

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

MEDTRONIC, INC. and MEDTRONIC VASCULAR, INC.  
Petitioners

v.

MARITAL DEDUCTION TRUST  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2014-00100  
Patent 5,593,417

---

**PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE  
TO PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION .....	1
II.	BACKGROUND .....	2
	A. Dr. Rhodes’s Early Artery Repair Work.....	2
	B. The Rhodes ’154 Patent .....	2
	C. The ’417 Patent Under Review .....	4
	D. The Industry’s Use of Dr. Rhodes’s Ideas and the Implicit Acknowledgement of the Importance of its Benefits.....	17
	E. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art .....	22
III.	CLAIM INTERPRETATION .....	25
	A. “At Least One Surface” and “Said At Least One Surface”.....	25
	B. “Engagement With,” “Engaging,” and “To Tightly Engage the Interior Surface of the Vessel, Duct, or Lumen to Fixedly Secure Said Device in Place.” .....	26
IV.	KORNBERG DOES NOT ANTICIPATE CLAIMS 1, 2, 9, 10, AND 13 OF THE ’417 PATENT.....	31
	A. Overview of Kornberg.....	31
	B. Fluid Flow Force Does Not Cause Kornberg’s Hooks to Engage at All, as They Fully Engage Upon Deployment .....	34
	C. Kornberg’s Hooks do Not “Tightly Engage” Because They Puncture the Artery Wall.....	36
V.	RHODES ’154 AND KORNBERG DO NOT RENDER CLAIMS 1, 2, 9, 10, AND 13 OBVIOUS.....	39
	A. Kornberg is a Deficient Secondary Reference.....	40
	B. There is No Motivation or Other Legally Sufficient Rationale to Combine Rhodes ’154 and Kornberg.....	42

C.	The Understanding of the Art Taught Away From the Proposed Modification. ....	46
D.	The Obviousness Contention is Tainted by Impermissible Hindsight. ....	47
E.	Replacement of Rhodes '154's Protuberances With Kornberg's Hooks Would Render Rhodes '154 Unsatisfactory for its Intended Purpose and Change its Principle of Operation. ....	49
F.	Secondary Considerations Demonstrate the Nonobviousness of the Invention. ....	51
1.	Recognition of a Problem, Long-Felt But Unmet Need, and Failure of Others .....	51
2.	Commercial Success .....	55
3.	Commercial Acquiescence and Licensing .....	55
VI.	CONCLUSION.....	56

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>Atofina v. Great Lakes Chem. Corp.</i> , 441 F.3d 991 (Fed. Cir. 2006) .....	39
<i>Bettcher Indus., Inc. v. Bunzl USA, Inc.</i> , 661 F.3d 629 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....	38
<i>Bicon, Inc. v. Straumann Co.</i> , 441 F.3d 945 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	26
<i>Depuy Spine, Inc. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc.</i> , 567 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2009) .....	46
<i>Elekta Instrument S.A. v. O.U.R. Sci. Int'l, Inc.</i> , 214 F.3d 1302 (Fed. Cir. 2000) .....	27
<i>In re Fine</i> , 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988) .....	39
<i>In re Gordon</i> , 733 F.2d 900 (Fed. Cir. 1984) .....	51
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966) .....	47
<i>Gubelmann v. Gang</i> , 408 F.2d 758 (C.C.P.A. 1969).....	38
<i>Hewlett-Packard Co. v. MCM Portfolio, LLC</i> , IPR2013-00217, Paper 10 (Sept. 10, 2013).....	44
<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006) .....	42
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007) .....	42, 48
<i>Monroe Auto Equip. Co. v. Heckethorn Mfg. &amp; Supply Co.</i> , 332 F.2d 406 (6th Cir. 1964).....	48
<i>Oakley, Inc. v. Sunglass Hut Int'l</i> , 316 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	44
<i>Tempo Lighting, Inc. v. Tivoli, LLC</i> , 742 F.3d 973 (Fed. Cir. 2014) .....	29
<i>Trintec Indus., Inc. v. Top-U.S.A. Corp.</i> , 295 F.3d 1292 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	38

## **Statutes**

35 U.S.C. § 102.....	31
35 U.S.C. § 103.....	39
35 U.S.C. § 316(a)(8).....	1

## **Rules**

37 C.F.R. § 42.120.....	1
37 C.F.R. § 42.65.....	44

## **Other Authorities**

MPEP § 2143(G).....	43
MPEP § 2143.01(V).....	51
MPEP § 2143.03.....	39

# Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

## Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

## Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

## Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

## API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

## LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

## FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

## E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.