

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

DECLARATION OF DR. SHORYA AWTAR

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. PRIORITY DATE AND LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART.....	2
III. QUALIFICATIONS	3
IV. RELEVANT LEGAL STANDARDS	4
V. OVERVIEW OF THE TECHNOLOGY DISCLOSED IN THE 969 PATENT.....	6
VI. PROSECUTION HISTORY OF THE 969 PATENT.....	16
VII. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	16
VIII. OVERVIEW OF THE PRIOR ART CITED BY PETITIONER.....	17
A. Ex. 1010, Anderson (U.S. Patent No. 6,783,524)	17
B. Ex. 1011, Timm (U.S. Patent No. 7,510,107).....	23
C. Ex. 1008, Wallace (U.S. Patent No. 6,699,235)	27
D. Ex. 1012, Knodel (U.S. Patent No. 5,465,895).....	31
E. Ex. 1013, Viola (U.S. Patent No. 5,954,259).....	33
IX. PETITIONER HAS NOT DEMONSTRATED THAT ANDERSON IN COMBINATION WITH ANY OF THE REMAINING PRIOR ART REFERENCES RENDERS OBVIOUS THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS OF THE 969 PATENT.....	36

A.	Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated Anderson in View of Timm Renders Obvious Claim 24 of the 969 Patent (Ground 2).....	36
1.	Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated That The Combination Of Anderson And Timm Discloses “A Tool Mounting Portion Operably Coupled To A Distal End Of Said Proximal Spine Portion” (Ground 2, claim 24)	37
2.	A POSITA Would Not Have Utilized Timm’s Passive Articulation Joint In The Robotic System Of Anderson (Ground 2, Claim 24).....	39
3.	A POSITA Would Not Have Had A Reasonable Expectation Of Success In Combining Anderson’s Tool Base With A Handheld Endocutter As Disclosed In Timm (Ground 2, Claim 24).....	42
a)	A POSITA Would Have Recognized That the Combination of Anderson with Timm’s Endocutter Would Require a Re-Design to Provide Sufficient Forces to Drive the Endocutter.....	45
b)	Handheld Endocutters That Are Manually Actuated Operate on Fundamentally Different Principles Than Robotic Tools	47
c)	The Publications of Both Patent Owner and Petitioner Confirm that a POSITA Would Not Have Had a Reasonable Expectation of Success	49
B.	Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated That The Combination Of Anderson, Timm, And Wallace Renders Obvious Claims 25-26 Of The 969 Patent (Ground 3).....	53
1.	Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated That Claim 24 Is Obvious, And Therefore Cannot Demonstrate That Its Dependent Claims Are Obvious.....	53

2.	Timm’s Passive Articulation Joint is Not Compatible With Wallace’s Active Articulation System	53
3.	The Combination Of Timm’s Endocutter With Wallace’s Wrist Requires More Control Inputs Than Are Available In Wallace And Anderson.....	55
C.	Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated That The Combination Of Anderson And Knodel Renders Obvious Claims 19-20 Of The 969 Patent (Ground 4).....	58
1.	A POSITA Would Have Been Dissuaded From the Combination of Anderson’s Robotic System with Knodel’s Handheld Endocutter	59
2.	A POSITA Would Have Lacked A Reasonable Expectation Of Success In Combining Anderson With Knodel.....	62
D.	Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated That The Combination Of Anderson And Viola Renders Obvious Claims 21-22 Of The 969 Patent (Ground 5)	62
XI.	JURAT	68

I. INTRODUCTION

1. My name is Dr. Shorya Awtar. I have been retained by counsel for Patent Owner Ethicon LLC (“Ethicon”) in the above captioned *inter partes* review to consult with counsel, review documents, form opinions, prepare expert declarations, and be available to testify as to my opinions.

2. I understand that Petitioner Intuitive Surgical, Inc. (“Intuitive”) has asserted that claims 19-22 and 24-26 of U.S. Patent No. 8,479,969 (the “969 Patent”) are invalid as obvious. I have been asked to give expert opinions and testimony related to the issue of the validity of claims 19-22 and 24-26 of the 969 Patent,¹ including the background of the technology at issue, and the scope and content of the prior art.

3. My opinions are based on reviewing the Petition, Dr. Knodel’s declaration (Ex. 1004), the Patent Owner Response, the transcripts of Dr. Knodel’s depositions, and the relevant portions of all exhibits cited in any of the foregoing documents and this declaration.

4. The opinions I have formed as explained herein are informed by and based on my consideration of the documents listed above, as well as my own

¹ I understand that challenged claim 23, which relates to Petitioner’s Ground 1, has been disclaimed. *See* Ex. 2002.

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.