

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

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

v.

TELEFLEX INNOVATIONS S.À.R.L.,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2020-00127  
Patent 8,048,032

---

**PETITIONERS' REPLY TO PATENT OWNER'S  
PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

Medtronic had no obligation to address secondary considerations in its Petition. Instead, Teleflex, as the Patent Owner, has the burden of production on that issue. Teleflex's positions on secondary considerations—which are not even supported by expert testimony—have not been fully developed, let alone adjudicated, in Court or the Patent Office. Nor has Teleflex identified any authority requiring a Petitioner to address secondary considerations absent those instances. Thus, secondary considerations should not be addressed until the trial phase.

The Board has repeatedly rejected arguments that a petition must address secondary considerations, including in cases involving allegations far more developed than the miscellaneous assortment of evidence presented here. In *Lowe's Co. v. Nichia Corp.*, the Board granted institution and found that the Petitioner did not have to address evidence of secondary considerations even though the District Court's findings of fact previously credited that evidence. IPR2017-02011, Paper 12 at \*4-6, 55-58 (POPR), Paper 13 at \*18 (PTAB Mar. 12, 2018) (Institution Decision); *see also Petroleum Geo-Services Inc. v. W. Geco LLC*, IPR2014-01477, Paper 12 at \*40-41 (POPR), Paper 18 at \*32 (PTAB Mar. 17, 2015) (Institution Decision). Similarly, in *C & D Zodiac, Inc. v. b/e Aerospace, Inc.*, the Board concluded that a petition need not “introduce and address such secondary considerations evidence” that was “discovered during the co-pending litigation.” IPR2017-01275, Paper 12 at \*15 (PTAB Oct. 31, 2017).

IPR2020-00127  
Patent 8,048,032

Indeed, the Board rejected the same arguments from Teleflex's counsel in *Arctic Cat, Inc. v. Polaris Industries Inc.*, IPR2017-00433, Paper 17 at \*9-10 (PTAB July 5, 2017). The Board explained that "Patent Owner does not identify, nor are we aware of any persuasive authority requiring Petitioner in this case to address secondary considerations, not previously presented to the Office, in the Petition." *Id.* at \*10. Instead, "the burden of production rests on Patent Owner with regard to secondary considerations." *Id.* Thus, the Board found that "full consideration of evidence of secondary considerations of this nature is not necessary" before institution. *Id.* at \*19.

Teleflex's arguments are no more compelling here. Again, Teleflex's counsel identifies no authority for requiring a Petitioner, such as Medtronic, to address evidence of secondary considerations, absent a decision by the Patent Office, ITC, or District Court crediting that evidence. *See, e.g., Stryker Corp. et al. v. KFx Med., LLC*, IPR2019-00817, Paper 10 at \*27-28 (PTAB Sept. 16, 2019) ("[S]econdary considerations evidence was developed fully during the Arthrex Litigation, and the Federal Circuit affirmed the jury's verdict"); *Robert Bosch Tool Corp. v. Sd3*, No. IPR2016-01753, Paper, at \*12 (PTAB Mar. 22, 2017) ("[A]fter development of the record at the ITC, including cross-examination, the Administrative Judge determined that the evidence of secondary considerations was 'very strong' in favor of Patent Owner."); *Gilead Sciences, Inc. v. United*

IPR2020-00127  
Patent 8,048,032

*States*, IPR2019-01453, Paper 14 at \*26-27 (PTAB Feb. 20, 2020) (“[W]ell-developed evidence of” secondary considerations “was key to the allowance of the claims”); *Coal. for Affordable Drugs V LLC v. Hoffman-LaRoche Inc.*, IPR2015-01792, Paper 14 at 17-18 (PTAB Mar. 11, 2016) (pointing to “objective indicia of nonobviousness presented to the Office during the prosecution”). None of those circumstances are present here.

The Patent Office never addressed secondary considerations during prosecution of this patent. *See* Exs. 1402-1403. Nor have secondary considerations even been raised by Teleflex in litigation against Medtronic, let alone fully developed or adjudicated. None of Teleflex’s identified exhibits even mention “secondary considerations.” Instead, an expert report from a different case discusses infringement (Ex. 2056); a declaration from Teleflex’s preliminary injunction briefing addresses purported irreparable harm (Ex. 2043); and an interrogatory response sets forth Teleflex’s alleged market share (Ex. 2059). Teleflex argues that Medtronic should have cobbled together disparate disclosures from these types of exhibits to make Teleflex’s argument for it. Requiring petitioners to engage in guessing games would waste the parties’ and the Board’s resources. Under these circumstances, Medtronic did not have to raise secondary considerations in its Petition. The Board should grant institution and reject Teleflex’s attempt to shift the initial burden on secondary considerations to Medtronic.

IPR2020-00127  
Patent 8,048,032

Dated: April 24, 2020

Respectfully submitted,

*/Cyrus A. Morton/*

Cyrus A. Morton

Reg. No. 44,954

Robins Kaplan LLP

2800 LaSalle Plaza

800 LaSalle Avenue

Minneapolis, MN 55402

*Attorney for Patent Owner*

# 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.