

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

INTUITIVE SURGICAL, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

ETHICON LLC,
Patent Owner.

IPR2018-01247
U.S. Patent No. 8,479,969

PATENT OWNER ETHICON LLC'S SUR-REPLY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION.....1

II. GROUND 2, CLAIM 24: PETITIONER HAS NOT DEMONSTRATED THAT THE ANDERSON/TIMM COMBINATION RENDERS OBVIOUS LIMITATION [24.4]3

A. The Certificate of Correction Is Invalid and Does Not Apply in This Proceeding3

 1. Collateral estoppel bars application of the Certificate.....4

 2. Judicial estoppel bars application of the Certificate5

B. The Petition’s Conclusory Analysis of Limitation [24.4] Failed to Meet Petitioner’s *Prima Facie* Burden7

C. Section II.B of the Reply Raises New, Impermissible Arguments Concerning Limitation [24.4] That Should be Disregarded8

III. GROUND 2, CLAIM 24: A POSITA WOULD NOT HAVE UTILIZED TIMM’S PASSIVE ARTICULATION JOINT IN ANDERSON’S ROBOTIC SYSTEM.....11

A. Petitioner’s Combination Eliminates the Tactile Feedback That Is Critical to the Operation of Timm’s Endocutter and Changes the Design Principles of the Anderson/Timm Surgical Tools11

B. Passively-Articulated Robotic Tools Have Not Been Introduced Even Today, Confirming That a POSITA Would Not Have Designed Such a Tool in 201113

C. Petitioner’s Counter-Arguments Are Unpersuasive13

 1. The Anderson/Timm combination does not disclose tactile feedback relating to forces applied to the exterior of the end effector14

2.	Petitioner’s argument that tactile feedback is not a requirement for use of passive articulation with a robotic system is meritless	15
3.	Petitioner’s argument that a POSITA would have added tactile feedback to the Anderson/Timm combination is meritless	17
IV.	GROUND 2, CLAIM 24: A POSITA WOULD NOT HAVE HAD A REASONABLE EXPECTATION OF SUCCESS IN COMBINING ANDERSON’S TOOL BASE WITH TIMM’S HANDHELD ENDOCUTTER.....	18
A.	Anderson Does Not Disclose a Drive System for a Surgical Instrument Capable of Driving an Endocutter	18
B.	Expert Testimony Concerning Gears Does Not Demonstrate a Reasonable Expectation of Success	20
C.	Petitioner Fails To Rebut Evidence From Its Own Patent Applications.....	22
V.	GROUND 3: PETITIONER HAS NOT DEMONSTRATED THAT THE ANDERSON/TIMM/WALLACE COMBINATION RENDERS CLAIMS 25-26 OBVIOUS	23
VI.	GROUND 4: PETITIONER HAS NOT DEMONSTRATED THAT THE ANDERSON/KNODEL COMBINATION RENDERS CLAIMS 19-20 OBVIOUS	25
VII.	GROUND 5: PETITIONER HAS NOT DEMONSTRATED THAT THE ANDERSON/VIOLA COMBINATION RENDERS CLAIMS 21-22 OBVIOUS	26
VIII.	CONCLUSION	27

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Adidas AG v. Nike, Inc.</i> , IPR2016-00922, 2019 WL 764425 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 19, 2019)	12
<i>Fisher & Paykel Healthcare Ltd. v. ResMed Pty Ltd.</i> , IPR2017-00059, 2018 WL 1193320 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 7, 2018).....	12
<i>Gillette Co. v. S.C. Johnson & Son, Inc.</i> , 919 F.2d 720 (Fed. Cir. 1990)	24
<i>Harmonic Inc. v. Avid Tech., Inc.</i> , 815 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	8
<i>Hynix Semiconductor Inc. v. Rambus Inc.</i> , 645 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	24
<i>Intelligent Bio-Systems, Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd.</i> , 821 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	8
<i>New Hampshire v. Maine</i> , 532 U.S. 742 (2001).....	5
<i>Plas-Pak Indus., Inc. v. Sulzer Mixpac AG</i> , 600 F. App'x 755 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	12
<i>Samsung Elecs. Co. v. Elm 3DS Innovations</i> , LLC, 925 F.3d 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	25
<i>Schenck, A.G. v. Norton Corp.</i> , 713 F.2d 782 (Fed. Cir. 1983)	21
<i>Trustees in Bankr. of N. Am. Rubber Thread Co. v. U.S.</i> , 593 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	6
<i>Worlds Inc. v. Bungie, Inc.</i> , 903 F.3d 1237 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	4

Other Authorities

37 C.F.R. § 42.23(b)8
August 2018 Trial Practice Guide Update.....8

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.