

Filed on behalf of Patent Owner  
By:

Alfred W. Zaher, Esq.  
Shawn S. Li, Esq.  
BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC  
Two Liberty Place  
50 S. 16th Street, Suite 3200  
Philadelphia, PA 19102-2555  
Telephone: (215) 665-8700  
Facsimile: (215) 665-8760  
[alfred.zaher@bipc.com](mailto:alfred.zaher@bipc.com)  
[shawn.li@bipc.com](mailto:shawn.li@bipc.com)

Roger H. Lee, Esq.  
Jonathan R. Bowser, Esq.  
BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC  
1737 King Street, Suite 500  
Alexandria, VA 22314-2727  
Telephone (703) 836-6620  
Facsimile (703) 836-2021  
[roger.lee@bipc.com](mailto:roger.lee@bipc.com)  
[jon.bowser@bipc.com](mailto:jon.bowser@bipc.com)

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

C.R. BARD, INC.  
Petitioner

v.

MEDICAL COMPONENTS, INC.  
Patent Owner

---

Case No. IPR2015-01660  
Patent 8,257,325

---

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO THE PETITION  
FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW FOR U.S. PATENT NO. 8,257,325  
PURSUANT TO 35 U.S.C. § 313 AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.107**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. BACKGROUND OF THE '325 PATENT .....	3
A. Background of the '325 Patent.....	3
B. The '325 Patent Provides a Port Assembly Having X-Ray Discernable Indicia or Cutouts in the Flange Configured to Indicate that the Assembly is Rated for Power Injection.....	4
III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	6
IV. ARGUMENT.....	7
A. The Petition Fails to Provide Adequate Reasoning for Combining the Alleged Prior Art.....	7
1. It Would Not Have Been Obvious to Modify Titanium Implanted Port of PORTS to Be Rated for Power Injection.....	8
a. Mr. Tallarida Provides No Underlying Facts or Data to Support His Conclusions .....	8
b. PowerPort Provides Evidence that It Would Not Have Been Obvious to Modify Titanium Implanted Port to Be Rated for Power Injection .....	11
2. It Would Not Have Been Obvious to Modify the Flange of PORTS to Have X-ray Discernable Indicia or Cutouts Configured to Indicate that the Assembly is Rated for Power Injection .....	14
a. The Orientation Holes of PORTS Are for Securing the Orientation of the Port, Not for Providing Indicia of Orientation under X-ray Examination .....	15
b. Petitioner Admitted that the Use of Indicia in the Form of Voids Would Compromise the Structural Integrity of the Port.....	19

- c. It Would Not Have Been Obvious to Add Alphanumeric Voids to the Flange in Light of the Suture Slots and Orientation Holes Already Present in the Flange.....21
- d. The Indicia for Indicating that the Port is Rated for Power Injection Taught by Powers Are Not Voids or Cutouts in the Flange.....23
- 3. PowerPort, Meyer, Sayre, and Hickman Do Not Cure the Above-described Deficiencies of PORTS and Powers.....26
  - a. PowerPort Does Not Provide Adequate Reasoning for Modifying the Flange of PORTS to Have X-ray Discernable Indicia or Cutouts .....26
    - i. Contrary to Mr. Tallarida’s Testimony, PowerPort Does Not Disclose that the Voids Are Formed in Titanium.....26
    - ii. The “CT” Indicia of PowerPort Is Not in the Flange Even under Petitioner’s Construction .....27
    - iii. PowerPort Teaches Using Palpation Bumps and a Triangular Port Housing as Means for Determining Whether an Implanted Port is Power Rated, Not X-ray Discernable Voids or Cutouts in the Flange.....30
  - b. Sayre Does Not Provide Adequate Reasoning for Modifying the Flange of PORTS to Have X-ray Discernable Indicia or Cutouts .....31
    - i. The Indicia Disclosed by Sayre Is Not in a Flange Even Under Petitioner’s Construction .....31
    - ii. Petitioner Provides No Reason with Rational Underpinnings for Modifying PORTS in View of Sayre.....33
  - c. Meyer Does Not Provide Adequate Reasoning for Modifying the Flange of PORTS to Have X-ray Discernable Indicia .....35

..

- i. Petitioner Has Not Established that the Plastic Collar of Meyer is Radiopaque .....35
    - ii. The Collar Disclosed by Meyer is Not a Flange Even Under Petitioner’s Construction .....36
    - iii. Petitioner’s Modification Would Defeat Meyer’s Stated Purpose of the Plastic Collar Which Is to Avoid the Use of Metal .....37
  - d. Hickman Does Not Cure the Above-described Deficiencies of the Other Alleged Prior Art.....38
- B. The Petition Fails to Address All of the Elements of the Challenged Claims of the ‘325 Patent .....38
  - 1. The Petition Fails to Specify Where PORTS Discloses a Flange “comprising...X-ray discernable indicia” and a “flange comprising...X-ray discernable material” .....39
  - 2. The Petition Fails to Specify Where PORTS Discloses a “flange...comprised of a metal material” .....41
  - 3. The Petition Fails to Specify Where the Alleged Prior Art Discloses that “the indicia are located within predetermined suture openings” .....42
- C. Petitioner’s Alleged Evidence Does Not Establish that PORTS, PowerPort, and Hickman Are Prior Art .....43
  - 1. Petitioner’s Alleged Evidence Does Not Establish that PORTS Is a Printed Publication .....44
    - a. Mr. Blaber’s Unsupported Testimony Concerning the Alleged Distribution of PORTS Should Be Given No Weight.....45
    - b. Mr. Blaber’s Unsupported Testimony Concerning the Alleged Availability of PORTS on the Bard Website Should Be Given No Weight.....46

...

c.	Mr. Blaber’s Unsupported Testimony Concerning the Alleged Standard Practices at Bard Should Be Given No Weight.....	48
2.	Petitioner’s Alleged Evidence Does Not Establish that PowerPort Is a Printed Publication .....	49
a.	Ms. Boswell’s Unsupported Testimony Concerning the Alleged Distribution of PowerPort Should Be Given No Weight.....	49
b.	Ms. Boswell’s Unsupported Testimony Concerning the Alleged Standard Practices at Bard Should Be Given No Weight.....	51
3.	Petitioner’s Alleged Evidence Does Not Establish that Hickman Is a Printed Publication .....	53
D.	The Petition Does Not Name All Real Parties-In-Interest.....	54
1.	Applicable Standards for Determining RPI.....	54
2.	Bard Access Systems, Inc. is an RPI .....	56
3.	The Petition Is Deficient Because It Fails to Name Bard Access Systems, Inc. as an RPI .....	59
V.	CONCLUSION.....	60

APPENDIX A - LIST OF EXHIBITS

# 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.