

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 IPR2017-00444

Patent 6,915,560

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

PATENT OWNER’S LIST OF EXHIBITS	I
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.....	7
V. THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE THE ALLEGED AAPA DOES NOT CONSTITUTE A PRIOR ART PATENT OR PRINTED PUBLICATION.....	8
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.....	13
A. The Instant Petition Is Against The Same Claims Of The Same Patent Using Substantially The Same Prior Art And Arguments As In The First Petition	14
B. The Prior Art And Arguments Presented In This Petition Are Also The Same Or Substantially The Same As Prior Art And Arguments Presented During Prosecution Of The ’560 Patent	16
1. The Examiner Previously Considered Prior Art Substantially The Same As Yasumi.....	17
2. The Examiner Repeatedly Considered The Alleged AAPA.....	21
3. The Examiner Also Considered Morales.....	25
VII. PETITIONER HAS FAILED TO CARRY ITS BURDEN OF DEMONSTRATING A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF OBVIOUSNESS IN ANY EVENT	26
A. Claim Construction.....	27
1. “A Stent Crimper Comprising”	27
2. “Stationary End-Walls” And “Stationary Plates”.....	29

B.	Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated That The Combination Of References Discloses Every Limitation Of Claims 1, 2, 6, 8-9, 18-19, 23, 25-26, 37, And 40	31
C.	Petitioner Has Not Met Its Burden Of Demonstrating A Motivation To Combine References Or A Reasonable Expectation Of Success In Combining References	33
1.	GROUND 1: Yasumi In View Of The Alleged AAPA.....	34
a.	Lack Of Motivation To Combine	34
b.	No Reasonable Expectation Of Success	42
2.	GROUND 2: Yasumi In View Of The Alleged AAPA And Morales.....	44
VIII.	CONCLUSION.....	45

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
<i>Bell Communications Research, Inc. v. Vitalink Communications Corp.</i> , 55 F.3d 615 (Fed. Cir. 1995).....	29
<i>Broadcom Corp. v. Emulex Corp.</i> , 732 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	42
<i>Cannon Inc. v. Papst Licensing GMBH & Co.</i> , Case No. IPR2016-01206, Paper 15 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 15, 2016).....	21, 24
<i>Catalina Mktg. Int’l v. Coolsavings.com, Inc.</i> , 289 F.3d 801 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	28
<i>Costco Wholesale Corp., v. Robert Bosch</i> , Case No. IPR2016-00035, Paper 16 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 25, 2016).....	33
<i>Duncan Parking Technologies, Inc., v. IPS Group Inc.</i> , Case No. IPR2016-01144, Paper 9 (P.T.A.B. Nov. 21, 2016).....	15, 16
<i>Ex. Parte Ji-Young Lee</i> , Appeal 2006-2328, 2006 WL 4075454 (B.P.A.I. Feb. 3, 2007).....	10
<i>Garmin Int’l, Inc. v. Cuozzo Speed Techs. LLC</i> , Case No. IPR2012-00001, Paper 15 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 9, 2013).....	31
<i>In re Arkley</i> , 455 F.2d 586 (C.C.P.A. 1972).....	41
<i>In re Bush</i> , 296 F.2d 491 (C.C.P.A. 1961).....	15
<i>In re Cortright</i> , 165 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 1999).....	30
<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	33
<i>In re Krammes</i> , 314 F.2d 813 (C.C.P.A. 1963).....	15
<i>In re Mouttet</i> , 686 F. 3d 1322 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	15
<i>In re Suitco Surface, Inc.</i> , 603 F.3d 1255 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	30

<i>Intri-Plex Tech., Inc. v. Saint-Gobain Performance Plastics Rencol Ltd.</i> , Case No. IPR2014-00309, Paper 83 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 23, 2014).....	12
<i>Knightbright Elec. Co. LTD v. Cree, Inc.</i> , Case No. IPR2015-00746, Paper 8 (P.T.A.B. August 20, 2015).....	11, 12
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	31, 33, 35
<i>Leo Pharm. Prods. v. Rea</i> , 726 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	42
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Proxyconn, Inc.</i> , 789 F.3d 1292 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	31
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Secure Web Conference Corp.</i> , Case No. IPR2014-00745, Paper 12 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 29, 2014)	38
<i>Net MoneyIN, Inc. v. VeriSign, Inc.</i> , 545 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	41
<i>Nu Mark LLC v. Fontem Holdings I, B.V.</i> , Case No. IPR2016-01309, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 15, 2016).....	21
<i>Palo Alto Networks, Inc. v. Finjan, Inc.</i> , Case No. IPR2016-00165, Paper 7 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 21, 2016)	42
<i>Panasonic Corp., et al. v. Optical Devices, LLC</i> , Case No. IPR2014-00302, Paper 9 (P.T.A.B. Jul. 11, 2014).....	41
<i>Poly-America, L.P. v. GSE Lining Tech., Inc.</i> , 383 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	27
<i>Rexnord Corp. v. Laitram Corp.</i> , 274 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	29
<i>Rotatable Techs. LLC v. Motorola Mobility LLC</i> , 567 Fed. Appx. 941 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	28
<i>Seabery N. Am., Inc. v. Lincoln Glob., Inc.</i> , Case No. IPR2016-00749, Paper 13 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 21, 2016)	34
<i>Toyota Motor Corp. v. Cellport Systems, Inc.</i> , Case No. IPR2015-01423, Paper 7 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 28, 2015).....	16
<i>Unified Patents Inc., v. John L. Berman</i> , Case No. IPR2016-01571, Paper 10 at 12 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 14, 2016).....	21, 24

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.