] 740

(D) Claim 6[c] 741

(E) Claim 6[d] 741

(1) Claim Construction 742

(2) Literal Infringement 742

(3) Doctrine of Equivalents 745

(a) The GFT Accused Products Are Insubstantially Different From The Claimed Limitation..... 746

(b) The GFT Accused Products Perform Substantially The Same Function, In Substantially The Same Way, To Achieve Substantially The Same Result As The Claimed Limitation 755

ii. Claim 7..... 765

iii. Claim 8..... 768

b. No Exceptions to Doctrine of Equivalents..... 770

i. Claim Vitiation Does Not Apply 770

ii. Prosecution History Estoppel Does Not Apply 771

iii. Ensnarement Does Not Apply 771

c. Indirect Infringement 772

2. Domestic Industry – Technical Prong..... 774

a. The DI Glow Fish Tape Products Practice Claims 1 and 5–8 of the '573 Patent..... 775

i. Claim 1..... 775

(A) Claim 1[pre]..... 775

(B) Claim 1[a] 776

(C) Claim 1[b]..... 776

(D) Claim 1[c] 776

(E) Claim 1[d]..... 777

ii. Claim 5..... 778

i. Claim 6..... 779

(A) Claim 6[pre]..... 779

(B) Claim 6[a] 779

(C) Claim 6[b] 780

(D) Claim 6[c] 780

(E) Claim 6[d] 781

ii. Claim 7 782

iii. Claim 8 783

3. Validity 785

a. Claims 1, 5, and 6-8 of the ’573 Patent Are Not Obvious Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 786

i. Claims 1 and 6-8 of the ’573 Patent Would Not Have Been Obvious Over Hartranft in View of Farretta 789

(A) Neither Hartranft Nor Farretta Discloses Each Limitation of Any Claim of the ’209 or ’573 Patents 789

(B) A POSITA Would Not Have Been Motivated to Combine Hartranft and Farretta in the Manner Milwaukee Proposes Absent Hindsight 789

(C) Claim 1 Is Not Obvious Based on Hartranft in View of Farretta 790

(D) Claim 6 Is Not Obvious Based on Hartranft in View of Farretta 792

(E) Claim 7 Is Not Obvious Based on Hartranft in View of Farretta 795

(F) Claim 8 Is Not Obvious Based on Hartranft in View of Farretta 795

ii. Claim 5 of the ’573 Patent Would Not Have Been Obvious Over Hartranft in View of Farretta and Noonan 796

(A) None of Hartranft, Farretta Or Noonan Disclose Each Limitation of Any Claim of the ’209 and ’573 Patents 796

(B) A POSITA Would Not Have Been Motivated to Combine Hartranft, Farretta, and Noonan in the Manner Milwaukee Proposes Absent Hindsight 797

(C) Claim 5 Is Not Obvious Based on Hartranft in View of Farretta and Noonan 798

iii. Claims 1 and 6-8 of the '573 Patent Would Not Have Been Obvious Over Hartranft in View of Bruin 799

(A) Neither Hartranft nor Bruin Discloses Each Limitation of Any Claim of the '209 or '573 Patents 799

(B) A POSITA Would Not Have Been Motivated to Combine Hartranft and Bruin in the Manner Milwaukee Proposes Absent Hindsight 800

(C) Claim 1 Is Not Obvious Based on Hartranft in View of Bruin 800

(D) Claim 6 Is Not Obvious Based on Hartranft in View of Bruin 803

(E) Claim 7 Is Not Obvious Based on Hartranft in View of Bruin 806

(F) Claim 8 Is Not Obvious Based on Hartranft in View of Bruin 807

iv. Claim 5 of the '573 Patent Would Not Have Been Obvious Over Hartranft in View of Bruin and Noonan 807

(A) None of Hartranft, Bruin Or Noonan Disclose Each Limitation of Any Claim of the '209 or '573 Patents 808

(B) A POSITA Would Not Have Been Motivated to Combine Hartranft, Bruin, and Noonan in the Manner Milwaukee Proposes Absent Hindsight 808

