

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

EDWARDS LIFESCIENCES CORP., EDWARDS LIFESCIENCES LLC, AND
EDWARDS LIFESCIENCES AG,

Petitioners,

v.

BOSTON SCIENTIFIC SCIMED, INC.,

Patent Owner.

Case IPR2017-01293

Patent 8,992,608

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>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. BACKGROUND	4
A. TAVR	4
B. The ‘608 Patent	6
C. IPR2017-00060	10
III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	11
A. The Intrinsic Evidence Establishes That “Flaps” And “Pockets” Are Distinct From “Sacs”	11
B. Petitioner Improperly Relies On Extrinsic Evidence Of Patent Owner’s Statements In The U.K. Trial	15
1. Petitioner Mischaracterizes Patent Owner’s Statements In The U.K. Trial	16
2. Petitioner’s Reliance On Foreign Argument Is Improper	17
IV. THE OPINIONS OF PETITIONER’S EXPERT ARE ENTITLED TO LITTLE OR NO WEIGHT	19
V. PETITIONER HAS NOT MET ITS BURDEN OF SHOWING THAT CLAIMS 1-9 ARE LIKELY INVALID	23
A. Petitioner Has Not Met Its Burden Of Showing That Claims 1-4 Are Likely Anticipated Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)	23
B. Petitioner Has Not Met Its Burden Of Showing That Claims 1-4 Are Likely Obvious Under 35 U.S.C. § 103	30
1. Petitioner’s Argument Is Based On Prior Art Directed To An Improper Claim Construction	30

2.	Petitioner’s Proposed Combinations Do Not Disclose Every Element Of Claims 1-4.....	33
3.	There Was No Motivation To Combine Seguin With Lazarus Or Lawrence-Brown.....	38
4.	The Board Should Reject The Petition Under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d)	41
VI.	CONCLUSION	43

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page(s)</u>
CASES	
<i>AIA Eng'g Ltd. v. Magotteaux Int'l S/A</i> , 657 F.3d 1264 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	18
<i>Alcon Research Ltd. v. Barr Labs., Inc.</i> , 745 F.3d 1180 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	24
<i>In re Alton</i> , 76 F.3d 1168 (Fed. Cir. 1996)	25
<i>Ariad Pharm., Inc. v. Eli Lilly & Co.</i> , 598 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	24, 25
<i>Bio-Rad Labs., Inc. v. GE Healthcare Bio-sciences AB</i> , IPR2015-01826, Paper 39 at 9 (Feb. 6, 2017).....	21
<i>BLD Services, LLC, v. LMK Techs.</i> , IPR2014-00772 (Nov. 18, 2015)	15
<i>Broadcom Corp. v. Emulex Corp.</i> , 732 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	40
<i>Captioncall, LLC v. Ultratec, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00636 (Sept. 7, 2016).....	21
<i>CFMT, Inc. v. YieldUp Int'l Corp.</i> , 349 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	34
<i>Costco Wholesale Corp. v. Robert Bosch</i> , IPR2016-00035 (PTAB Apr. 25, 2016)	39
<i>In re Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC</i> , 793 F.3d 1268 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	11, 12
<i>DePuy Spine, Inc. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc.</i> , 567 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	37

<i>In re Dulberg</i> , 472 F.2d 1394 (C.C.P.A. 1973).....	18
<i>EnOcean GmbH v. Face Int’l Corp.</i> , 742 F.3d 955 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	28
<i>In re Gardner</i> , 480 F.2d 879 (CCPA 1973).....	26
<i>Garmin Int’l, Inc. v. Cuozzo Speed Techs. LLC</i> , IPR2012-00001 (PTAB Jan. 9, 2013)	34
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	33
<i>Heidelberger Druckmaschinen AG v. Hantscho Commercial Prods., Inc.</i> , 21 F.3d 1068 (Fed. Cir. 1994)	17
<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	39
<i>Keurig Green Mountain, Inc. v. Touch Coffee & Beverages, LLC</i> , IPR2016-01394 (Jan. 4, 2017).....	37
<i>Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.</i> , 688 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	40
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	33, 39
<i>Leo Pharm. Prods., Ltd. v. Rea</i> , 726 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	39
<i>Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GMBH v. Am. Hoist & Derrick Co.</i> , 730 F.2d 1452 (Fed. Cir. 1984)	18
<i>Micro Motion, Inc. v. Invensys Systems, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-01409 (PTAB Feb. 18, 2015).....	40
<i>Mintz v. Dietz & Watson, Inc.</i> , 679 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	40

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.