

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

REPLY TO PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	i
Table of Authorities	iii
Petitioner’s Updated Exhibit List as of November 28, 2016.....	iv
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. ALL CLAIMS OF THE ‘386 PATENT SHOULD BE FOUND UNPATENTABLE	2
A. Patentee’s Claim Construction of “Percutaneously” is wrong	3
1. A narrow construction of “percutaneously” is contrary to the specification of the ‘386 Patent	4
2. The addition of “through unbroken skin” to the definition of “percutaneous” is contrary to Patentee’s dictionary definition	5
3. Both experts agree on the ordinary meaning of “percutaneously”	7
4. Patentee’s proposed construction improperly imports limitations into the claim limitation.....	7
B. The Grounds Based on Speziali Should Be Maintained.....	8
1. Patentee has effectively conceded that claims 1, 3 and 7-14 are anticipated by Speziali by only arguing, incorrectly, that Speziali is not prior art	8
a. Patentee is misreading the burdens imposed by Dynamic Drinkware.....	8
b. Dynamic Drinkware is not applicable to Speziali because Speziali is a PCT National Stage application.....	9
c. The disclosure of Speziali is effectively identical in all priority documents.....	10
2. Speziali anticipates claims 19, 22 and 23 because Patentee’s arguments are entirely premised on Patentee’s incorrect construction of “percutaneous”	13
3. Claims 5, 6, 18, 20 and 21 are obvious over the combination of Speziali and Bachman.....	13

a.	Patentee has presented no evidence for why one skilled in the art would not be motivated to combine Speziali and Bachman regarding claims 5, 6 and 18	14
b.	Claims 20 and 21 are unpatentable because Bachman teaches how the Speziali device could be modified to be used endovascularly	15
C.	The Grounds based on Lattouf I and Bachman Should Be Maintained.	18
1.	Claims 1 and 4-6 are unpatentable because Patentee’s arguments ignore the teachings of both references	18
2.	Claims 19-21 are unpatentable over Lattouf I and Bachman	19
a.	Claim 19 is unpatentable because both Lattouf I and Bachman teach percutaneous procedures.....	20
b.	Claims 20 and 21 are obvious because Bachman teaches how a device similar to that of Speziali could be used endovascularly ..	21
D.	The Grounds Based on Lattouf I and Carpentier Should Be Maintained	22
1.	Claims 1-9, 10-18 are unpatentable over the cited combinations....	22
2.	Claims 19, 22 and 23 are unpatentable over Lattouf I and Carpentier.....	24
E.	The Grounds Based on Lattouf I and Downing Should Be Maintained	25
1.	Claims 1, 2, 4 and 5 are unpatentable over Lattouf I and Downing.....	25
2.	Claims 19 is unpatentable over Lattouf I and Downing	25
III.	CONCLUSION.....	26
	Certificate of Compliance with Word Limitations	27
	Certificate of Service	28

Table of Authorities

<u>Cases</u>	<u>Page</u>
<i>Dynamic Drinkware LLC v. National Graphics, Inc.</i> 800 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	8
<i>Glob. Tel Link. Corp. V. Securus Techs, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00824 Final Written Decision at *10-12 (PTAB December 2, 2015).....	9
<i>In re Merch & Co, Inc.</i> 800 F.2d 1091 (Fed. Cir. 1986)	16
<i>Superguide Corp. v. DirecTV Enterprises, Inc.</i> 358 F.3d 870 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	7,8
 <u>Statutes & Rules</u>	
MPEP § 211.01	7
MPEP § 2145	14, 16

Petitioner's Updated Exhibit List as of November 28, 2016

Exhibit #	Name
1001	U.S. Patent No. 7,635,386 (the '386 Patent)
1002	Power of Attorney for Petitioner NeoChord, Inc.
1003	Prosecution History for the '386 Patent
1004	U.S. Patent No. 6,978,176 (Lattouf I)
1005	U.S. Patent No. 6,840,246 (Downing)
1006	U.S. Patent No. 8,465,500 (Speziali)
1007	U.S. Patent No. 7,871,433 to (Lattouf II)
1008	U.S. Publ. No. 2004/0044365 (Bachman)
1009	<i>Cardiac valve surgery – the “French Correction”</i> by Alain Carpentier, M.D., The Journal of Thoracic and Cardiovascular Surgery, Vol. 86, No. 3, September 1983 (Carpentier)
1010	U.S. Patent No. 6,269,819 (Oz)
1011	Declaration of Dr. Lishan Aklog
1012	Dictionary definition for “inunction”
1013	PCT Publication No. WO 2006/078694 (Speziali)
1014	Provisional Application No. 60/645,677 (Speziali)
1015	File history for US 8,465,500 (Speziali)

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.