

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

EDWARDS LIFESCIENCES CORP.,

Petitioner,

v.

BOSTON SCIENTIFIC SCIMED, INC.,

Patent Owner.

Case IPR2017-00072

Patent 6,915,560

**CORRECTED
PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY 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>
PATENT OWNER’S LIST OF EXHIBITS	iv
I. STATEMENT OF RELIEF REQUESTED	1
II. INTRODUCTION	1
III. BACKGROUND	2
A. Prior Art Crimping Methods And Devices	3
B. The ’560 Patent	5
IV. THE ART AND GROUNDS OF UNPATENTABILITY RELIED ON BY PETITIONER	6
V. THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE THE ALLEGED AAPA DOES NOT CONSTITUTE A PRIOR ART PATENT OR PRINTED PUBLICATION	7
VI. EVEN IF THE ALLEGED AAPA COULD BE CONSIDERED, THE PETITION SHOULD STILL BE DENIED BECAUSE THE SAME OR SUBSTANTIALLY THE SAME ART AND ARGUMENTS WERE PREVIOUSLY PRESENTED TO THE OFFICE	12
A. The Examiner Repeatedly Considered The Alleged AAPA	13
B. The Examiner Also Considered Morales	17
C. The Examiner Also Previously Considered Prior Art Substantially The Same As Sabbaghian and Baker	17
VII. PETITIONER HAS FAILED TO CARRY ITS BURDEN OF DEMONSTRATING A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF OBVIOUSNESS IN ANY EVENT	21
A. Claim Construction	22
1. “A Stent Crimper Comprising”	23
2. “Stationary End-Walls” And “Stationary Plates”	25
B. The Combination Of References Does Not Disclose Every Limitation Of Claims 1, 2, 6, 8-11, 14, 15, 17-19, 23, 25-28, 31, 33-35, 37, and 40	27

C.	Petitioner Has Not Met Its Burden Of Demonstrating A Motivation To Combine References Or A Reasonable Expectation Of Success In Combining References.....	30
1.	GROUND 1: The Alleged AAPA In View Of Sabbaghian.....	31
a.	Lack Of Motivation To Combine.....	31
b.	No Reasonable Expectation Of Success.....	39
2.	GROUND 2: The Alleged AAPA In View Of Sabbaghian And Morales.....	41
3.	GROUND 3: The Alleged AAPA In View Of Baker.....	42
4.	GROUND 4: The Alleged AAPA In View Of Baker And Morales.....	44
VIII.	PETITIONER’S CITATION OF ADDITIONAL REFERENCES DOES NOT SUPPORT A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF OBVIOUSNESS.....	44
IX.	CONCLUSION.....	45

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
<i>Bell Commc'ns Research, Inc. v. Vitalink Comm'ns Corp.</i> , 55 F.3d 615 (Fed. Cir. 1995)	24
<i>Broadcom Corp. v. Emulex Corp.</i> , 732 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	38
<i>Catalina Mktg. Int'l v. Coolsavings.com, Inc.</i> , 289 F.3d 801 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	24
<i>Ex Parte Ji-Young Lee</i> , Appeal No. 2006-2328, 2006 WL 4075454 at *19-20 (B.P.A.I. Feb. 23, 2007)	9
<i>In re Cortright</i> , 165 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	26
<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	31
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	passim
<i>Leo Pharm. Prods. v. Rea</i> , 726 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	43
<i>Poly-America, L.P. v. GSE Lining Tech., Inc.</i> , 383 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	23
<i>Rexnord Corp. v. Laitram Corp.</i> , 274 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	25
<i>Rotatable Techs. LLC v. Motorola Mobility LLC</i> , 567 F. App'x. 941 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	24
<i>In re Suitco Surface, Inc.</i> , 603 F.3d 1255 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	26

DOCKETED CASES

<i>Cannon Inc. v. Papst Licensing GMBH & Co.</i> , Case No. IPR2016-01206	16, 21
<i>Costco Wholesale Corp., v. Robert Bosch</i> , Case No. IPR2016-00035	31
<i>Garmin Int’l, Inc. v. Cuozzo Speed Techs. LLC</i> , Case No. IPR2012-00001	27
<i>Intri-Plex Tech., Inc. v. Saint-Gobain Performance Plastics Rencol Ltd.</i> , Case No. IPR2014-00309	11, 12
<i>Knightbright Elec. Co. LTD v. Cree, Inc.</i> , Case No. IPR2015-00744	45
<i>Knightbright Elec. Co. LTD v. Cree, Inc.</i> , Case No. IPR2015-00746	10, 11
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Secure Web Conference Corp.</i> , Case No. IPR2014-00745	37
<i>Nu Mark LLC v. Fontem Holdings 1, B.V.</i> , Case No. IPR2016-01309	21
<i>Palo Alto Networks, Inc. v. Finjan, Inc.</i> , Case No. IPR2016-00165	38
<i>Seabery N. Am., Inc. v. Lincoln Glob., Inc.</i> , Case No. IPR2016-00749	31
<i>Unified Patents Inc., v. John L. Berman</i> , Case No. IPR2016-01571	16, 21

STATUTES, RULES AND REGULATIONS

37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(4).....	7, 8, 9, 42
37 C.F.R. § 42.107(a).....	1
37 C.F.R. § 42.108(b)	13

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.