UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD ______

NEOCHORD, INC. Petitioner

V.

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, BALTIMORE

Patent Owner

Case No. IPR2016-00208 Patent No. 7,635,386

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.120



Table of Contents

I.	INTI	RODU	CTION	1	
II.	BAC	KGRO	OUND AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENTS	1	
	A.	Back	ground on the Invention of the '386 Patent	1	
III.			ICTION OF AND SUPPORT FOR THE CHALLENGED	2	
	A.	The S	Standard for Claim Construction in These Proceedings	2	
	B.	PO's	PO's Proposed Claim Constructions		
		1.	"Percutaneously accessing an apical region of the heart" (claim 19)	2	
IV.	CHALLENGED CLAIMS 1-23 ARE PATENTABLE OVER THE INSTITUTED GROUNDS				
	A.		lenged Claims 1, 3, 7-14, 19, 22 and 23 Are Patentable er 35 U.S.C. § 102	11	
		1.	Ground 1: Claims 19, 22, and 23 are Not Anticipated by Speziali.	11	
		2.	Ground 1: Claims 1, 3, and 7-14 are Not Anticipated by Speziali.	16	
	B.	The (Challenged Claims Are Patentable Under 35 U.S.C. § 103	16	
		1.	Petition Fails to Provide Sufficient Motivation to Combine (MTC) Arguments	16	
		2.	Ground 2: Claims 20 and 21 are Not Rendered Obvious by Speziali in view of Bachman	19	
		3.	Ground 3: Claims 19, 22 and 23 are Not Rendered Obvious by Lattouf I in view of Carpentier	26	
		4.	Ground 4: Claim 19 is Not Rendered Obvious by Lattouf I in View of Bachman.	33	
		5.	Ground 4: Claims 20 and 21 are Not Rendered Obvious by Lattouf I in view of Bachman.	35	
		6.	Ground 5: Claim 19 is Not Rendered Obvious by Lattouf I in view of Downing.	41	



Table of Contents

(continued)

Page

	7.	Ground 2: Claims 5, 6 and 18 are Not Rendered Obvious by Speziali in view of Bachman	44
	8.	Ground 3: Claims 1-9, 11-15, 17 and 18 are Not Rendered Obvious by Lattouf I in view of Carpentier	46
	9.	Ground 4: Claims 1 and 4-6 are Not Rendered Obvious by Lattouf I in view of Bachman.	47
	10.	Ground 5: Claims 1, 2, 4 and 5 are Not Rendered Obvious by Lattouf I in view of Downing	48
	11.	Ground 6: Claims 2 and 4 are Not Rendered Obvious over Speziali	49
	12.	Ground 7: Claims 10 and 16 are Not Rendered Obvious over Lattouf I in view of Carpentier and Downing	49
17	CONCLUS	ION	50



List of Exhibits

Ex. No.	Description of Document
2001	Declaration of John Richard Garrett, M.D.
2002	Curriculum Vitae of John Richard Garrett, M.D.
2003	Excerpts from The American Heritage Stedman's Medical Dictionary (1995)
2004	Transcript of Deposition of Dr. Lishan Aklog, M.D. dated August 26, 2016 ("Aklog Trans.")
2005	WO 2006/078694 to Speziali
2006	U.S. Patent No. 8,075,510 to Aklog et al.
2007	Excerpts from Stedman's Medical Dictionary, Illustrated in Color (28th ed. 2006)
2008	Wikipedia, "Percutaneous" (retrieved Sept. 2016)
2009	"Seldinger Technique for Introducing Catheters" (retrieved Sept. 2016)
2010	T. Doby, "A Tribute to Sven-Ivar Seldinger," American Roentgen Ray Society, 142:1-3 (Jan. 1984)
2011	I. Mohiuddin, et al., "Chapter 1: General principles of endovascular therapy," <i>Endovascular Therapy</i> , Blackwell Publishing (2006)



I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.120, the patent owner, University of Maryland, Baltimore ("PO"), hereby submits this Patent Owner Response to the Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 7,635,386 ("the '386 Patent") ("Petition") filed by NeoChord, Inc. ("Petitioner") on November 18, 2015. Claims 1-23 are currently pending and have been instituted under multiple grounds.

This filing is timely as it is being filed on September 12, 2016, pursuant to the Notice to Modify Due Dates 1 & 2 filed jointly by the parties (see Paper 9).

Petitioner did not submit statements of material facts in the Petition, thus no response is due pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.23(a) and no facts are admitted.

It is Petitioner's burden to show by a preponderance of evidence that the challenged claims are unpatentable. 35 U.S.C. § 316(e). As set forth herein, Petitioner fails to meet its burden of proof for at least claims 1-23. Accordingly, PO requests that the Board issue a Final Decision confirming the patentability of challenged claims 1-23 of the '386 Patent.

II. BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENTS

A. Background on the Invention of the '386 Patent

The '386 Patent claims priority to U.S. Patent Application No. 60/780,521, and is therefore entitled to a priority filing date of March 7, 2006.



DOCKET

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.

