

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

Before the Honorable NEIL T. POWELL, JAMES A. TARTAL, and STACY B. MARGOLIES, *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>
PATENT OWNER'S LIST OF EXHIBITS	v
I. STATEMENT OF RELIEF REQUESTED	1
II. INTRODUCTION	1
III. BACKGROUND	3
A. The '560 Patent	4
B. The Petitions.....	8
C. The Art Upon Which <i>Inter Partes</i> Review Is Instituted	10
1. Yasumi	10
2. Morales.....	12
IV. THE OPINIONS OF PETITIONER'S EXPERT ARE ENTITLED TO LITTLE OR NO WEIGHT.....	13
V. THE CLAIM PREAMBLE "A STENT CRIMPER" IS LIMITING	17
VI. GROUND 1: CLAIMS 1, 2, 6, 8-11, 14, 15, 17-19, 23, 25-28, 31, 33-35, 37, 39, AND 40 ARE NOT UNPATENTABLE IN VIEW OF FIGURE 8 OF YASUMI	24
A. Yasumi Does Not Disclose Each Element of The Challenged Claims	24
1. Yasumi Does Not Disclose A "Stent Crimper"	25
2. Yasumi Does Not Disclose Dies "Operatively Engaged" To A Stationary End-Wall	25
3. Yasumi Does Not Disclose Dies That Move "Inward" Or "Outward" To Change The Size Of The Aperture	27

B.	A Skilled Artisan Would Not Have Considered The Figure 8 Embodiment Of Yasumi A Stent Crimper Or Been Motivated To Modify It To Crimp A Stent	29
C.	Even If A Skilled Artisan Tried To Modify The Figure 8 Embodiment Of Yasumi, They Would Not Have Had A Reasonable Expectation Of Success	33
VII.	GROUND 2: CLAIMS 11, 17, 19, 26, 34, 35, AND 39 ARE NOT UNPATENTABLE IN VIEW OF YASUMI FIGURE 8 AND MORALES.....	34
A.	Yasumi In View Of Morales Does Not Disclose Each Element Of Claim 11, 17, 19, 26, 34, And 35.....	34
B.	There Would Have Been No Motivation To Combine Yasumi with Morales	34
VIII.	OBJECTIVE INDICIA OF NON-OBVIOUSNESS ESTABLISH THAT THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE NOT INVALID	35
A.	There Is A Nexus Between The Commercial Success Of Petitioner's Crimpers And The Merits Of The Claimed Invention Of The '560 Patent.....	35
B.	Petitioner Admits That There Was A Long-Felt And Unresolved Need For Uniformly Crimping A Stent.....	36
C.	Petitioner Admits Failure Of Others To Solve The Need For Uniformly Crimping A Stent.....	36
IX.	CONCLUSION.....	37

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page(s)</u>
CASES	
<i>Apple Inc. v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd.</i> , 839 F.3d 1034 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	32
<i>Catalina Marketing Int'l, Inc. v. Coolsavings.com, Inc.</i> , 289 F.3d 801 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	18
<i>Circuit Check Inc. v. QXQ Inc.</i> , 795 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	32
<i>Corning Glass Works v. Sumitomo Elec. U.S.A., Inc.</i> , 868 F.2d 1251 (Fed. Cir. 1989)	15, 16, 17, 18
<i>In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Patent Litigation</i> , 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	32
<i>Deere & Co. v. Bush Hog, LLC</i> , 703 F.3d 1349 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	17, 18
<i>Gen. Elec. Co. v. Nintendo Co., Ltd.</i> , 179 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	16, 17, 18
<i>Karsten Mfg. Corp. v. Cleveland Golf Co.</i> , 242 F.3d 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	16, 18
<i>Oil States Energy Services, LLC v. Greene's Energy Group, LLC</i> , 137 S. Ct. 2239 (2017).....	1
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	20
<i>Poly-America, L.P. v. GSE Lining Tech., Inc.</i> , 383 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	16, 18
<i>Regents of Univ. of Minn. v. AGA Med. Corp.</i> , 717 F.3d 929 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	19

Rexnord Corp. v. Laitram Corp.,
274 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2001)19

DOCKETED CASES

Bio-Rad Labs., Inc. v. GE Healthcare Bio-sciences AB,
IPR2015-01826, Paper 39 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 6, 2017)14

CaptionCall, L.L.C. v. Ultratec, Inc.,
IPR2015-00636, Paper 97 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 7, 2016)14

Edwards Lifesciences Corp. v. Boston Scientific Scimed, Inc.,
IPR2017-00072, Paper No. 1, Ex. 2015. (P.T.A.B. Oct. 13,
2016)7, 8

Microsoft Corp. v. Secure Web Conference Corp.,
IPR2014-00745 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 29, 2014).....28

Owens Corning v. Fast Felt Corp.,
IPR2015-00650, Paper 32 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 11, 2016).....14

TCL Corp. v. Telefonaktiebolaget LM Ericsson,
IPR2015-01674, Paper 35 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 13, 2017)14

STATUTES

37 C.F.R. § 42.65(a).....14

37 C.F.R. § 42.1201

35 U.S.C. § 103(a)8

35 U.S.C. § 325(d)7

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.