

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 No. IPR2020-00126

Case No. IPR2020-00127

U.S. Patent No. 8,048,032

---

**PETITIONER'S OPPOSITION  
TO PATENT OWNER'S CORRECTED MOTION TO AMEND**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|  | <b>Page</b> |
|--|-------------|
| I. Introduction.....   | 1           |
| II. Proposed Claims 23-25 Lack Written Description or Are Indefinite.....                        | 1           |
| A. Claims reciting a side opening outside of the substantially rigid portion lack support.....   | 1           |
| B. Proposed claims 23-25 are indefinite.....   | 11          |
| III. The Prior Art Renders Proposed Claims 23-25 Unpatentable .....                              | 11          |
| A. Claim Construction.....   | 12          |
| B. Substitute claims 23-25 are unpatentable over Itou in view of Ressemann or Kataishi. ....     | 12          |
| 1. Substitute Claim 23 .....   | 12          |
| 2. Substitute Claim 24 .....   | 22          |
| 3. Substitute Claim 25 .....   | 24          |
| C. Substitute claims 23-25 are unpatentable over Kontos in view of Ressemann and Takahashi. .... | 25          |
| 1. Substitute Claim 23 .....   | 25          |
| 2. Substitute Claim 24 .....   | 30          |
| 3. Substitute Claim 25 .....   | 35          |
| D. Combining Kontos with Kataishi for Claims 23-25 .....   | 35          |
| IV. Conclusion .....   | 35          |

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

|   | Page(s) |
|---|---------|
| <b>Federal Cases</b>  |         |
| <i>Gentry Gallery, Inc. v. Berkline Corp.</i> ,<br>134 F.3d 1473 (Fed. Cir. 1998) .....         | 5       |
| <i>ICU Medical, Inc. v. Alaris Medical Sys., Inc.</i> ,<br>558 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2009) ..... | 10      |
| <i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.</i> ,<br>550 U.S. 398 (2007).....                            | 18      |
| <i>PowerOasis Inc. v. T-Mobile USA, Inc.</i> ,<br>522 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....          | 4       |
| <i>In re Schreiber</i> ,<br>128 F.3d 1473 (Fed. Cir. 1997) .....                                | 23      |
| <i>Tronzo v. Biomet, Inc.</i> ,<br>156 F.3d 1154 (Fed. Cir. 1998) .....                         | 5       |

## I. INTRODUCTION

Medtronic, Inc., and Medtronic Vascular, Inc., (“Petitioner”) opposes Patent Owner’s Corrected Contingent Motion to Amend (“Mot.”). Patent Owner (“PO”) seeks to amend claims 1, 11, and 16 and proposes substitute claims 23-25. (Mot., 1, Appendix A (“App.”).) But the substitute claims are not supported by the original disclosure and are unpatentable over the prior art. PO’s Motion should be denied.

## II. PROPOSED CLAIMS 23-25 LACK WRITTEN DESCRIPTION OR ARE INDEFINITE.

### A. Claims reciting a side opening outside of the substantially rigid portion lack support.

Proposed claim 23 recites a “device for use with a standard 6 French guide catheter ... comprising, *in a distal-to-proximal direction* ... a flexible tip portion ... [a] side opening ... and a substantially rigid portion[.]” (App., 1-2.)<sup>1</sup> Similarly, proposed claim 24 recites “a side opening positioned between a proximal end of the reinforced portion and a distal end of the substantially rigid portion.” (*Id.*, 4.) A POSITA would understand that claims 23 and 24 require a side opening that is separate from (distal to) the “substantially rigid portion.” (Ex. 1919, ¶¶ 48-52; *see also* Mot., 4 (“The claim need not expressly recite that the side opening is in the substantially rigid portion.”).) But the written description exclusively and repeatedly

---

<sup>1</sup> All emphasis and annotations added unless otherwise specified.

describes the side opening as *part of* the substantially rigid portion of the claimed device. Thus, proposed claims 23 and 24 should be rejected for lack of written description.

The original patent application describes the invention as a device that is used with “standard guide catheters” in “interventional cardiology procedures.” (Ex. 1842, 7-8.) The claims of the original patent application (and the proposed claims here) are generally directed to the “coaxial guide catheter” described in the specification. (*See, e.g., id.*, 38-44; *see also* POR, 4 (also describing the invention as a “guide extension catheter”).) This coaxial guide catheter is consistently described as being made of three distinct portions: “a tip portion, a reinforced portion, and a substantially rigid portion.” (Ex. 1842, 9; *see also id.*, 16 (alternatively describing the final section as a “rigid portion 20”).) Each of these portions has a specified composition—the tip portion is “a low durometer polymer or elastomer”; the reinforced portion is made of PTFE, Pebax®, and may be reinforced with “metallic fibers in a braided or coiled pattern”; and the rigid portion is “formed from a stainless steel or Nitinol tube.” (*Id.*, 9.)

The only portions of the specification that describe a side opening are in the parts describing the “rigid portion.” (*Id.*, 9-10, 13-20, 38-41, 43, Figs. 4, 12-16; *see also* Ex. 1919, ¶¶ 28-41, 46-47.) Indeed, PO points to these portions as supporting the “side opening” limitations of the proposed claims. (Mot., 4, 7.)

# 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.