

**IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT**

No. 2014-1185

VASCULAR SOLUTIONS, INC.,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

v.

BOSTON SCIENTIFIC CORPORATION,

Defendant-Appellant.

On Appeal from the United States District Court
For the District of Minnesota in Case No. 13-cv-01172-JRT-SER
Judge John R. Tunheim

CORRECTED BRIEF OF APPELLEE VASCULAR SOLUTIONS, INC.

NONCONFIDENTIAL VERSION

January 29, 2014

Dorsey & Whitney LLP
J. Thomas Vitt
Heather D. Redmond
Suite 1500, 50 South Sixth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402-1498
Telephone: (612) 340-2600

*Attorneys for Plaintiff-Appellee
Vascular Solutions, Inc.*

CERTIFICATE OF INTEREST

Counsel for Plaintiff-Appellee Vascular Solutions, Inc. certifies the following:

1. The full name of every party or amicus represented by me is:

Vascular Solutions, Inc.

2. The name of the real party in interest (if the party named in the caption is not the real party in interest) represented by me is:

Vascular Solutions, Inc.

3. All parent corporations and any publicly held companies that own 10 percent or more of the stock of the party of amicus curiae represented by me are:

Vascular Solutions, Inc. is a publicly traded corporation; it has no parent corporation; and no publicly held company owns more than 10% of its stock.

4. The names of all law firms and the partners or associates that appeared for the party or amicus now represented by me in the trial court or agency or are expected to appear in this court are:

J. Thomas Vitt
Heather D. Redmond
Shannon L. Bjorklund
Forrest Tahdoahnippah

Dorsey & Whitney LLP
50 South Sixth Street, Suite 1500
Minneapolis, MN 55402-1498
Telephone: (612) 340-2600
Facsimile: (612) 340-2868

Respectfully submitted,

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP

Dated: January 29, 2014

By /s/ Heather D. Redmond
J. Thomas Vitt
Heather D. Redmond
50 South Sixth Street, Suite 1500
Minneapolis, MN 55402-1498
Telephone: (612) 340-2600

*Attorneys for Plaintiff-Appellee Vascular
Solutions, Inc.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIESiv

STATEMENT OF RELATED CASES viii

STATEMENT OF THE ISSUES..... 1

STATEMENT OF THE CASE..... 2

 I. THE PARTIES 2

 II. VSI’S INVENTION SOLVED A LONG-STANDING PROBLEM
 IN INTERVENTIONAL CARDIOLOGY 3

 A. Cardiac Catheterization Procedures And Guide Catheter
 Limitations 3

 B. Prior Attempts To Solve Guide Catheter Limitations..... 4

 C. Over-The-Wire And Monorail Systems..... 5

 D. VSI’s “Game-Changing” GuideLiner Catheter 5

 1. GuideLiner’s Flexible Portion 6

 2. GuideLiner’s Substantially Rigid Portion 8

 3. GuideLiner’s Transition Collar..... 9

 E. VSI’S GuideLiner Is Clinically And Commercially
 Successful..... 10

 III. VSI’S GUIDELINER PATENTS 11

 IV. BSC COPIES GUIDELINER AND INFRINGES VSI’S
 PATENTS..... 12

 V. BSC’S INFRINGEMENT WAS CAUSING SUBSTANTIAL
 IRREPARABLE HARM..... 16

 VI. BSC’S DEFENSES 17

 A. BSC’s Noninfringement Defenses 17

 B. BSC’s Invalidity Defense..... 17

 1. The Adams Patent 18

 2. Verbeek, Steinke, and Alt 21

VII. BSC HAD A FAIR OPPORTUNITY TO PRESENT ITS DEFENSES23

VIII. THE PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION ORDER25

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT26

ARGUMENT29

I. STANDARD OF REVIEW.....30

II. THERE WAS NO LEGAL ERROR IN THE DISTRICT COURT’S CLAIM CONSTRUCTION, AND VSI IS LIKELY TO ESTABLISH INFRINGEMENT OF MULTIPLE CLAIMS31

 1. “Without a Lumen” Applies To The Rail Structure, Not The Collar Or Entire Substantially Rigid Portion32

 B. A “Lumen” Requires A Passageway For Medical Devices.....35

 1. The Intrinsic Evidence Supports The District Court’s Construction35

 2. The Extrinsic Evidence Also Supports The District Court’s Construction.....39

 C. VSI Is Likely To Establish BSC’s Infringement Of Multiple Claims.....43

III. THE DISTRICT COURT CORRECTLY FOUND THAT BSC WAS NOT LIKELY TO ESTABLISH THAT THE ASSERTED CLAIMS WERE OBVIOUS.....44

 A. Standard Of Review44

 B. The District Court Correctly Found That VSI Was Likely To Overcome BSC’s Obviousness Defense Based On Adams/Verbeek/Alt/Stein45

 1. Verbeek/Steinke/Alt Do Not Disclose All Of The Missing Limitations Of The Asserted Claims47

 2. BSC Presented No Evidence Establishing A Motivation To Combine Adams With Verbeek/Steinke/Alt.....50

 3. The District Court Correctly Found That Secondary Considerations Weigh In Favor Of Finding The

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.