#### UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

\_\_\_\_\_

#### BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

\_\_\_\_\_

NIPRO CORPORATION, Petitioner,

v.

NXSTAGE MEDICAL, INC., Patent Owner.

Case IPR2016-00744 Patent No. 8,092,414

NXSTAGE MEDICAL, INC.'S
PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

## Mail Stop "PATENT BOARD"

Patent Trial and Appeal Board U.S. Patent and Trademark Office P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

			<b>Page</b>
I.	INT	RODUCTION	7
II.	BAC	CKGROUND	7
III.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION		
	A.	"integrally attached to the chamber" (Claim 1), "integral with said pod" (Claims 13/23)	11
	B.	"pressure sensing pod" (Claim 1)	18
	C.	"said diaphragm being moveable between first and second positions" (Claim 1)	23
	D.	"dome shaped" (Claim 12), "having a dome shape" (Claims 13/23)	26
	E.	"said dome shaped diaphragm being capable of bowing outwardly to form said dome shape in either of two opposed directions" (Claims 12/22/23)	33
	F.	"is inside of said diaphragm" (Claim 1)	37
IV.	RES	PONSE TO GROUNDS OF CHALLENGE	39
	A.	Ground 1: Claims 1, 2 and 7 Are Not Anticipated by Minami	39
		1. Minami does not teach the claimed "first position" and "second position"	39
		2. Minami does not disclose a "pressure sensing pod"	46
		3. Minami does not teach "integrally attached" pressure tubing	47
		4. Minami does not anticipate claims 2 and 7	50



		<u>Page</u>				
В.	Gro	Grounds 2-5				
	1.	Ground 2: Claims 3 and 9 are not obvious over Minami in view of Kirita				
	2.	Ground 3: Claim 4 is not obvious over Minami in view of Kirita/Isou				
	3.	Ground 4: Claims 5 and 6 are not obvious over Minami in view of Tamari				
	4.	Ground 5: Claim 8 is not obvious over Minami in view of Brugger				
C.	obvi Gan	Ground 6: Claims 12, 13, 16, 19, 22, 23, and 26 are not obvious over Minami in view of He, further in view of Gangemi, Onishi, Kersten, Calzia, and Kell ("the GOKCK references")				
	1.	He does not disclose the claimed flexible and easily distortable dome				
	2.	The GOKCK references do not disclose the claimed dome shape				
	3.	Nipro has not met its burden to show a reason to combine Minami, He and the GOKCK references				
	4.	The combined references further fail to teach the "flipping" limitations of claims 12, 22 and 23				
D.	Gro	unds 7, 8, 9, and 10				
CON	JCI II	CION				



V.

## **TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

### **Cases**

Abbott Labs. v. Sandoz, Inc., 544 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2008)
Anderson Corp. v. Fiber Composites, LLC, 474 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2007)
Atofina v. Great Lakes Chem. Corp., 441 F.3d 991 (Fed. Cir. 2006)
Bettcher Indus. v. Bunzl USA, Inc., 661 F.3d 629 (Fed. Cir. 2011)
Chef Am., Inc. v. Lamb-Weston, Inc., 358 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2004)
Ex parte Wada, No. 2007-3733, 2008 WL 142652 (B.P.A.I. Jan. 14, 2008)
<i>Greenberg v. Ethicon Endo-Surgery, Inc.</i> , 91 F.3d 1580 (Fed. Cir. 1996)
Hill-Rom Servs., Inc. v. Stryker Corp., 755 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir.), cert. denied, 135 S. Ct. 719, 190 L. Ed. 2d 463 (2014)
Hockerson-Halberstadt, Inc. v. Avia Group Int'l, 222 F.3d 951 (Fed. Cir. 2000)
Illumina, Inc. v. The Trustee of Columbia University, IPR2012-00006, 2013 WL 2023631 (PTAB, March 12, 2013) 10
In re Am. Acad. of Sci. Tech Ctr., 367 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2004)
Kinetic Technologies, Inc. v. Skyworks Solutions, Inc., IPR2014-00529, Paper 8 (Sept. 23, 2014)



	<b>Page</b>
Lighting World, Inc. v. Birchwood Lighting, Inc., 382 F.3d 1354 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	55
Microsoft Corp. v. Proxyconn, 789 F.3d 1292 (Fed. Circ., 2015)	23
Mintz v. Dietz & Watson, Inc., 679 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	71
Net MoneyIN, Inc. v. VeriSign, Inc., 545 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	39
Straight Path IP Grp., Inc. v. Sipnet EU S.R.O., 806 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	32
Thorner v. Sony Computer Entm't Am. LLC, 669 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	29
Toshiba v. Intellectual Ventures II LLC, IPR2014-00201, Paper 11 (May 21, 2014)	54
Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628 (Fed. Cir. 1987)	39
W.L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc., 721 F.2d 1540 (Fed. Cir. 1983)	71
Zimmer Holdings, Inc. v. Bonutti Skeletal Innovations LLC, IPR2014-01078, Paper 17 (Oct. 30, 2014)	54
<u>Statutes</u>	
35 U.S.C. § 102	43
37 C.F.R. § 42.100	10
27 C F D 8 42 22	6



# DOCKET A L A R M

# 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.

