

james.elacqua@dechert.com
Noemi C. Espinosa (CSB No. 116753)
nicky.espinosa@dechert.com
Andrew N. Thomases (CSB No. 177339)
andrew.thomases@dechert.com
Michelle W. Yang (CSB No. 215199)
michelle.yang@dechert.com
Hieu H. Phan (CSB No. 218216)
hieu.phan@dechert.com
Joshua C. Walsh-Benson (CSB No. 228983)
joshua.walsh-benson@dechert.com
DECHERT LLP
2440 W. El Camino Real, Suite 700
Mountain View, California 94040-1499
Telephone: (650) 813-4800
Facsimile: (650) 813-4848

Attorneys for Plaintiffs
MEDTRONIC, INC., MEDTRONIC USA, INC.,
AND MEDTRONIC VASCULAR, INC.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

MEDTRONIC, INC., a Minnesota
corporation, MEDTRONIC USA, INC., a
Minnesota corporation, and MEDTRONIC
VASCULAR, INC., a Delaware
corporation,

Plaintiffs,

v.

AGA MEDICAL CORPORATION, a
Minnesota corporation,

Defendant.

Case No. C07-00567 MMC

**MEDTRONIC'S FED. R. CIV. P. 50(a)
MOTION FOR JUDGMENT AS A
MATTER OF LAW**

Date: TBD
Time: TBD
Place: Courtroom 7, 19th Floor
Judge: Hon. Maxine M. Chesney

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
1		
2		
3	I. INTRODUCTION	1
4	II. AGA HAS INFRINGED THE ASSERTED CLAIMS OF THE ‘141 AND ‘957 PATENTS	1
5	A. The Commonalities Among All The Accused Systems.....	2
6	1. All Accused Systems Function Similarly And Require The Use Of AGA’s Delivery Cable And A Loader/Delivery Catheter	2
7	2. All Accused Devices Exhibit SIM When Restrained	3
8	3. All Accused Devices Undergo A Load Test	4
9	4. AGA Makes Or Has Made All Components Of The Accused Systems	4
10	5. AGA Instructs Physicians On How To Use The Accused Systems	5
11	B. Direct Infringement.....	5
12	1. Claim 18 of the ‘141 Patent	5
13	C. Contributory Infringement	6
14	1. The ‘141 Patent	6
15	2. The ‘957 Patent	7
16	D. Infringement Under 35 U.S.C. § 271(f)(2)	7
17	1. The ‘957 Patent	7
18	III. MEDTRONIC IS ENTITLED TO DAMAGES IN THE FORM OF A REASONABLE ROYALTY EQUAL TO 13.4% OF AGA’S SALES OF ACCUSED DEVICES AND DELIVERY SYSTEMS.....	8
19	IV. THE ‘141 AND ‘957 PATENTS ARE NOT INVALID	9
20	A. The Patents Are Not Anticipated By The “Work” Of Dr. Cragg Or The Cragg II Paper	9
21	1. The “Work” of Dr. Cragg.....	9
22	2. The Cragg II Paper.....	10
23	B. Obviousness	10
24	1. Cragg et al., Nonsurgical Placement of Arterial Endoprostheses: A New Technique Using Nitinol Wire, Radiology (April 1983) (“Cragg I”) and Patent Application S56-144326 to Miyauchi et al. (“Miyauchi”)	10
25	2. Miyauchi And Patent No. 4,512,338 (“Balko”).....	11
26	3. Miyauchi And Palestrant, Comparative In Vitro Evaluation of the Nitinol Inferior Vena Cava Filter, Radiology 145: 351-355, November 1982.....	11
27	4. Secondary Considerations of Non-Obviousness.....	12
28	V. CONCLUSION	13

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

FEDERAL CASES

Page

Waymark Corp. v. Porta Sys. Corp.,
245 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2001)..... 8, 9

FEDERAL STATUTES

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 50(a) 1, 2, 3

NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION

1
2 TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD, PLEASE TAKE
3 NOTICE that Medtronic will and hereby does move this Court, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil
4 Procedure 50(a), for an Order granting judgment as a matter of law that (1) AGA has infringed
5 U.S. Patent No. 6,306,141 (hereinafter “the ‘141 patent”) and U.S. Patent No. 5,067,957
6 (hereinafter “the ‘957 patent”), (2) the ‘141 and ‘957 patents are not invalid, and (3) Medtronic is
7 entitled to damages in the form of a reasonable royalty equal to 13.4% of AGA’s sales of accused
8 devices and delivery systems. This Motion is based upon this Notice of Motion and Motion,
9 Memorandum of Points and Authorities, the evidence and testimony of record, other papers and
10 pleadings on file, and on such other argument and evidence as may be presented to the Court at or
11 prior to the hearing on this Motion.

