

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

EDWARDS LIFESCIENCES CORPORATION, EDWARDS
LIFESCIENCES LLC, AND EDWARDS LIFESCIENCES AG,

Petitioners,

v.

BOSTON SCIENTIFIC SCIMED, INC.,

Patent Owner.

Case IPR2017-00060

Patent 8,992,608 B2

Before the Honorable NEIL T. POWELL, JAMES A. TARTAL, and
ROBERT L. KINDER, *Administrative Patent Judges.*

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

Mail Stop PATENT BOARD
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent & Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. STATEMENT OF PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED	1
II. INTRODUCTION	2
III. BACKGROUND	6
A. TAVR.....	6
B. The ‘608 Patent.....	8
C. Petitioner’s Earlier-Generation TAVR Devices.....	11
D. Petitioner’s Infringing SAPIEN 3 TAVR Device	12
E. The Petition.....	15
IV. THE OPINIONS OF PETITIONER’S EXPERT ARE ENTITLED TO LITTLE OR NO WEIGHT.....	15
V. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	20
VI. CLAIMS 1-4 ARE NOT UNPATENTABLE.....	20
A. There Was No Motivation To Combine Spenser With Elliot, Thornton, Or Cook.....	21
1. There Was No Motivation To Combine Spenser With Elliot	22
a) Spenser And Elliot Address Different Problems	22
b) The Teachings Of Spenser Are Inconsistent With The Seal Of Elliot.....	27
2. There Was No Motivation To Combine Spenser With Thornton	32
a) Spenser And Thornton Address Different Problems.....	32
b) The Teachings Of Spenser Are Inconsistent With The Seal Of Thornton.....	34
3. There Was No Motivation To Combine Spenser With Cook	35
a) Spenser And Cook Address Different Problems	35
b) The Teachings Of Spenser Are Inconsistent With The Seal Of Cook	37
B. None Of Petitioner’s Combinations Discloses Every Element Of Claims 1-4.....	38

1. Spenser In View Of Elliot Does Not Disclose Every Element Of Claims 1-4	.39
2. Spenser In View Of Thornton Does Not Disclose Every Element Of Claims 1-4	42
3. Spenser In View Of Cook Does Not Disclose Every Element Of Claims 1-4	.44
C. Objective Indicia Of Non-Obviousness Establish That Claims 1-4 Are Not Invalid Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)	47
1. There Is A Strong Nexus Between Petitioner’s Use Of The Invention And The Objective Indicia Of Non-Obviousness	50
2. Objective Indicia Of Non-Obviousness	58
a) Others, Including The Petitioner, Tried And Failed To Solve The Problem Of PVL	58
b) There Was A Long-Felt Need For A Solution To The Problem Of Paravalvular Leakage	63
c) Petitioner Copied The Invention	64
d) The Industry Has Praised The Invention	66
e) The Invention Yielded Unexpected Results	69
f) The Invention Has Enjoyed Commercial Success	70
3. Petitioner’s Expert Failed To Consider The Objective Indicia Of Nonobviousness	72
VII. CONCLUSION	75

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
<i>Apple Inc. v. Samsung Elec. Co., Ltd.</i> , 839 F.3d 1034 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	48, 64, 69
<i>Bio-Rad Labs., Inc. v. GE Healthcare Bio-sciences AB</i> , IPR2015-01826 (Feb. 6, 2015)	18
<i>Broadcom Corp. v. Emulex Corp.</i> , 732 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	26
<i>CFMT, Inc. v. YieldUp Int’l Corp.</i> , 349 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	38
<i>CaptionCall, L.L.C. v. Ultratec, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00636 (Sept. 7, 2016)	18
<i>Costco Wholesale Corp., v. Robert Bosch LLC</i> , IPR2016-00035 (April 25, 2016).....	22
<i>Crocs, Inc. v. ITC</i> , 598 F.3d 1294 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	66
<i>DePuy Spine, Inc. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc.</i> , 567 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	30
<i>DePuy Synthes Sales, Inc. v. Acantha LLC</i> , IPR2016-00334 (June 6, 2016).....	31
<i>Gnosis S.P.A. v. South Alabama Med. Sci. Found.</i> , IPR2013-00116 (June 20, 2014).....	57
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	21, 48
<i>Heidelberger Druckmaschinen AG v. Hantscho Commercial Prod., Inc.</i> , 21 F.3d 1068 (Fed. Cir. 1994)	63
<i>In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Patent Litig.</i> , 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	48, 62, 64

<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	21
<i>In re Kao</i> , 639 F.3d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	48
<i>In re Nuvasive, Inc.</i> , 842 F.3d 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	22, 26
<i>In re Rijckaert</i> , 9 F.3d 1531 (Fed. Cir. 1993)	38
<i>Innopharma Licensing, Inc. v. Senju Pharm. Co.</i> , IPR2015-00902 (July 28, 2016)	49
<i>Intouch Techs., Inc. v. VGo Commc'ns, Inc.</i> , 751 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	72, 73
<i>Intri-plex Tech., Inc. v. Saint-Gobain Performance Plastics Rencol Ltd.</i> , IPR2014-00309 (March 23, 2014).....	48, 66
<i>Keurig Green Mountain, Inc. v. Touch Coffee & Beverages, LLC</i> , IPR2016-01394 (Jan. 4, 2017).....	30
<i>Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.</i> , 688 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	26, 69, 70, 72, 73
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	21
<i>Leo Pharm. Prods., Ltd. v. Rea</i> , 726 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	23, 48, 49, 71
<i>Micro Motion, Inc. v. Invensys Sys., Inc.</i> , IPR2014-01409 (Feb. 18, 2015)	24
<i>Mintz v. Dietz & Watson, Inc.</i> , 679 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	23, 63
<i>Nike, Inc. v. Adidas AG</i> , 812 F.3d 1326 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	48

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.