

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 IPR2020-00128  
Patent RE45,380

---

**PATENT OWNER SUR-REPLY TO PETITIONER'S REPLY**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. Introduction.....	1
II. The Proper Construction of “Through Which Interventional Cardiology Devices are Insertable” Is Dispositive Against the Petition (All Challenged Claims) .....	2
A. “Through Which Interventional Cardiology Devices are Insertable” Requires at Least the Defined Set of Guidewires, Balloon Catheters, Stents, <i>and</i> Stent Catheters are Insertable .....	3
B. “Interventional Cardiology Device” .....	5
III. All Challenged Claims (Ground 1): Petitioner Has Not Shown that Itou’s Lumen Has the Claimed Structure with a “Cross-Sectional Inner Diameter Through Which Interventional Cardiology Devices are Insertable” Under Either Construction .....	7
A. Itou’s Protective Catheter Is Not an “Interventional Cardiology Device” As That Term Is Defined and Used in the ’380 Patent.....	7
B. Petitioner’s New Inherency Argument Is Untimely and It Would Be Unfairly Prejudicial for the Board To Consider It .....	8
C. Petitioner’s New Inherency Argument Is Unpersuasive, Even If the Board Were to Consider It .....	10
IV. Independent Claim 1 (Ground 1): Itou Does Not Anticipate Because Its Distal Tip Portion Is Not Cylindrical .....	11
V. Dependent Claims 3, 14, and 15 (Grounds 1 and 2) .....	12
A. Petitioner Failed to Show That Itou Anticipates Claims 3, 14, or 15 (Ground 1) .....	12
B. Claim 3 Would Not Have Been Obvious in View of Itou and Ressemann (Ground 2) .....	14
C. Claim 14 Would Not Have Been Obvious in View of Itou and Ressemann (Ground 2) .....	16

D.	Claim 15 Is Not Obvious in View of Itou and Ressemann (Ground 2)	18
VI.	Petitioner Has Not Refuted the Striking Objective Evidence That Confirms Claims 3 and 14 Were Not Obvious	18
A.	The Objective Evidence, Including Nexus, Is Undisputed	18
B.	The Combination of Features That Resulted in GuideLiner’s Success and Praise Is Not in the Prior Art	19
C.	The Fact That All of GuideLiner’s Competitors Copied its Design Confirms Non-Obviousness	20
VII.	Non-AIA Patent	22

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>Apple Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , 839 F.3d 1034 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	22
<i>In re Magnum Oil Tools Int'l, Ltd.</i> , 829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	13
<i>Intelligent Bio-Sys., Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge, Ltd.</i> , 821 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	9
<i>Iron Grip Barbell Co. v. USA Sports, Inc.</i> , 392 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2004) .....	21, 22
<i>Jack Guttman, Inc. v. Kopykake Enters.</i> , 302 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2002) .....	3
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007) .....	14
<i>Lectrosonics, Inc. v. Zaxcom, Inc.</i> , IPR2018-01129, Paper 33 (PTAB Jan. 24, 2020) .....	19
<i>Mytee Prods., Inc. v. Harris Rsch, Inc.</i> , 439 F. App'x 882 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....	13
<i>Tech. Patents LLC v. T-Mobile UK, Ltd.</i> , 700 F.3d 482 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	6
<i>Vitronics Corp. v. Conceptronic</i> , 90 F.3d 1576 (Fed. Cir. 1996) .....	3
<i>WBIP, LLC v. Kohler Co.</i> , 829 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	19, 20

### Other Authorities

35 U.S.C. § 103 .....	16
35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(3) .....	9

## I. Introduction

The challenged claims are directed to a guide extension catheter (“GEC”) with rapid exchange capability through which at least a defined set of “interventional cardiology devices” are insertable. Petitioner’s reliance on Itou, a suction catheter designed for an entirely different purpose, is unavailing. Petitioner does not persuasively explain why the Board should ignore the patent’s express definition of “interventional cardiology devices” as including at least guidewires, balloon catheters, stents, and stent catheters. Even under the Board’s preliminary construction, the Petition incorrectly relies on Itou’s protective catheter, which the patent itself makes clear is not an interventional cardiology device. What’s more, Itou’s protective catheter is inserted into Itou’s suction catheter only *outside* the body. Unlike GuideLiner, Itou does not receive anything *into* its proximal opening after it is loaded into a guide catheter.

Petitioner also raises an inherency argument for the first time in Reply. This is a transparent and improper attempt to belatedly gap-fill. And Petitioner’s new argument is not even supported by the new evidence.

Independent claim 1 of the ’380 patent requires that the tubular structure (defined by the flexible tip portion) include “a flexible cylindrical distal tip portion.” The distal tip portion of Itou’s suction catheter is not “cylindrical.” It is

# 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.