

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

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

v.

TELEFLEX INNOVATIONS S.A.R.L.
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2020-00127
Patent 8,048,032

PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO PETITION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION COMMON TO ALL IPR PETITIONS.....	1
II.	INTRODUCTION TO THE PRESENT PATENT OWNER RESPONSE	3
III.	BACKGROUND	4
	A. The Revolutionary GuideLiner Product.....	4
	B. The '032 Patent	5
	C. The <i>QXM</i> and <i>Medtronic</i> Cases: Parallel Litigation Regarding the Validity of the '032 Patent in the District of Minnesota.....	10
IV.	THE PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	12
V.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	13
	A. A flexible tip portion/tubular portion “defining a coaxial lumen having a cross-sectional inner diameter through which interventional cardiology devices are insertable” (Claims 1, 11).....	13
	B. Other Terms.....	18
VI.	THE KONTOS REFERENCE (Ex. 1409)	18
VII.	THE ADAMS REFERENCE (Ex. 1435).....	20
VIII.	THE BOARD SHOULD DECLINE TO INSTITUTE REVIEW	21
	A. ALL GROUNDS: The Petition Should Be Denied Under 35 U.S.C. § 314(a).....	21
	B. ALL GROUNDS: The Petition Should Be Denied Because Medtronic Failed to Justify Its Filing of Multiple Petitions	25
	C. ALL GROUNDS: Medtronic Has Not Identified Any Prior Art Showing the Claimed Structure “defining a coaxial lumen having a cross-sectional inner diameter through which interventional cardiology devices are insertable” (Claim 1.a, Claim 11.b)	27
	D. ALL GROUNDS: The Petition Should Be Denied Because It Failed to Address Known, Compelling Objective Evidence of	

Non-Obviousness30

1. Commercial Success33

2. Industry Praise.....37

3. Licensing and Licensing Attempts38

4. Copying.....39

5. Long-Felt Need41

E. The Petition Should Be Denied Because Inter Partes Review Is
Unconstitutional43

IX. CONCLUSION.....44

CERTIFICATE OF WORD COUNT COMPLIANCE.....45

CERTIFICATION OF SERVICE.....46

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Apple Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , 839 F.3d 1034 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	36
<i>Arthrex, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.</i> , 941 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2019)	43
<i>Coalition for Affordable Drugs V LLC v. Hoffman-LaRoche Inc.</i> , IPR2015-01792, Paper 14 (PTAB Mar. 11, 2016)	33
<i>Comcast Cable Commc'ns, LLC v. Rovi Guides, Inc.</i> , IPR2019-00279, -00280, -00282, -00283, Paper 10 (PTAB July 1, 2019).....	27
<i>Comcast Cable Commc'ns, LLC v. Rovi Guides, Inc.</i> , IPR2019-01354, -01355, Paper 10 (PTAB Jan. 27, 2020)	26
<i>Dropbox, Inc. v. Whitserve LLC</i> , IPR2019-01018, Paper 13 (PTAB Nov. 1, 2019).....	27
<i>E-One, Inc. v. Oshkosh Corp.</i> , IPR2019-00161, Paper 16 (PTAB May 15, 2019)	23, 24
<i>Gilead Scis., Inc. v. United States</i> , IPR2019-01453, Paper 14 (PTAB Feb. 20, 2020).....	33
<i>Gilead Scis., Inc. v. United States</i> , IPR2019-01455, Paper 16 (PTAB Feb. 5, 2020).....	33
<i>In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Patent Litig.</i> , 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	30
<i>Institut Pasteur v. Focarino</i> , 738 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	37, 38
<i>Intri-Plex Techs. Inc. et al. v. Saint-Gobain Performance Plastics Rencol Ltd.</i> , IPR2014-00309, Paper 83 (PTAB Mar. 23, 2014)	39
<i>Jack Guttman, Inc. v. Kopykake Enters.</i> , 302 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	13

<i>Lucia v. SEC</i> , 138 S. Ct. 2044 (2018).....	43
<i>Merial Ltd. v. Virbac</i> , IPR2014-01279, Paper 13 (PTAB Jan. 22, 2015)	33
<i>NHK Spring Co., Ltd., v. Intri-Plex Technologies, Inc.</i> , IPR2018-00752, Paper 8 (PTAB Sept. 12, 2018).....	21, 23, 24
<i>Polaris Indus. v. Arctic Cat</i> , 882 F.3d 1056 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	35
<i>Robert Bosch Tool Corp. v. SD3, LLC</i> , IPR2016-01753, Paper 15 (PTAB Mar. 22, 2017)	32, 33, 36
<i>Square, Inc. v. 4361423 Canada Inc.</i> , IPR2019-01628, Paper 14 (PTAB Mar. 31, 2020)	25, 26
<i>Stryker Corp. v. Intermedics Orthopedics, Inc.</i> , 96 F.3d 1409 (Fed. Cir. 1996)	41
<i>Stryker Corp. v. KFx Medical, LLC</i> , IPR2019-00817, Paper 10 (PTAB Sept. 16, 2019).....	33
<i>Transocean Offshore Deepwater Drilling, Inc. v. Maersk Drilling USA, Inc.</i> , 699 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	30
<i>United States v. Booker</i> , 543 U.S. 220 (2005).....	43
<i>Vitronics Corp. v. Conceptronic</i> , 90 F.3d 1576 (Fed. Cir. 1996)	13
<i>WBIP, LLC v. Kohler Co.</i> , 829 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	41
<i>Wyers v. Master Lock Co.</i> , 616 F.3d 1231 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	39
Statutes	
35 U.S.C. § 102(b)	18
35 U.S.C. § 311(b)	28

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.