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**I. INTRODUCTION**

12
13
14 Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 50(a), Medtronic hereby moves for judgment
15 as a matter of law on all factual issues that have been presented to the jury regarding AGA’s
16 infringement of the ‘141 and ‘957 patents, the validity of the ‘141 and ‘957 patents, and the
17 amount of damages owed to Medtronic as a result of AGA’s infringement. The trial record
18 establishes that no reasonable jury could find that AGA has not infringed the asserted claims of
19 the ‘141 and ‘957 patents, that the asserted claims of the ‘141 and ‘957 patents are invalid, or that
20 Medtronic is not entitled to damages in the form of a reasonable royalty equal to 13.4% of AGA’s
21 sales of the accused products.¹

II. AGA HAS INFRINGED THE ASSERTED CLAIMS OF THE ‘141 AND ‘957 PATENTS

22
23
24 Medtronic accuses AGA of infringement of the asserted claims of the ‘141 and/or ‘957
25 patents with respect to the following AGA devices and their corresponding delivery systems: the
26 AMPLATZER® Septal Occluder and Multi-Fenestrated Septal Occluder, the AMPLATZER®

27
28 ¹ Medtronic also moves for judgment as a matter of law on AGA’s counterclaims for declaratory judgment of noninfringement and invalidity of the ‘141 and ‘957 patents because no reasonable juror could find that the patents are not infringed or are invalid.

1 Duct Occluder I and II, the AMPLATZER® PFO Occluder, the AMPLATZER® VSD Occluders
2 (including the Membranous VSD Occluder, the Muscular VSD Occluder, and the P.I. Muscular
3 VSD Occluder), and the AMPLATZER® Vascular Plug, Vascular Plug II, and Vascular Plug III.
4 The occluders and plugs are collectively referred to as the “Accused Devices.”

5 **A. The Commonalities Among All The Accused Systems**

6 **1. All Accused Systems Function Similarly And Require The Use Of**
7 **AGA’s Delivery Cable And A Loader/Delivery Catheter**

8 All sizes of the Accused Devices and their delivery systems function similarly. Dkt. 812
9 (Feinstein testimony) at 245-303. All of the Accused Devices are designed and made so that each
10 occluder or plug device can be implanted into patients using minimally invasive techniques,
11 requiring only a small incision allowing the device to be implanted via the patient’s vascular
12 system. *Id.*

13 Although AGA sells several components of the Accused Systems separately, every
14 Accused Device requires a loader, AGA’s delivery cable/wire and a delivery catheter in order to
15 function. *See, e.g.*, Dkt. 812 at 258:1-3; TX Nos. 22, 23, 36, 346, 347, 457, 460, 474, 502, 503-
16 506, 1558-1560, 1999, 1185, 1186, 2451-2454. The occluders are sold separately from their
17 corresponding delivery systems, which include a loader, a sheath, and a delivery cable. *See, e.g.*,
18 Dkt. 812 at 258:1-3; TX Nos. 22, 23, 36, 346, 347, 457, 460, 502, 504-506, 1558-1560, 1999,
19 1185, 1186, 2451, 2452, and 2454. Because an AGA loader and sheath are bundled with the
20 required delivery cable, the vast majority of the time the physicians also use AGA’s sheath and
21 loader. *See, e.g.*, Dkt. 812 at 257:18-258:7. The vascular plugs are sold preloaded and pre-
22 connected to the delivery wire. *See, e.g.*, TX Nos. 474, 503, 2453, and 2462. The sheaths used
23 with the plugs are sold separately. *See, e.g.*, TX 474, 503, and 453.

24 For implantation, each occluder must first be affixed onto the end of AGA’s delivery
25 cable with a threaded connector. *See, e.g.*, Dkt. 812 at 258:1-3, TX Nos. 22, 23, 36, 346, 347,
26 457, 460, 502, 504-506, 1558-1560, 1999, 1185, 1186, 2451, 2452, and 2454. Using the AGA
27 delivery cable to manipulate the device, the physician pulls the device into a loader so that the
28 device is restrained in a deformed shape. *See, e.g.*, Dkt. 812 at 280-287. The loader is connected

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.