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 RE 45,380

PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO PETITION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTR	TRODUCTION COMMON TO ALL IPR PETITIONS1					
II.	INTRODUCTION TO THE PRESENT PATENT OWNER RESPONSE3						
III.	KGROUND5						
	A.	The Revolutionary GuideLiner Product5					
	B.	The '380 Patent6					
	C.	The <i>QXM</i> and <i>Medtronic</i> Cases: Parallel Litigation Regarding the Validity of the '380 Patent in the District of Minnesota					
IV.	RITY DATE – PRE-AIA LAW APPLIES14						
V.	THE	THE PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART15					
VI.	CLA	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION15					
	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, 12)					
	B.	Other Terms					
VII.	/II. THE ITOU REFERENCE (Ex. 1007)						
VIII.	THE BOARD SHOULD DECLINE TO INSTITUTE REVIEW21						
	A.	ALL GROUNDS: The Petition Should Be Denied Because the Itou Reference Is Not Prior Art					
	B.	ALL GROUNDS: The Petition Should Be Denied Under 35 U.S.C. § 314(a)					



	C.	ALL Faile	UNDS: The Petition Should Be Denied Because Medtronic				
		to Ju	to Justify its Multiple-Petition Attack on the '379 Patent30				
	D.	ALL GROUNDS: Medtronic Has Not Shown that Itou's Suction Catheter Anticipates Any Challenged Claim33					
	E.	Reas	OUNDS 2 AND 3: Medtronic Has Failed to Demonstrate a asonable Likelihood of Prevailing as to Its Challenges to bendent Claims				
		1.	Grounds 2 and 3 Are Substantively Deficient Because Ground 1 Fails				
		2.		nds 2 and 3 Fail to Address Known Objective Evidence of Obviousness			
			(a)	Commercial Success41			
			(b)	Industry Praise44			
			(c)	Licensing and Licensing Attempts46			
			(d)	Copying47			
			(e)	Long-Felt Need			
	F.		n Should Be Denied Because <i>Inter Partes</i> Review Is ional				
IX.	CON	CONCLUSION					



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Apple Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co., 839 F.3d 1034 (Fed. Cir. 2016)44
Arthrex, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc., 941 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2019)51
Bettcher Indus. v. Bunzl USA, 661 F.3d 629 (Fed. Cir. 2011)35
Comcast Cable Commc'ns., LLC v. Rovi Guides, Inc., IPR2019-01354, -01355, Paper 10 (PTAB Jan. 27, 2020)31
Corning Glass Works v. Sumitomo Elec. U.S.A., Inc., 868 F.2d 1251 (Fed. Cir. 1989)38
Edwards Lifesciences Corp. v. Boston Scientific Scimed, Inc., IPR2017-01298, Paper 8 (PTAB Oct. 25, 2017)38
E-One, Inc. v. Oshkosh Corp., IPR2019-00161, Paper 16 (PTAB May 15, 2019)26, 29
Gilead Scis., Inc. v. United States, IPR2019-01453, Paper 14 (PTAB Feb. 20, 2020)
Guangdong Alison Hi-Tech Co., Ltd. v. Aspen Aerogels, Inc., IPR2017-00413, Paper 10 (PTAB June 8, 2017)38
In re Oelrich, 666 F.2d 578 (C.C.P.A. 1981)35
Institut Pasteur v. Focarino, 738 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2013)
Intri-Plex Techs. Inc. et al. v. Saint-Gobain Performance Plastics Rencol Ltd., IPR2014-00309, Paper 83 (PTAB Mar. 23, 2014)



Jack Guttman, Inc. v. Kopykake Enters., 302 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	16
LG Elecs., Inc. v. Wi-LAN Inc., IPR2018-00704, Paper 14 (PTAB Sept. 5, 2018)	.22
Lucia v. SEC, 138 S. Ct. 2044 (2018)	.51
Newzoom, LLC v. Crane Merchandizing Systems, Inc. IPR2018-01441, Paper 11 (PTAB Jan. 9, 2019)	.37
NHK Spring Co., Ltd., v. Intri-Plex Technologies, Inc., IPR2018-00752, Paper 8 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 12, 2018) (Precedential) 25, 27,	28
Pfenex, Inc. v. GlaxoSmithKline Biologicals SA, IPR2019-01027, Paper 12 (PTAB Nov. 13, 2019)	.32
Polaris Indus. v. Arctic Cat, 882 F.3d 1056 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	.43
Robert Bosch Tool Corp. v. SD3, LLC, IPR2016-01753, Paper 15 (PTAB Mar. 22, 2017)	44
Stryker Corp. et al. v. KFx Medical, LLC, IPR2019-00817, Paper 10 (PTAB Sept. 16, 2019)	41
Stryker Corp. v. Intermedics Orthopedics, Inc., 96 F.3d 1409 (Fed. Cir. 1996)	.49
Transclean Corp. v. Bridgewood Servs., 290 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	38
Transocean Offshore Deepwater Drilling, Inc. v. Maersk Drilling USA, Inc., 699 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	.40
United States v. Booker, 543 U.S. 220 (2005)	52



DOCKET A L A R M

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.

