

By: David A. Caine (Reg. No. 52,683)
Arnold & Porter Kaye Scholer LLP
3000 El Camino Real
Five Palo Alto Square, Suite 500
Palo Alto, California 94306-3807
Telephone: 650.319.4500
Facsimile: 650.319.4700

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

NEVRO CORP.
Petitioner,

v.

BOSTON SCIENTIFIC NEUROMODULATION CORP.
Patent Owner

Inter Partes Review No. 2018-00143
U.S. Patent No. 7,891,085

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. STATEMENT OF PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED	1
II. INTRODUCTION	1
III. THE '085 PATENT	4
IV. THE ASSERTED REFERENCES	10
A. Stolz	10
B. Black	12
C. Ormsby	15
D. Wessman	18
E. Saab	19
V. STATEMENT OF THE LAW	20
VI. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	23
VII. GROUND 1: THE COMBINATION OF STOLZ, ORMSBY, AND BLACK DOES NOT RENDER OBVIOUS CLAIMS 1-3, 6-12, OR 14-17	23
A. Claim 1: Neither Stolz, Ormsby nor Black Discloses, Teaches or Suggests “Inserting Monofilament Into at Least one Portion of at Least one of the Conductor Lumens of the Lead Body that is not Occupied by the Conductor Wires”	23
1. Stolz	24
2. Black	25
3. Ormsby	27
B. Claim 1: Neither Stolz, Black or Ormsby Discloses, Teaches or Suggests “Heating the Spacers and Monofilament to a Temperature	

to Cause Thermal Flow or Melting of at Least one of the Spacers or Monofilament”28

C. Claims 2-3, 6-12, and 14-17: The Cited References do not Render Dependent Claims 2-3, 6-12, and 14-17 Obvious.....30

D. Claims 3, 11-12, 17: The Cited References do not Render Dependent Claims 3, 11-12, and 17 Obvious.31

E. Claim 7: The Petition Fails to Establish that Stolz’s “Conductive Contacts are in the Form of Rings”31

F. Petitioner has not Identified a Sufficient Reason to Combine its Cited References.....32

1. Stolz Discloses That its Multi-lumen Lead Body Addresses the Alleged Advantages Conferred by Ormsby’s Back-Fill.....32

2. The Alleged Reasons to Modify Stolz Using Black are Already Addressed by Stolz.....38

3. The Petition Fails to Establish That a POSA Would Substitute Monofilament for the Non-Conductive Materials Disclosed in the Prior Art39

VIII. GROUND 2: THE COMBINATION OF STOLZ, ORMSBY, BLACK, AND THE MODERN PLASTICS ENCYCLOPEDIA DOES NOT RENDER OBVIOUS CLAIMS 4, 5, OR 13 OF THE ’085 PATENT43

A. Claims 4, 5, and 13: The Cited References do not Render Dependent Claims 4, 5, and 13 Obvious Because They Do Not Render Independent Claim 1 Obvious.43

B. Claims 4, 5, and 13: The Modern Plastics Encyclopedia Fails to Supply Missing Elements of Claims 4, 5, and 13.44

IX. GROUND III: THE COMBINATION OF STOLZ, ORMSBY, BLACK, AND WESSMAN DOES NOT RENDER OBVIOUS CLAIM 18 OF THE ’085 PATENT46

A. Claim 18: The Cited References do not Render Dependent Claim 18 Obvious.46

X. GROUND IV: THE COMBINATION OF STOLZ, ORMSBY, BLACK, WESSMAN, AND SAAB DOES NOT RENDER OBVIOUS CLAIM 19 OF THE '085 PATENT47

A. Claim 19: The Cited References do not Render Dependent Claim 19 Obvious.47

XI. RESERVATION OF RIGHTS49

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Agrinomix, LLC v. Mitchell Ellis Products, Inc.,
IPR2017-00525, Paper 8, (P.T.A.B. Jun. 14, 2017)..... 20

Belden Inc. v. Berk-Tek LLC,
805 F.3d 1064 (Fed. Cir. 2015) 21

Broadcom Corp. v. Emulex Corp.,
732 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2013)..... 22, 23

CFMT, Inc. v. YieldUp Int’l Corp.,
349 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2003)..... 21

DePuy Spine, Inc. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc.,
567 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2009) 22

Graham v. John Deere Co.,
383 U.S. 1 (1966)..... 21

In re Kahn,
441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006)..... 21

In re Rijckaert,
9 F.3d 1531 (Fed. Cir. 1993)..... 21

InTouch Techs., Inc. v. VGO Commc’ns, Inc.,
751 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2014)..... 21, 22

Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.,
688 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2012)..... 21, 22, 23

KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.,
550 U.S. 398 (2007)..... 20, 21

Oil States Energy Servs., LLC v. Greene’s Energy Grp., LLC,
639 F. App’x 639 (Fed. Cir. 2016), *cert. granted*, 137 S. Ct. 2239 (2017)
..... 49

Pers. Web Techs., LLC v. Apple, Inc.,
848 F.3d 987 (Fed. Cir. 2017) 22

St. Jude Med., Inc. v. Access Closure, Inc.,
729 F.3d 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2013)..... 21

Trivascular, Inc. v. Samuels,
812 F. 3d 1056 (Fed. Cir. 2016) 34

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.