UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

INTUITIVE SURGICAL, INC., Petitioner,

v.

ETHICON LLC, Patent Owner.

IPR2018-00934 U.S. Patent No. 8,998,058

PATENT OWNER ETHICON LLC'S RESPONSE



TABLE OF CONTENTS

				rage
I.	INTI	RODU	JCTION	1
II.	BACKGROUND			
	A.	Over	view of the 058 Patent	6
	B.	Over	view of Challenged Independent Claims 6 and 1	14
III.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION			
	A.	to recompose attack	oling system comprising an electric motor configured ceive power from a power source such that said electrical or can only selectively receive power from said power source a said housing connector is attached to the surgical nument system" (Claim 6) / "disposable loading unit prising: a motor configured to receive power from a cer source such that said motor can only selectively receive the from said power source when said means for removably hing said housing to the surgical instrument is operably led to the surgical instrument" (Claim 1)	17
		1.	The Claim Language Confirms That These Limitations Require That The Electric Motor Is Attached To A Power Source And Configured Such That The Transfer Of Power To The Motor Is Prevented When The Housing Connector of the DLU/Stapling System Is Detached From The Surgical Instrument	19
		2.	The Specification Confirms That This Limitation Requires That The Electric Motor Is Attached To A Power Source And Configured Such That The Transfer Of Power To The Motor Is Prevented When The DLU Is Detached From The Surgical Instrument	23
		3.	Petitioner's Analysis Vitiates This Claim Limitation	28



IV.	THE PRIOR ART				
	A.	Hooven	30		
	B.	Heinrich	36		
	C.	Milliman			
V.	DEM ANI	UITIVE DID NOT CARRY ITS BURDEN OF MONSTRATING THAT THE COMBINATION OF HOOVEN DIFFERENCE OF THE USE PATENT OF EINDEPENDENT CLAIMS OF THE USE PATENT	43		
	A.	Hooven In View Of Heinrich Does Not Disclose A Motor Configured To Only Selectively Receive Power From An Attached Power Source As Required By Claims 6 and 144			
	В.	Petitioner Does Not Establish a Motivation to Combine Hooven with Heinrich or Milliman			
		1. Heinrich Discourages a Combination With Hooven	55		
		2. Petitioner Relies On Impermissible Hindsight To Combine Hooven And Heinrich	56		
		3. A POSITA would not have a reasonable expectation of success in combining Hooven and Heinrich	59		
	C.	Dr. Fischer's Testimony Is Entitled To Little Weight	61		
VI.	CON	ICLUSION	64		



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
Arctic Cat Inc. v. Bombardier Recreational Prod. Inc., 876 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	4
ATD Corp. v. Lydall, Inc., 159 F.3d 534 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	55
Carlson v. Bioremedi Therapeutic Sys., 822 F.3d 194 (5th Cir. 2016)	62
<i>In re Chu</i> , 66 F.3d 292 (Fed. Cir. 1995)	58
Compass Bank v. Intellectual Ventures II, IPR2014-00786, Paper 46	58
Corning Incorp. v. DSM IP Assets, IPR2013-00050, Paper 77	58
Dell Inc. v. Acceleron, LLC, 818 F.3d 1293 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	22, 29
Graham v. John Deere Co. of Kansas City, 383 U.S. 1 (1966)	4
Honeywell Int'l Inc. v. Mexichem Amanco Holding S.A. De C.V., 865 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	59
Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc., 688 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	54, 55
KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. 398 (2007)	4
Kumho Tire Co. v. Carmichael, 526 U.S. 137 (1999)	62



L'Oréal USA Inc. v. Liqwd, Inc., PGR2018-00023 Paper 9 (PTAB Aug. 10, 2018)	61
<i>In re Laskowski</i> , 871 F.2d 115 (Fed. Cir. 1989)4	, 59
Merck & Co., Inc. v. Teva Pharm. USA, Inc., 395 F.3d 1364 (Fed.Cir.2005)	22
Microsoft Corp. v. Multi-Tech Sys., Inc., 357 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	17
In re NuVasive, Inc., 693 F. App'x 893 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	., 29
PharmaStem Therapeutics, Inc. v. ViaCell, Inc., 491 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	62
Philips Lighting N. Am. Corp. v. Wangs All. Corp., 727 F. App'x 676 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	57
Sciele Pharma Inc. v. Lupin Ltd., 684 F.3d 1253 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	61
Tech. Patents LLC v. T-Mobile (UK) Ltd., 700 F.3d 482 (Fed. Cir. 2012), cert. denied, 134 S.Ct. 67 (2013)	17
TMI Prod., Inc. v. Rosen Entm't Sys., L.P., 610 F.App'x 968 (Fed. Cir. 2015)23	, 29
Total Containment, Inc. v. Intelpro Corp., 217 F.3d 852, 1999 WL 717945 (Fed. Cir. 1999)4, 57	', 59
ViaTech Techs. Inc. v. Microsoft Corp., 733 F. App'x 542 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	29
Statutes	
35 U.S.C. § 253(a)	14
Other Authorities	
37 C.F.R. § 1.321(a)	14



DOCKET A L A R M

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.

