

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

MEDTRONIC, INC. AND MEDTRONIC VASCULAR, INC.

Petitioner,

v.

TELEFLEX INNOVATIONS S.A.R.L.

Patent Owner.

---

**SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATION OF  
STEPHEN JON DAVID BRECKER, MD, FRCP, FESC, FACC  
SUBMITTED IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONER'S REPLIES**

## Table of Contents

	Page
Table of Contents .....	2
I. Overview.....	4
II. Claim Construction.....	4
A. “interventional cardiology devices” .....	4
B. “coaxial” .....	9
C. Claim 25 of the ’380 Patent.....	14
1. Claim 25: “Means for Receiving and Guiding” .....	14
2. Claim 25: “Interventional Device” .....	19
III. Itou-Based Grounds.....	20
A. Types of interventional cardiology devices insertable through catheter (2).....	20
B. Distal end protective catheter (5) .....	24
C. Itou and Ressemann as prior art .....	25
D. Itou and Ressemann collar 2141 .....	29
E. Itou and Kataishi .....	34
IV. Ressemann-Based Grounds .....	36
A. Ressemann discloses a “tubular structure defining a lumen coaxial and in fluid communication with the lumen of the guide catheter” .....	36
B. Ressemann in view of Takahashi .....	39
C. Ressemann collar 2141.....	42
D. Ressemann anticipates the means-plus-function claims of the ’380 patent .....	45
E. Ressemann or Itou + Kataishi renders claim 27 of the ’380 patent obvious.....	49

V.	Kontos-Based Grounds.....	50
A.	Tube 16 of Kontos’s body 12 is not a narrow tube .....	50
B.	Body 12 of Kontos’s support catheter 10 has a “cross-sectional inner diameter through which interventional cardiology devices are insertable” .....	55
C.	Kontos necessarily resists axial and shear forces that would otherwise tend to dislodge the guide catheter. ....	57
D.	The side opening claims are obvious. ....	61
1.	Replacing Kontos’s proximal funnel with a side opening would maximize the usable “real estate” inside the catheter assembly. ....	61
2.	After removing Kontos’s proximal funnel, a posita would have been motivated to maximize the usable real estate, but even if no further modifications were made, Kontos would not have a “problem gap.” .....	65
3.	After removing Kontos’s proximal funnel, Kontos’s support catheter 10 would remain coaxial with the guide catheter.....	69
E.	Even under patent owner’s interpretation, Kontos still has a “flexible cylindrical reinforced portion.” .....	72
F.	A POSITA would have been motivated with a reasonable expectation of success to achieve the no-more-than-one-french differential between inner diameters of the guide catheter and body 12. ....	73
G.	My opinion remains unchanged: the claims of the ’776 patent that recite a two-inclined side opening are obvious. ....	76
1.	Kontos + Ressemann and Kontos + Ressemann + Takahashi ..	76
2.	Kontos + Ressemann + Kataishi .....	78
VI.	Teleflex’s Evidence Regarding Secondary Considerations Does Not Alter My Opinion That the Challenged Claims Are Obvious. ....	80
VII.	Conclusion .....	83

## I. Overview

1. I have been retained by Robins Kaplan LLP on behalf of Medtronic, Inc. and Medtronic Vascular, Inc. (“Medtronic”) as an independent expert to provide my opinions concerning U.S. Patent Nos. 8,048,032; RE45,380; RE45,776; RE45,760; and RE47,379 (the “Teleflex Patents”) in IPR2020-00126, IPR2020-00127, IPR2020-00128, IPR2020-00129, IPR2020-00130, IPR2020-00132, IPR2020-00134, IPR2020-00135, IPR2020-00136, IPR2020-00137 and IPR2020-00138.<sup>1</sup>

2. I set forth the information below as a supplement to my original declarations, as Teleflex raised new issues in their Patent Owner Responses on which I had not previously been given an opportunity to offer testimony. Having considered Teleflex’s arguments, and the testimony of Teleflex’s declarants, my opinions on the invalidity of the Teleflex Patents remain the same.

## II. Claim Construction

### A. “interventional cardiology devices”

3. The opinions in this section generally relate to at least the following IPRs:

---

<sup>1</sup> Citations to exhibits refer to exhibits filed in IPR2020-00126, unless noted otherwise. I understand that most of Patent Owner’s and Petitioners’ exhibits are numbered consistently across all seven IPRs.

- IPR2020-00126 ('032 patent)
- IPR2020-00127 ('032 patent)
- IPR2020-00128 ('380 patent)
- IPR2020-00130 ('380 patent)
- IPR2020-00135 ('776 patent)

4. I am aware that when the Board instituted the IPR2020-00126 '032 petition it considered whether the limitation “interventional cardiology devices” required that “all four enumerated devices (guidewires, balloon catheters, stents and stent catheters)” be insertable into the lumen of the claimed “device for use with a standard guide catheter.” I.D., Paper 22, 10-13 (IPR2020-00126). This limitation appears in independent claims 1 and 11. This limitation also appears in claims 1 and 12 of the '380 patent. (*See* I.D., Paper 22, 9-11) (IPR2020-00128).

5. At institution, the Board determined that “interventional cardiology devices” refers to “at least two types of the devices selected from the group that includes but is not limited to guidewires, balloon catheters, stents, and stent catheters.” I.D., Paper 22, 12 (IPR2020-00126). Additionally, it determined that Medtronic demonstrated that the tubular portion of Itou’s catheter (2) has an inner diameter through which both guidewire (6) and distal end protective catheter (5) may be inserted. *Id.*, 20.

# 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.