

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MEDTRONIC, INC., AND MEDTRONIC VASCULAR, INC.,

Petitioners,

v.

TELEFLEX INNOVATIONS S.À.R.L.,

Patent Owner.

IPR2020-00126

IPR2020-00128

IPR2020-00129

IPR2020-00132

IPR2020-00134

IPR2020-00135

IPR2020-00137

PETITIONERS' MOTION TO EXCLUDE EXHIBIT 2024

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | |
|------|--|---|
| I. | Introduction..... | 1 |
| II. | Teleflex has not authenticated Exhibit 2024. | 1 |
| A. | Exhibit 2024 is unreliable on its face. | 2 |
| B. | Peterson cannot authenticate Exhibit 2024. | 5 |
| 1. | Peterson lacks personal knowledge of Exhibit 2024. | 6 |
| 2. | Peterson lacks knowledge of VSI’s record-keeping procedures. | 7 |
| C. | No other witness can authenticate Exhibit 2024. | 7 |
| III. | Conclusion | 9 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

| | Page(s) |
|---|---------|
| Cases | |
| <i>Ingenico Inc. v. Iogene, LLC</i> , IPR2019-00929, Paper 53 (PTAB Sept. 21, 2020)..... | 5 |
| <i>Linear Technology Corp. v. Micrel, Inc.</i> , 275 F.3d 1040 (Fed. Cir. 2001) | 5, 6, 8 |
| <i>Riverbed Tech., Inc. v. Realtime Data LLC</i> , IPR2016-00978, Paper 67 (PTAB Oct. 30, 2017)..... | 1 |
| <i>Schroeder v. Smith’s Food & Drug Centers, Inc.</i> , No. 2:12-CV-02024-APG, 2014 WL 548149 (D. Nev. Feb. 11, 2014) | 8 |
| <i>Standard Innovation Corp. v. Lelo, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00148, Paper 41 (PTAB Apr. 23, 2015) | 3, 5 |
| Other Authorities | |
| Fed. R. Evid. 802 | 1 |
| Fed. R. Evid. 901 | 1 |

I. INTRODUCTION

In an attempt to antedate Medtronic’s primary prior art reference, Itou (Ex-1007), Teleflex filed and relies on a “Product Requirements: Guideline Catheter System” document (Ex-2024). Teleflex attempts to authenticate Exhibit 2024 using Dean Peterson, a Principle Research and Design Engineer formerly at VSI, now at Teleflex. Teleflex served a declaration from Peterson as supplemental evidence in response to Medtronic’s objections to Exhibit 2024 under Federal Rules of Evidence 802 and 901. *See* Ex-1923. Exhibit 2024, though, lacks critical indicia of reliability on its face, and Teleflex’s attempt to authenticate the document using Peterson’s conclusory declaration fails. Peterson does not know the circumstances of the creation of the document and cannot speak to VSI’s record-keeping practices.

Indeed, none of Teleflex’s witnesses appear to have personal knowledge of Exhibit 2024. Gregg Sutton, Deborah Schmalz, and Howard Root all mention Exhibit 2024 in their declarations and depositions. *See* Ex-1762, 116:11 *et seq.*; Ex-1757, 79:20 *et seq.*; Ex-1766, 56:9 *et seq.* But none provides information necessary to verify that the document is what Teleflex says it is. The Board should exclude Exhibit 2024.

II. TELEFLEX HAS NOT AUTHENTICATED EXHIBIT 2024.

Under Federal Rule of Evidence 901, Teleflex “must produce evidence sufficient to support a finding that [Exhibit 2024] is what the proponent [Teleflex]

claims it is.” Fed. R. Evid. 901; *Riverbed Tech., Inc. v. Realtime Data LLC*, IPR2016-00978, Paper 67 at 41 (PTAB Oct. 30, 2017) (“The burden is on Patent Owner to produce evidence sufficient to support a finding that [the exhibit] is what the Patent Owner claims it is.”). Teleflex cannot prove that Exhibit 2024 is what it claims: a VSI document created as of a particular date—August 24, 2005—that “signaled VSI’s transition to the formal Quality process for bringing [the GuideLiner RX] to market.” Paper 39 at 17.¹ Teleflex contends that VSI created Exhibit 2024 on August 24, 2005, and that the document “discuss[ed] both the rapid exchange and OTW version of GuideLiner” as of that date. *Id.* If Teleflex (i) cannot date the document, or (ii) cannot show that the document addressed RX Product Requirements as of August 24, 2005, the document is not what Teleflex claims. For either reason, the Board should exclude Exhibit 2024.

A. Exhibit 2024 is unreliable on its face.

Exhibit 2024 lacks critical indicia of reliability. First, the document does not provide a reliable date. The “8/24/05” on the face of the document is an unexplained “effective” date:

¹ This quotation is found in Paper 39 for the following cases: IPR2020-00126, IPR2020-00128, IPR2020-00129, IPR2020-00132, IPR2020-00135, IPR2020-00137. For IPR2020-00134, see Paper 36 at 17.

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.