(C) Claim 5 Is Not Obvious Based on Hartranft in View of Bruin and Noonan 809

v. Claims 1 and 6-8 of the '573 Patent Would Not Have Been Obvious Over MFT in View of Farretta 810

PGR2025-00080 Klein Tools
Ex. 2004
Page 23 of 27

(A) Neither MFT Nor Farretta Discloses Each Limitation of Any Claim of the '209 or '573 Patents 811

(B) A POSITA Would Not Have Been Motivated to Combine MFT and Farretta in the Manner Milwaukee Proposes Absent Hindsight 812

(C) Claim 1 Is Not Obvious Based on MFT in View of Farretta 812

(D) Claim 6 Is Not Obvious Based on MFT in View of Farretta 814

(E) Claim 7 Is Not Obvious Based on MFT in View of Farretta 815

(F) Claim 8 Is Not Obvious Based on MFT in View of Farretta 816

vi. Claim 5 of the '573 Patent Would Not Have Been Obvious Over MFT in View of Farretta and Noonan 817

(A) None of MFT, Farretta Or Noonan Disclose Each Limitation of Any Claim of the '209 and '573 Patents 817

(B) A POSITA Would Not Have Been Motivated to Combine MFT, Farretta, and Noonan in the Manner Milwaukee Proposes Absent Hindsight 818

(C) Claim 5 Is Not Obvious Based on MFT in View of Farretta and Noonan 825

vii. Objective Indicia Support a Finding of Nonobviousness 827

b. Claims 1 and 5-8 Are Not Invalid Under 35 U.S.C. § 112 for Lack of Written Description Support 827

VIII. Domestic Industry – Economic Prong 833

A. Quantification of Domestic Investments 846

1. Klein Tools' Domestic ER&D Investments in Labor 846

a. Safety Helmet System DI Products 846

b. Glow Fish Tape System DI Products 854

2. Klein Tools' Domestic Manufacturing in Labor 863
a. Safety Helmet System DI Products..... 863
b. Glow Fish Tape System DI Products..... 867
3. Klein Tools' Manufacturing Investments in Plant and Equipment 870
a. Safety Helmet System DI Products..... 870
b. Glow Fish Tape System DI Products..... 871
B. Significance & Substantiality 874
1. Safety Helmet System DI Products..... 874
a. Qualitative Significance..... 874
b. Quantitative Significance & Substantiality..... 875
c. Nexus 880
2. Glow Fish Tape System DI Products..... 882
a. Qualitative Significance..... 882
b. Quantitative Significance & Substantiality..... 883
c. Nexus 887
IX. Remedy and Bond 888
A. Limited Exclusion Order..... 888
B. Cease-and-Desist Order 889
C. Respondent's Proposed Carve-Outs from Remedial Relief Should be Rejected..... 891
D. Bond..... 895
X. Conclusion 898

[redacted]

Dated: November 17, 2025

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Paul F. Brinkman, P.C.

Paul F. Brinkman, P.C.
Edward C. Donovan, P.C.
Kelly Tripathi
Kirkland & Ellis LLP
1301 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone: (202) 389-5000
Facsimile: (202) 389-5200

Greg S. Arovas, P.C.
Ryan Kane, P.C.
Alan Rabinowitz
Ashley Ross
Jae Hyun Kim
Mara L. Greenberg
Robert Endrizzi

[redacted]

Jeffrey M. Jacobsen
Jiange Xiao
Kirkland & Ellis LLP
601 Lexington Avenue
New York, NY 10022
Telephone: (212) 446-4800
Facsimile: (212) 446-4900

Brian A. Verbus
Kirkland & Ellis LLP
333 W. Wolf Point Plaza
Chicago, IL 60654
Telephone: (312) 862-2000
Facsimile: (312) 862-2200

Tiffany Knapp
Kirkland & Ellis LLP
200 Clarendon Street
Boston, MA 02116
Telephone: (617) 385-7500
Facsimile: (617) 385-7501

Email: KleinTools_Litigation@kirkland.com

Counsel for Complainant Klein Tools, Inc.